

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

203451

Calendar No. 1944

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 7786

[Report No. 1941]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 11 (legislative day, MARCH 29), 1950

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 8, 1950

Reported, under authority of the order of the Senate of July 6 (legislative day, July 1), 1950, by Mr. McKELLAR, with amendments

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
- 2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any
- 4 money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the
- 5 support of the Government, for the fiscal year ending June
- 6 30, 1951, namely:

~~1~~ CHAPTER I—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

~~2~~ For the general fund of the District of Columbia,
~~3~~ ~~\$9,800,000~~ \$11,000,000, and for the water fund, established
~~4~~ by law (D. C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), \$1,000,000, both
~~5~~ amounts to be advanced July 1, 1950.

- 1 prescribed for such appointees by the Capitol Police Board:
- 2 *Provided, That* the Capitol Police Board is hereby authorized
- 3 to detail police from the House Office, Senate Office, and
- 4 Capitol Buildings for police duty on the Capitol Grounds.
- 5 This chapter may be cited as the "Legislative Branch
- 6 Appropriation Act, 1951".

1 CHAPTER III—DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUS-
2 TICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY
3 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses of the Department of State not
6 otherwise provided for, including personal services in the
7 District of Columbia; expenses authorized by the Foreign
8 Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158),
9 not otherwise provided for; expenses of the National Com-
10 mission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooper-
11 ation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the Act of
12 July 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 287o, 287q, 287r); expenses
13 of attendance at meetings concerned with activities
14 provided for under this appropriation; hire of passen-
15 ger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation of aircraft
16 outside the continental United States; printing and binding,
17 including printing and binding outside the continental United
18 States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1,

1 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by
2 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
3 not to exceed \$1,000 for payment of tort claims pursuant
4 to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as
5 authorized by law; purchase of uniforms; insurance of official
6 motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law
7 of such countries; dues for library membership in organiza-
8 tions which issue publications to members only, or to mem-
9 bers at a price lower than to others; rental of tie lines and
10 teletype equipment; employment of aliens, by contract, for
11 services abroad; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid
12 for passports; establishment, maintenance, and operation of
13 passport and despatch agencies; examination of estimates of
14 appropriations in the field; ice and drinking water for use
15 abroad; excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; loss
16 by exchange; radio communications; payment in advance
17 for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and
18 similar services abroad; relief, protection, and burial of
19 American seamen, and alien seamen in foreign countries
20 and in the United States Territories and possessions; ex-
21 penses incurred in acknowledging services of officers and
22 crews of foreign vessels and aircraft in rescuing American
23 seamen, airmen, or citizens from shipwreck or other catas-
24 trophe abroad; rent and expenses of maintaining in Egypt,
25 Morocco, and Muscat, institutions for American convicts

1 and persons declared insane by any consular court, and care
2 and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane;
3 expenses, as authorized by law (18 U. S. C. 3192), of
4 bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons
5 charged with crime; and procurement by contract or other-
6 wise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1)
7 translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical infor-
8 mation, (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geo-
9 graphic aids, (4) maintenance, improvement, and repair
10 of diplomatic and consular properties in foreign countries,
11 including minor construction on Government-owned prop-
12 erties, (5) not to exceed \$200,000 for maintenance and
13 operation of commissary and mess services, (6) fuel and
14 utilities for Government-owned or leased property abroad,
15 and (7) rental or lease, for periods not exceeding ten years,
16 of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for the
17 use of the Foreign Service, for which payments may be
18 made in advance; ~~\$77,300,000~~ \$78,300,000: *Provided*, That
19 pursuant to section 8 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
20 118d-1), passenger motor vehicles in possession of the
21 Foreign Service abroad may be exchanged or sold and the
22 exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be
23 available without fiscal year limitation for replacement of
24 an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including
25 the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not

1 exceed \$3,000 in the case of the chief of mission automobile
 2 at each diplomatic mission and \$1,400 in the case of all
 3 other such vehicles except station wagons: *Provided further,*
 4 That of the amount appropriated herein, not to exceed
 5 \$30,000 shall be expended for carrying out the provisions
 6 of the Act of July 31, 1945 (5 U. S. C. 168d): *Provided*
 7 *further, That the compensation of the Deputy Under Secre-*
 8 *tary for Administration shall be \$17,500 per annum so long*
 9 *as the position is held by the present incumbent.*

10 REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

11 For representation allowances as authorized by section
 12 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C.
 13 1131), ~~\$675,000~~ \$900,000.

14 FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

15 For financing the liability of the United States, created
 16 by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1061-
 17 1116), ~~\$2,233,000~~, which amount shall be placed to the
 18 credit of the "Foreign Service retirement and disability
 19 fund."

20 BUILDINGS FUND

21 For carrying into effect the Act of July 25, 1946
 22 (22 U. S. C. 295b), including the initial alterations,
 23 repair, and furnishing of buildings acquired under said Act,
 24 ~~\$8,000,000~~ \$5,000,000, which is exclusively for expenditure
 25 under the provisions of said Act which relate to payments

1 representing the value of foreign property or credits: *Pro-*
 2 *vided*, That, when specifically authorized by the Secretary
 3 of State or such Assistant Secretary as he may designate,
 4 section 6 of the Act of May 7, 1926, may be construed as
 5 including leaseholds of not less than ten years.

6 EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR 7 SERVICE

8 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of
 9 State to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Diplo-
 10 matic and Consular Service, to be expended pursuant to
 11 the requirement of section 291 of the Revised Statutes
 12 (31 U. S. C. 107), including personal services in the
 13 District of Columbia, ~~\$10,600,000~~ \$9,900,000: *Provided*,
 14 That the Secretary of State may delegate to subordinate
 15 officials the authority vested in him by section 291 of the
 16 Revised Statutes pertaining to certification of expenditures.

17 CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

18 For expenses necessary to meet annual obligations to
 19 international organizations, the Government of Panama, and
 20 Gorgas Memorial Institute, pursuant to treaties, conventions,
 21 or specific Acts of Congress, ~~\$55,178,297~~ \$53,753,067, to-
 22 gether with such additional sums due to increase in rates of
 23 exchange as the Secretary of State may determine and certify
 24 to the Secretary of the Treasury to be necessary to pay, in
 25 foreign currencies, the quotas and contributions required by

1 the several treaties, conventions, or laws establishing the
2 amount of the obligation: *Provided*, That the Department of
3 State, when requested by the United Nations, is authorized to
4 acquire surplus property for the United Nations in accord-
5 ance with existing surplus property disposal laws and regula-
6 tions, and the contribution of the United States to the United
7 Nations shall be reduced by the value of the surplus property
8 and necessary expenses, including transportation costs, inci-
9 dental to the acquisition thereof.

10 MISSIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

11 For expenses necessary for permanent representation to
12 certain international organizations in which the United States
13 participates pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific Acts
14 of Congress, including expenses authorized by the pertinent
15 Acts and Conventions providing for such representation;
16 attendance at meetings of societies or associations concerned
17 with the work of the organizations; salaries, expenses, and
18 allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the
19 Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C.
20 801-1158) ; purchase (not to exceed two, for replacement
21 only, including one at not to exceed \$3,000) and hire of
22 passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, without
23 regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44
24 U. S. C. 111) ; and purchase of uniforms for guards and
25 chauffeurs, ~~\$1,600,000~~ \$1,500,000: *Provided*, That the pro-

visions of section 8 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that Act, shall be applicable to the obligation and expenditure of funds in connection with United States participation in the International Civil Aviation Organization.

INTERNATIONAL CONTINGENCIES

For necessary expenses of participation by the United States upon approval by the Secretary of State, in international activities which arise from time to time in the conduct of foreign affairs and for which specific appropriations have not been provided pursuant to treaties, conventions, or special Acts of Congress, including personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere without regard to civil-service and classification laws; salaries, expenses and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158) ; employment of aliens; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and without regard to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949; transportation of families and effects under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; not to exceed \$15 per diem in lieu of subsistence for persons serving without compensation in an advisory ca-

1 pacity while away from their homes or regular places of
 2 business; stenographic and other services; rent of quarters
 3 by contract or otherwise; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
 4 contributions for the share of the United States in expenses
 5 of international organizations; and printing and binding
 6 without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919
 7 (44 U. S. C. 111) ; ~~\$3,000,000~~ \$2,800,000, of which not
 8 to exceed a total of \$100,000 may be expended for repre-
 9 sentation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the
 10 Act of August 13, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131) and for enter-
 11 tainment.

12 INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION,
 13 UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

14 For expenses necessary to enable the United States to
 15 meet its obligations under the treaties of 1884, 1889, 1905,
 16 1906, 1933, and 1944 between the United States and
 17 Mexico, and to comply with the Act approved August 19,
 18 1935, as amended (22 U. S. C. 277-277d), including
 19 operation and maintenance of the Rio Grande rectification,
 20 canalization, flood control, bank protection, boundary fence,
 21 and sanitation projects; examinations, preliminary surveys,
 22 and investigations; detailed plan preparation and construc-
 23 tion (including surveys and operation and maintenance and
 24 protection during construction) ; Rio Grande emergency
 25 flood protection; construction and operation of gaging

1 stations; purchase and exchange of map-reproduction ma-
2 chines and other equipment and machinery; personal services
3 in the District of Columbia; services in accordance with
4 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),
5 at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem;
6 travel expenses, including, in the discretion of the Commis-
7 sioner, expenses (not to exceed \$500) of attendance at
8 meetings of organizations concerned with the activities of
9 the International Boundary and Water Commission which
10 may be necessary for the efficient discharge of the respon-
11 sibilities of the Commission; printing and binding; purchase
12 of ~~four~~ *eight* passenger motor vehicles, *of which six shall*
13 *be* for replacement only; hire, with or without personal
14 services, of work animals, and animal-drawn and motor-
15 propelled vehicles and aircraft and equipment; acquisition
16 by donation, purchase, or condemnation, of real and per-
17 sonal property, including expenses of abstracts and certifi-
18 cates of title; purchase of ice and drinking water; inspec-
19 tion of equipment, supplies, and materials by contract;
20 drilling and testing of foundations and dam sites, by con-
21 tract if deemed necessary, purchase of planographs and
22 lithographs; leasing of private property to remove there-
23 from sand, gravel, stone, and other materials, without regard
24 to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41
25 U. S. C. 5); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28

1 U. S. C. 2672), and the Act of August 27, 1935, as
 2 amended (22 U. S. C. 277e); and payment of official tele-
 3 phone service in the field in case of official telephones
 4 installed in private houses when authorized under regulations
 5 established by the Commissioner; as follows:

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For salaries and expenses, regular boundary activities,
 8 including examinations, preliminary surveys, and investi-
 9 gations, \$1,000,000.

10 CONSTRUCTION

11 For detail plan preparation and construction of projects
 12 authorized by the Convention concluded February 1, 1933,
 13 between the United States and Mexico, the Acts approved
 14 August 19, 1935, as amended (22 U. S. C. 277-277d),
 15 August 29, 1935 (Public Law 392), June 4, 1936 (Public
 16 Law 648), June 28, 1941 (22 U. S. C. 277f), and the
 17 projects stipulated in the treaty between the United States
 18 and Mexico signed at Washington on February 3, 1944,
 19 ~~\$5,035,000~~ \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended:
 20 *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made for the lower
 21 Rio Grande flood-control project for construction on any
 22 land, site, or easement in connection with this project except
 23 such as has been acquired by donation and the title thereto
 24 has been approved by the Attorney General of the United

1 States: *Provided further*, That expenditures for the Rio
2 Grande bank-protection project shall be subject to the pro-
3 visions and conditions contained in the appropriation for said
4 project as provided by the Act approved April 25,
5 1945 (59 Stat. 89): *Provided further*, That unex-
6 pended balances of appropriations for construction under
7 the International Boundary and Water Commission available
8 for the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with this
9 appropriation and shall continue available until expended.

10 RIO GRANDE EMERGENCY FLOOD PROTECTION

11 For emergency flood-control work, including protection,
12 reconstruction, and repair of all structures under the juris-
13 diction of the International Boundary and Water Commis-
14 sion, United States and Mexico, threatened or damaged by
15 floodwaters of the Rio Grande, which have heretofore been
16 authorized and erected under the provisions of treaties be-
17 tween the United States and Mexico, or in pursuance of
18 Federal laws authorizing improvements on the Rio Grande,
19 \$30,000, to be merged with the unobligated balance of the
20 appropriation for this purpose for the next preceding fiscal
21 year, and to remain available until expended.

22 AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

23 For expenses necessary to enable the President to per-
24 form the obligations of the United States pursuant to con-
25 ventions between the United States and Canada signed May

1 26, 1930 (50 Stat. 1355) and January 29, 1937 (50
2 Stat. 1351), and treaties between the United States and
3 Great Britain, in respect to Canada, signed January 11,
4 1909 (36 Stat. 2448) and February 24, 1925 (44 Stat.
5 2102), including personal services in the District of Colum-
6 bia; stenographic reporting services by contract; printing and
7 binding; hire of passenger motor vehicles; the United States
8 share of the expenses of the International Pacific Salmon
9 Fisheries Commission and the International Fisheries Com-
10 mission, which except for the expenses of the members, may
11 be advanced to the respective Commissions; \$500,000
12 \$600,000, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secre-
13 tary of State and to be available also for additional expenses
14 of the American Sections, International Commissions, as
15 hereinafter set forth, *except that \$92,000 of such amount*
16 *shall be available upon the enactment of this Act and until*
17 *expended only for the examination and survey of the Red*
18 *River of the North and its tributaries for the purpose of*
19 *determining what action should be taken to control floods*
20 *and provide proper drainage in the areas through which*
21 *such river and tributaries flow:*

22 International Joint Commission, United States and
23 Canada, the salary of one Commissioner on the part of the
24 United States who shall serve at the pleasure of the Presi-
25 dent (the other Commissioners to serve in that capacity with-

1 out compensation therefor) ; salaries of clerks and other em-
2 ployees appointed by the Commissioners on the part of the
3 United States with the approval solely of the Secretary of
4 State; travel expenses and compensation of witnesses in
5 attending hearings of the Commission at such places in the
6 United States and Canada as the Commission or the Amer-
7 ican Commissioners shall determine to be necessary; and
8 special and technical investigations in connection with mat-
9 ters falling within the Commission's jurisdiction, including
10 purchase for replacement only of two passenger automo-
11 biles: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State is authorized to
12 transfer to any department or independent establishment of
13 the Government, with the consent of the head thereof, funds
14 from this appropriation for direct expenditure by such de-
15 partment or establishment for such investigations.

16 International Boundary Commission, United States,
17 Alaska, and Canada, the completion of such remaining work
18 as may be required under the award of the Alaskan Bound-
19 ary Tribunal and the existing treaties between the United
20 States and Great Britain; commutation of subsistence to
21 employees while on field duty, not to exceed \$6 per day each
22 (but not to exceed \$3 per day each when a member of a field
23 party and subsisting in camp) ; hire of freight and passenger
24 motor vehicles from temporary field employees; and payment
25 for timber necessarily cut in keeping the boundary line clear.

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL
ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of State to carry out international information and educational activities as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U. S. C. 1431-1479) and the Act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 501), and to administer the program authorized by section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b)) and the program authorized by the Act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 265), including personal services in the District of Columbia; employment, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, of persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed \$60,000) and aliens within the United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation (not to exceed \$11,000); printing and binding; entertainment within the United States (not to exceed \$5,000); hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended; actual expenses of preparing

1 and transporting to their former homes the remains of
2 persons, not United States Government employees, who
3 may die away from their homes while participating in
4 activities authorized under this appropriation; establish-
5 ment and operation of agricultural and other experiment
6 and demonstration stations in other American countries,
7 on land acquired by gift or lease, and construction of neces-
8 sary buildings thereon; radio activities and acquisition and
9 production of motion pictures and visual materials and pur-
10 chase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor,
11 narration and script-writing, by contract or otherwise; and
12 purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments,
13 schools, or organizations; ~~\$34,000,000~~ \$32,700,000, of
14 which sum, \$200,000 shall be used for the purpose of pre-
15 serving friendships with the peoples of western European
16 countries by means of radio broadcasts, said programs to be
17 created and produced under the supervision and control of
18 the Department of State by experienced private international
19 broadcasting organizations; and of which not to exceed
20 ~~\$3,000,000~~ \$2,875,000 may be transferred to other appro-
21 priations of the Department of State: *Provided*, That, not-
22 withstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised
23 Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Department of State is
24 authorized in making contracts for the use of the international
25 short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf

1 of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators
2 of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may
3 be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or
4 damage on account of injury to persons or property arising
5 from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided*
6 *further*, That in the acquisition of leasehold interests
7 payments may be made in advance for the entire term
8 or any part thereof: *Provided further*, That funds herein
9 appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75
10 per centum of the effective daily broadcasting time from
11 any person or corporation holding an international short-
12 wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communica-
13 tions Commission without the consent of such licensee: *Pro-*
14 *vided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be
15 available for payment to private organizations abroad in
16 pursuance of contracts entered into for the processing and
17 distribution of motion-picture films.

18 PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION

19 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to
20 authority granted under this head in the Department of
21 State Appropriation Act, 1949, ~~\$13,000,000~~ \$10,000,000,
22 to be consolidated with appropriations heretofore made under
23 said head; and the unobligated balance of such consolidated
24 appropriation shall remain available during the current fiscal
25 year upon the terms and conditions specified under this head

1 in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1950, for
2 carrying out the purposes of sections 302 (a) and 303 (a)
3 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended
4 (50 U. S. C. App. 1782, 1783), as authorized by the Act of
5 September 7, 1949 (Public Law 295), and for carrying
6 out the purposes of section 311 of the Philippine Rehabilita-
7 tion Act of 1946, as authorized by section 3 of the Act of
8 July 2, 1948 (Public Law 882).

9 THE INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

10 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of
11 the Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act of August 5,
12 1947 (22 U. S. C. 281-2811), as amended by the Act of
13 September 3, 1949 (Public Law 283), including purchase
14 (not to exceed eighteen for replacement only) and hire of
15 passenger motor vehicles, ~~\$5,500,000~~ \$5,000,000, to remain
16 available until expended, *and in addition, the Institute is*
17 *authorized, prior to June 30, 1953, to enter into contracts*
18 *for the purposes of such Act, as amended, in an amount not*
19 *to exceed \$7,000,000.*

20 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

21 SEC. 102. Contracts entered into in foreign countries
22 involving expenditures from any of the appropriations under
23 this title shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3741
24 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22).

1 SEC. 103. The provision of law prescribing the use of
2 vessels of United States registry by any officer or employee
3 of the United States (46 U. S. C. 1241) shall not apply to
4 any travel or transportation of effects payable from funds
5 appropriated, allocated, or transferred to the Secretary of
6 State or the Department of State.

7 SEC. 104. The exchange of funds for payment of ex-
8 penses in connection with the operation of diplomatic and
9 consular establishments abroad shall not be subject to the
10 provisions of section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31
11 U. S. C. 543).

12 SEC. 105. Appropriations under this title available
13 for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside
14 the continental United States, including travel of de-
15 pendants and transportation of personal effects, household
16 goods, or automobiles of such personnel, shall be available
17 for such expenses when any part of such travel or transpor-
18 tation begins in the current fiscal year pursuant to travel
19 orders issued in that year, notwithstanding the fact that such
20 travel or transportation may not be completed during the
21 current fiscal year.

22 SEC. 106. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 16a
23 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78 (a)),
24 Government-owned vehicles may be used in foreign coun-
25 tries for transportation of United States Government em-

1 ployees from their residence to the office and return when
2 public transportation facilities are unsafe or are not available:
3 *Provided*, That each Chief of Mission shall have prior au-
4 thority from the Secretary of State to approve such trans-
5 portation.

6 SEC. 107. Appropriations under this title for "Salaries
7 and expenses", "International contingencies", and "Missions
8 to international organizations" are available for reimburse-
9 ment of the General Services Administration for security
10 guard services for protection of confidential files.

11 This title may be cited as the "Department of State
12 Appropriation Act, 1951".

13 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

14 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION 15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

16 For expenses necessary for the administration of the
17 Department of Justice and for investigation of the official
18 acts, records, and accounts of officers and offices of United
19 States and territorial courts, including personal services in
20 the District of Columbia; purchase of one passenger motor
21 vehicle at not to exceed \$4,000, for replacement only; serv-
22 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
23 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; miscellaneous and emergency expenses
24 authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his Ad-
25 ministrative Assistant; special attorneys and special assistants

1 to the Attorney General; and examination of estimates of
 2 appropriations in the field; ~~\$2,175,000~~ \$2,125,000.

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

4 For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the
 5 Department of Justice not otherwise provided for, including
 6 personal services in the District of Columbia; services as
 7 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
 8 U. S. C. 55a) ; miscellaneous and emergency expenses au-
 9 thorized or approved by the Attorney General or his Admin-
 10 istrative Assistant; and advances of public moneys pursuant
 11 to law (31 U. S. C. 529) ; ~~\$7,300,000~~ \$7,475,000.

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

13 For expenses necessary for the enforcement of anti-
 14 trust and kindred laws, including personal services in the
 15 District of Columbia and services as authorized by section
 16 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),
 17 ~~\$3,850,000~~ \$3,750,000, of which \$125,000 shall be available
 18 exclusively for activities in connection with railroad repara-
 19 tions cases: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall
 20 be expended for the establishment and maintenance of
 21 permanent regional offices of the Antitrust Division.

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

23 AND MARSHALS

24 For necessary expenses of the offices of United States
 25 attorneys and marshals and United States district attorneys

1 in Alaska, including purchase of not to exceed six passenger
 2 motor vehicles (including four for Alaska at not to exceed
 3 \$2,200 each, one van for replacement only at not to exceed
 4 \$2,500, and one bus for replacement only at not to exceed
 5 \$15,000) ; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
 6 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; expenses incident to
 7 the transfer of prisoners in the custody of United States
 8 marshals to narcotic farms; services in Alaska in collecting
 9 by the Attorney General; meals and lodging for deputy mar-
 10 shals in attendance upon juries when ordered by the court;
 11 notarial fees or like services; and firearms and ammunition;
 12 ~~\$12,600,000~~ \$12,847,000, of which not to exceed \$50,000
 13 shall be available for the employment of temporary deputy
 14 marshals in lieu of bailiffs at a rate not to exceed \$10 per day.

15 FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

16 For expenses, mileage, and per diems of witnesses and
 17 for per diems in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law;
 18 and not to exceed \$115,000 for such compensation and
 19 expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses) or in-
 20 formants as may be authorized or approved by the At-
 21 torney General or his Administrative Assistant, which
 22 approval shall be conclusive; ~~\$1,000,000~~ \$1,250,000: *Pro-*
 23 *vided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be
 24 used to pay any witness more than one attendance fee for
 25 any one calendar day.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF
JAPANESE ANCESTRY

For expenses necessary for payment of claims of persons of Japanese ancestry, pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U. S. C. 1981-1987), including personal services in the District of Columbia, ~~\$4,000,000~~ \$1,300,000, of which not to exceed ~~\$250,000~~ \$300,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States; protection of the person of the President of the United States; acquisition, collection, classification and preservation of identification and other records and their exchange with the duly authorized officials of the Federal Government, of States, cities, and other institutions; and such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice and the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed five hundred for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase at not to exceed \$10,000,

1 for replacement only, of one armored motor vehicle; firearms
2 and ammunition; not to exceed \$10,000 for taxicab hire to
3 be used exclusively for the purposes set forth in this para-
4 graph; not to exceed \$4,500 for expenses of attend-
5 ance at meetings of organizations concerned with the
6 purposes of this appropriation; not to exceed \$3,000
7 for membership in the International Commission of
8 Criminal Police; payment of rewards when specifically au-
9 thorized by the Attorney General for information leading
10 to the apprehension of fugitives from justice; and not to
11 exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a con-
12 fidential character, to be expended under the direction of
13 the Attorney General and to be accounted for solely on his
14 certificate; \$57,400,000: *Provided*, That of the amount
15 herein appropriated \$100,000 is to be held as a reserve for
16 emergencies arising in connection with kidnaping, extortion,
17 and bank robbery, to be released for expenditure in such
18 amounts and at such times as the Attorney General may
19 determine: *Provided further*, That the compensation of the
20 Director of the Bureau shall be \$20,000 per annum so long
21 as the position is held by the present incumbent.

22 None of the funds appropriated for the Federal Bureau
23 of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of
24 any civil-service employee.

1 IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary
4 for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating
5 to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, includ-
6 ing personal services in the District of Columbia; advance
7 of cash to aliens for meals and lodging while en route; pay-
8 ment of allowances (at a rate not in excess of \$1 per day)
9 to aliens, while held in custody under the immigration laws,
10 for work performed; payment of rewards for information
11 leading to the apprehension or conviction of violators of
12 the immigration laws; not to exceed \$20,000 to meet
13 unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be
14 expended under the direction of the Attorney General and
15 accounted for solely on his certificate; not to exceed
16 \$5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organiza-
17 tions concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; pur-
18 chase (not to exceed one hundred and fifty, for replacement
19 only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not
20 to exceed four for replacement only) and maintenance and
21 operation of aircraft; firearms and ammunition; free distribu-
22 tion of citizenship textbooks; refunds of head tax, main-
23 tenance bills, immigration fines, and other items properly
24 returnable, except deposits of aliens who become public
25 charges and deposits to secure payment of fines and passage

1 money; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
2 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; operation, maintenance,
3 remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of
4 equipment incident thereto; reimbursement of the General
5 Services Administration for security guard services for pro-
6 tection of confidential files; and maintenance, care, detention,
7 surveillance, parole, and transportation of alien enemies and
8 their wives and dependent children, including return of such
9 persons to place of bona fide residence or to such other place
10 as may be authorized by the Attorney General; \$31,400,000:
11 *Provided*, That the Commissioner of Immigration and
12 Naturalization may contract with officers and employees for
13 the use, on official business, of privately owned horses:
14 *Provided further*, That provisions of law prohibiting or re-
15 stricting the employment of aliens in the Government serv-
16 ice shall not apply to the employment of interpreters in the
17 Immigration and Naturalization Service (not to exceed ten
18 permanent and such temporary employees as are required
19 from time to time) where competent citizen interpreters are
20 not available.

21 FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

23 For expenses necessary for the administration, opera-
24 tion, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional
25 institutions, including not to exceed \$425,000 for depart-

1 mental personal services; not to exceed \$13,500 for expenses
2 of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with
3 the purposes of this appropriation; purchase of not to ex-
4 ceed nineteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only,
5 including two busses at not to exceed \$20,000 each; services
6 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
7 (5 U. S. C. 55a); compilation of statistics relating to
8 prisoners in Federal and non-Federal penal and correc-
9 tional institutions; furnishing of insignia, uniforms, and
10 other distinctive wearing apparel necessary for employees
11 in the performance of their official duties; payment pursuant
12 to law of claims of employees for loss, damage, or destruc-
13 tion of personal property (63 Stat. 167); firearms and
14 ammunition; payment of rewards for the apprehension, or
15 for information leading to the recapture, of escaped prison-
16 ers; purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock;
17 construction of buildings at prison camps; and not to exceed
18 \$35,000 for acquisition of land adjacent to any Federal
19 penal or correctional institution when in the opinion of the
20 Attorney General the additional land is essential for health
21 or safety; \$21,730,000: *Provided*, That collections in cash
22 for meals, laundry, barber service, uniform equipment, and
23 any other items for which payment is made originally from

1 appropriated funds may be deposited in the Treasury to the
2 credit of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That there
3 may be transferred to the Public Health Service such
4 amounts as may be necessary, in the discretion of the At-
5 torney General, for direct expenditure by that Service for
6 medical relief for inmates of Federal penal and correctional
7 institutions.

8 BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

9 For constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary
10 buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional
11 institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto,
12 by contract or force account, ~~\$900,000~~ \$800,000, of which
13 \$540,000 is for liquidation of authority granted under this
14 head in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1950,
15 to enter into contracts for replacement of a power plant at
16 the United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas, and
17 of which ~~\$270,000~~ \$170,000 is for replacement of a power
18 plant at the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia;
19 and in addition, the Attorney General is authorized to enter
20 into contracts and incur obligations in an amount not to ex-
21 ceed \$700,000 for completion of the latter project at a total
22 cost not to exceed ~~\$970,000~~ \$870,000: *Provided*, That labor
23 of United States prisoners may be used for work performed
24 under this appropriation.

1 SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

2 For support of United States prisoners in non-Federal
3 institutions and in the Territory of Alaska, including neces-
4 sary clothing and medical aid, and payment of rewards for
5 the apprehension, or for information leading to the recap-
6 ture, of escaped prisoners; \$1,875,000.

7 OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 The Attorney General, or such officer as he may desig-
10 nate, is hereby authorized to pay out of any funds or other
11 property or interest vested in him or transferred to him
12 pursuant to or with respect to the Trading with the Enemy
13 Act of October 6, 1917, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.),
14 necessary expenses incurred in carrying out the powers and
15 duties conferred on the Attorney General pursuant to said
16 Act: *Provided*, That not to exceed ~~\$4,240,000~~ \$4,150,000
17 shall be available in the current fiscal year for the general
18 administrative expenses of the Office of Alien Property, in-
19 cluding rent of private or Government-owned space in the
20 District of Columbia; purchase of not to exceed three passen-
21 ger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the
22 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; personal services
23 in the District of Columbia; and expenses of attendance
24 at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of
25 this authorization: *Provided further*, That on or before

1 November 1 of the current fiscal year, the Attorney General
2 shall make a report to the Appropriations Committees of
3 the Senate and the House of Representatives giving detailed
4 information on all administrative and nonadministrative ex-
5 penses incurred during the next preceding fiscal year in
6 connection with the activities of the Office of Alien Property:
7 *Provided further*, That of the total amount herein author-
8 ized the amount of \$100,000 is to be transferred to the
9 appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, general adminis-
10 tration", Department of Justice.

11 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

12 SEC. 202. Not to exceed \$350,000 in the aggregate
13 from the appropriations made in this title for general ad-
14 ministration, general legal activities, and United States
15 attorneys and marshals shall be available, without regard
16 to the Classification Act of 1949, for compensation (not to
17 exceed \$11,000 per annum) of special attorneys and special
18 assistants to the Attorney General and to United States
19 attorneys not otherwise provided for: *Provided*, That reports
20 be submitted to the Congress on the 1st of July and January
21 showing the names of the persons employed under the fore-
22 going limitation, the annual rate of compensation or amount
23 of any fee paid to each, together with a description of their
24 duties.

25 SEC. 203. None of the funds appropriated by this

1 title may be used to pay the compensation of any person
2 hereafter employed as an attorney (except foreign counsel
3 employed in special cases) unless such person shall be duly
4 licensed and authorized to practice as an attorney under the
5 laws of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

6 SEC. 204. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for
7 the offices of the United States attorney and the United
8 States marshal for the District of Columbia from all appro-
9 priations in this title shall be reimbursed to the United
10 States from any funds in the Treasury of the United States
11 to the credit of the District of Columbia.

12 SEC. 205. Appropriations and authorizations made in
13 this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for pay-
14 ment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

15 SEC. 206. Appropriations and authorizations made in
16 this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for a
17 health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C.
18 150).

19 SEC. 207. Appropriations and authorizations made in
20 this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for
21 printing and binding.

22 SEC. 208. Appropriations and authorizations made in
23 this title which are available for expenses of attendance at
24 meetings shall be expended for such purposes in accordance
25 with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General.

1 This title may be cited as the "Department of Justice
2 Appropriation Act, 1951".

3 TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

4 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

5 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the
6 Office of the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this title
7 referred to as the Secretary) including personal services in
8 the District of Columbia; printing and binding; services as
9 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
10 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50
11 per diem; and teletype news service (not exceeding \$1,000) ;
12 ~~\$1,300,000~~ \$1,400,000.

13 Technical and scientific services: For necessary
14 expenses in the performance of activities and services relating
15 to the collection, compilation, and dissemination of tech-
16 nological information as an aid to business in the develop-
17 ment of foreign and domestic commerce, including personal
18 services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed \$2,000
19 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
20 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and printing and bind-
21 ing, \$225,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized,
22 upon request of any public or private organization or indi-
23 vidual, to reproduce by appropriate process, independently
24 or through any other agency of the Government, any
25 scientific or technical report, document, or descriptive

1 material, foreign or domestic, which has been released for
2 public dissemination, and to sell such reproductions at a
3 price not less than the estimated total cost of reproducing
4 and disseminating same as may be determined by the Secre-
5 tary, the moneys received from such sale to be deposited
6 in a special account in the Treasury, such account to be
7 available for reimbursing any appropriation which may have
8 borne the expense of such reproduction and dissemination
9 and making refunds to organizations and individuals when
10 entitled thereto.

11 BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

12 Salaries and expenses, age and citizenship certification:
13 For expenses necessary for searching census records and
14 supplying information incident to carrying out the provisions
15 of the Social Security Act, and other statutory requirements
16 with respect to age and citizenship certification, including
17 personal services at the seat of government, travel, micro-
18 film, printing and binding, and photographic supplies,
19 \$109,000: *Provided*, That the procedure hereunder for the
20 furnishing from census records of evidence for the establish-
21 ment of age of individuals shall be pursuant to regulations
22 approved jointly by the Secretary and the Social Security
23 Administration.

24 Current census statistics: For expenses necessary for
25 collecting, compiling, and publishing current census statistics

1 provided for by law; enumerators at rates to be fixed with-
2 out regard to the Classification Act; printing and binding;
3 the cost of obtaining State, municipal, and other records;
4 preparation of monographs on census subjects and other
5 work of specialized character by contract; and purchase,
6 construction, repair, and rental of mechanical and electrical
7 tabulating equipment and other labor-saving devices;
8 \$6,000,000, of which \$100,000 shall be available exclusively
9 for vessel shipping statistics.

10 Seventeenth decennial census: For expenses necessary
11 for taking, compiling, and publishing the seventeenth decen-
12 nial census including the census of housing as authorized by
13 law (13 U. S. C. 201-219; Public Law 171, approved July
14 15, 1949), including personal services at the seat of govern-
15 ment and elsewhere at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of
16 Commerce without regard to the Classification Act of 1949
17 and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended;
18 printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of
19 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); health service
20 program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and com-
21 pensation of employees of the Department of Commerce and
22 other departments and independent establishments of the
23 Government who may be detailed for field work;
24 ~~\$29,500,000~~ \$28,500,000, to remain available until Decem-

ber 31, 1952, and to be merged with the appropriation made under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1950.

General administration, Bureau of the Census: For expenses necessary for general administration, and printing and binding, \$898,000.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), and other Acts incident to the enforcement of safety regulations; maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities and air traffic control; furnishing advisory service to States and other public and private agencies in connection with the construction or improvement of airports and landing areas; and the disposal of surplus airports; including personal services in the District of Columbia; hire of aircraft (not exceeding \$420,000); the operation and maintenance of eighty-five aircraft; printing and binding; contract stenographic reporting services; fees and mileage of expert and other witnesses; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; purchase (not to exceed ten, for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; and salaries and traveling expenses, together

1 with tuition (not to exceed \$20,000) and other con-
2 tractual expenses in connection therewith, of employees
3 detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the
4 Government or other organizations serving aviation;
5 ~~\$97,000,000~~ \$99,775,000, and the Departments of the Air
6 Force, Army and Navy, are authorized to transfer to the
7 Civil Aeronautics Administration without charge, subject
8 to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for
9 replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, flight equipment,
10 and hangar, line, and shop equipment surplus to the needs of
11 such Departments: *Provided*, That there may be credited
12 to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties,
13 municipalities, and other public authorities for expenses
14 incurred in the maintenance and operation of airport traffic
15 control towers.

16 Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For the acqui-
17 sition and establishment by contract or purchase and hire
18 of air-navigation facilities, including the equipment of addi-
19 tional civil airways for day and night flying; the construction
20 of additional necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling
21 and communicating structures and apparatus; the alteration
22 and modernization of existing air-navigation facilities; the
23 acquisition of the necessary sites by lease, condemnation or
24 grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related
25 accommodations for officers and employees of the Civil Aero-

1 nautics Administration and the Weather Bureau stationed at
2 remote localities not on foreign soil where such accommoda-
3 tions are not otherwise available; personal services in the
4 District of Columbia; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
5 printing and binding; and not to exceed \$200,000 for emer-
6 gency repairs and replacement of facilities damaged by
7 fire, flood, or storm; ~~\$32,000,000~~ \$27,500,000, of which
8 ~~\$26,500,000~~ \$22,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations
9 incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into
10 contracts for the foregoing purposes; and, in addition, the
11 Civil Aeronautics Administration is authorized to enter
12 into contracts and incur obligations for purposes contained
13 in this paragraph in an amount not exceeding ~~\$13,461,500~~
14 \$20,000,000: *Provided*, That authority heretofore granted
15 under this head to enter into contracts for such purposes
16 may be exercised until June 30, 1951: *Provided further*,
17 That the consolidated appropriation under this head for
18 the next preceding fiscal year is hereby consolidated with
19 and made a part of this appropriation to be disbursed
20 and accounted for as one fund: *Provided further*, That
21 transfers may be made from this appropriation to the
22 appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Ad-
23 ministration," for costs of maintenance and operation of
24 aircraft for initial flight checking of facilities established under
25 this appropriation (not to exceed \$171,000) ; for necessary

1 expenses in connection with the transportation by air to and
2 from and within the Territories of the United States of
3 materials and equipment secured under this appropriation
4 (not to exceed \$115,000) ; and for necessary administra-
5 tive costs (not to exceed \$389,000) : *Provided further*, That
6 the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are
7 authorized during the current fiscal year to transfer without
8 charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,
9 air-navigation and communication facilities, including appur-
10 tenances thereto, to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

11 Technical development and evaluation: For expenses
12 necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aero-
13 nautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), rela-
14 tive to such developmental work and service testing as
15 tends to the creation of improved air-navigation facilities,
16 including landing areas, aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers,
17 appliances, personnel, and operation methods, and personal
18 services in the District of Columbia; acquisition of neces-
19 sary sites by lease or grant; operation and maintenance of
20 five aircraft, which shall be in addition to the number
21 authorized herein under the appropriation for "Salaries and
22 expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration"; and printing
23 and binding; \$1,375,000.

24 Maintenance and operation, Washington National Air-
25 port: For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-

1 nance, and protection of the Washington National Airport,
2 including purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replace-
3 ment only; printing and binding; not to exceed \$3,380 for
4 the purchase, cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms
5 and ammunition; \$1,300,000.

6 Construction, Washington National Airport: For an
7 additional amount for construction at the Washington Na-
8 tional Airport, including acquisition of an existing fuel sys-
9 tem and necessary related facilities, \$540,000, to remain
10 available until expended.

11 Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For
12 carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of
13 May 13, 1946 (except section 5 (a)), to be available
14 until June 30, 1953, ~~\$45,000,000~~ \$37,000,000, of which
15 ~~\$42,000,000~~ \$34,000,000 is for liquidation of obliga-
16 tions incurred under authority heretofore granted to
17 enter into contract for the foregoing purposes; and in
18 addition, the Civil Aeronautics Administration is author-
19 ized until June 30, 1953, to enter into contracts and
20 incur obligations for purposes of this paragraph in an amount
21 not exceeding \$36,700,000, of which \$36,000,000 shall be
22 for projects in the States in accordance with section 6 of
23 said Act, \$500,000 for projects in Puerto Rico, \$150,000
24 for projects in the Territory of Hawaii, and \$50,000 for
25 projects in the Virgin Islands: *Provided*, That of the amount

1 appropriated herein, \$3,000,000 shall be available as one
2 fund for necessary planning, research, and administrative
3 expenses; including personal services in the District of
4 Columbia; purchase (not to exceed twenty-five for replace-
5 ment only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and print-
6 ing and binding; of which \$3,000,000 not to exceed
7 \$600,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries
8 and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration", to provide
9 for necessary administrative expenses, including the main-
10 tenance and operation of aircraft and printing and binding:
11 *Provided further*, That the appropriation under this head for
12 the next preceding fiscal year is hereby merged with this
13 appropriation.

14 Construction of public airports, Territory of Alaska:
15 For an additional amount for construction of public airports,
16 Territory of Alaska. \$3,200,000, to remain available until
17 expended for liquidation of obligations incurred under au-
18 thority granted in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act,
19 1948, to enter into contracts for such purpose.

20 Air navigation development: For expenses necessary
21 for planning and developing a national system of aids
22 to air navigation and air traffic control common to
23 military and civil air navigation, including research, ex-
24 perimental investigations, purchase, and development, by
25 contract or otherwise, of new types of air navigation aids

1 (including plans, specifications, and drawings) ; personal
2 services in the District of Columbia; hire of passenger motor
3 vehicles and aircraft; printing and binding; services as
4 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
5 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess
6 of \$50 per diem; acquisition of necessary sites by lease or
7 grant; payments in advance under contracts for research or
8 development work; and not to exceed \$130,000 for admin-
9 istrative expenses, *of which \$35,000 may be transferred to*
10 *the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics*
11 *Administration" for such expenses, including the maintenance*
12 *and operation of aircraft; \$6,000,000, of which \$2,885,000*
13 *is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority*
14 *heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing*
15 *purposes, and, in addition, the Civil Aeronautics Adminis-*
16 *tration is authorized to enter into contracts and incur obli-*
17 *gations for the purposes contained in this paragraph in*
18 *an amount not exceeding \$2,250,000.*

19 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

20 Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses: For
21 necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including
22 personal services in the District of Columbia; contract steno-
23 graphic reporting services; employment of temporary guards
24 on a contract or fee basis; salaries and traveling expenses of
25 employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted

1 by the Government or industries serving aviation; expenses
 2 of examination of estimates of appropriations in the field;
 3 hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, operation, maintenance,
 4 nance, and repair of aircraft; and printing and binding;
 5 ~~\$3,400,000~~ \$4,000,000: *Provided, That the Departments*
 6 *of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized to transfer*
 7 *to the Civil Aeronautics Board without charge, subject to the*
 8 *approval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for replacement*
 9 *only), aircraft engines, parts, and accessories surplus*
 10 *to the needs of such Departments.*

11 COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

12 Salaries and expenses, departmental: For expenses
 13 necessary to carry out in the District of Columbia the provisions
 14 of the Act of August 6, 1947 (33 U. S. C. 883a-
 15 883i), including personal services; purchase of maps
 16 and nautical and aeronautical charts; maintenance of an
 17 instrument shop and procurement or exchange of metal-
 18 working and woodworking supplies and equipment; chart
 19 paper, drafting, photographic, photolithographic, and printing
 20 supplies and equipment; printing and binding; instruments
 21 (except surveying instruments); and stationery for
 22 field use; \$3,800,000.

23 Salaries and expenses, field: For expenses necessary
 24 to carry out in the field the provisions of the Act of August
 25 6, 1947 (33 U. S. C. 883a-883i), including the operation

1 and maintenance of ships and other field units; replacement
2 of observatories and auxiliary buildings where necessary;
3 purchase of plans and specifications of vessels; lease of sites
4 where necessary and the erection of temporary magnetic
5 and seismological buildings; hire of aircraft; operation,
6 maintenance and repair of an airplane for photographic sur-
7 veys; packing, crating, and transporting personal household
8 effects of commissioned officers when transferred from one
9 official station to another, and of commissioned officers who
10 die on active duty, and funeral expenses of commissioned
11 officers, as authorized by law; and extra compensation at
12 not to exceed \$15 per month to each member of the crew
13 of a vessel when assigned duties as bomber or fathometer
14 reader or duties of a similar nature, and at not to exceed \$1
15 per day for each station to employees of other Federal agen-
16 cies while observing tides or currents or tending seismo-
17 graphs; \$6,200,000: *Provided*, That the Departments of
18 the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized during the
19 current fiscal year to transfer to the Coast and Geodetic
20 Survey, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,
21 landing craft, launches, marine engines, electronic equip-
22 ment, automotive vehicles, parts, equipment, and supplies,
23 excess to the needs of such Departments, which will serve to
24 expedite surveys in Alaska for the national defense.

25 Pay, commissioned officers: For pay and allowances

1 prescribed by law for not to exceed one hundred and sev-
2 enty-one commissioned officers on the active list and of
3 officers retired in accordance with existing law, including
4 payment of six months' death gratuity as authorized by law,
5 \$1,515,000.

6 The foregoing appropriations for the Coast and Geodetic
7 Survey shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed
8 five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and
9 (not to exceed \$25,000) for services as authorized by
10 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

11 BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

12 Departmental salaries and expenses: For personal ser-
13 vices and other necessary expenses of the Bureau of Foreign
14 and Domestic Commerce at the seat of government, includ-
15 ing printing and binding, the purchase of commercial and
16 trade reports, and not to exceed \$50,000 for services as
17 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
18 U. S. C. 55a), ~~\$5,000,000~~ \$5,300,000: *Provided*, That ex-
19 penses of field studies or surveys conducted by departmental
20 personnel of the Bureau shall be payable from the amount
21 herein appropriated.

22 Field office service: For expenses necessary to operate
23 and maintain regional, district, and cooperative branch offices
24 for the collection and dissemination of information useful in
25 the development and improvement of commerce throughout

1 the United States and its possessions, including not to exceed
2 \$90,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia,
3 and printing and binding, ~~\$2,050,000~~ \$2,155,000.

4 Export control: For expenses necessary for carrying out
5 the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949 (Public
6 Law 11, approved February 26, 1949), relating to export
7 controls, including personal services in the District of
8 Columbia and services as authorized by section 15 of the
9 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to
10 exceed \$50 per diem for individuals, and printing and
11 binding, \$2,000,000, of which not to exceed \$828,000
12 may be transferred to the Bureau of Customs, Treasury
13 Department, for enforcement of the export control pro-
14 gram, and of which not to exceed \$40,000 may be trans-
15 ferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses"
16 under the Office of the Secretary.

17 PATENT OFFICE

18 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
19 ing personal services in the District of Columbia; services
20 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
21 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$75
22 per diem (not to exceed \$25,000); expenses of transporting
23 to foreign governments publications of patents issued by the
24 Patent Office; defense of suits instituted against the Com-
25 missioner of Patents; travel; printing and binding; and other

1 contingent expenses of the Patent Office: *Provided, That*
2 the headings of the drawings for patented cases may be
3 multigraphed in the Patent Office for the purpose of photo-
4 lithography, ~~\$11,300,000~~ \$11,530,000.

5 BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

6 General administrative expenses: For the employment
7 of persons and means, including rent, advertising (including
8 advertising in the city of Washington for work to be per-
9 formed in areas adjacent thereto), printing and binding,
10 purchase of periodicals, purchase of one hundred passenger
11 motor vehicles for replacement only, health service program
12 as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), and the preparation,
13 distribution, and display of exhibits, in the city of Washing-
14 ton and elsewhere for the purpose of conducting research
15 and investigational studies, either independently or in co-
16 operation with State highway departments, or other agencies,
17 including studies of highway administration, legislation,
18 finance, economics, transport, construction, operation, main-
19 tenance, utilization, and safety, and of street and highway
20 traffic control; investigations and experiments in the best
21 methods of road making, especially by the use of local
22 materials; studies of types of mechanical plants and appli-
23 ances used for road building and maintenance, and of methods
24 of road repair and maintenance suited to the needs of dif-
25 ferent localities; for maintenance and repairs of experimental

1 highways; for furnishing expert advice on these subjects;
2 for collating, reporting, and illustrating the results of same;
3 and for preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins and
4 reports; to be paid from any moneys available from the
5 administrative funds provided under the Act of July 11,
6 1916, as amended (23 U. S. C. 21), or as otherwise
7 provided.

8 In carrying out the provisions of "An Act to provide
9 that the United States shall aid the States in the con-
10 struction of rural post roads, and for other purposes", as
11 amended and supplemented (23 U. S. C. 1-117), none
12 of the money appropriated for the work of the Bureau of
13 Public Roads during the current fiscal year shall be paid
14 to any State on account of any project on which con-
15 vict labor shall be employed, except this provision shall
16 not apply to convict labor performed by convicts on parole
17 or probation: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year,
18 whenever performing authorized engineering or other serv-
19 ices in connection with the survey, construction, and mainte-
20 nance, or improvement of roads for other Government agen-
21 cies, cooperating foreign countries and State cooperating
22 agencies the charge for such services may include depre-
23 ciation on engineering and road-building equipment used,
24 and the amounts received on account of such charges shall
25 be credited to the appropriation concerned: *Provided*

1 *further*, That during the current fiscal year the appropria-
2 tions for the work of the Bureau of Public Roads shall be
3 available for meeting the expenses of warehouse mainte-
4 nance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies,
5 materials, and equipment stored therein for distribution to
6 projects under the supervision of the Bureau of Public Roads,
7 and for sale and for distribution to other Government activi-
8 ties, cooperating foreign countries and State cooperating
9 agencies, the cost of such supplies and materials or the
10 value of such equipment (including the cost of transporta-
11 tion and handling) to be reimbursed to appropriations cur-
12 rent at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment
13 are procured, from the appropriation chargeable with the
14 cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment: *Pro-*
15 *vided further*, That the appropriations available to the Bu-
16 reau of Public Roads may be used in emergency for medical
17 supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the
18 immediate relief of employees engaged on hazardous work
19 under that Bureau, and for temporary services as author-
20 ized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
21 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per
22 diem: ~~*Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,000,000;~~
23 ~~to be derived from the administrative funds provided under~~
24 ~~the Act of July 11, 1916, as amended or supplemented~~
25 ~~(23 U. S. C. 21), shall be available until expended for~~

1 continuing the construction of a laboratory, on a site al-
2 ready acquired, for permanent quarters for the testing and
3 research work of the Bureau of Public Roads.

4 For all necessary expenses to enable the President
5 to utilize the services of the Bureau of Public Roads
6 in fulfilling the obligations of the United States under
7 the Convention on the Pan-American Highway Between
8 the United States and Other American Republics, signed
9 at Buenos Aires, December 23, 1936, and proclaimed
10 September 16, 1937 (51 Stat. 152), for the continuation
11 of cooperation with several governments, members of the
12 Pan American Union, in connection with the survey and
13 construction of the Inter-American Highway as provided in
14 public resolution, approved March 4, 1929 (Public Resolu-
15 tion 104), as amended or supplemented, and for performing
16 engineering service in pan-American countries for and upon
17 the request of any agency or governmental corporation of the
18 United States, \$100,000 to be derived from the administrative
19 funds provided under the Act of July 11, 1916, as amended
20 or supplemented (23 U. S. C. 21), or as otherwise provided.

21 Federal-aid postwar highways: For carrying out the
22 provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1944 and
23 1948 (58 Stat. 838; 62 Stat. 1105), to remain available
24 until expended, ~~\$405,000,000~~ \$385,000,000, which sum
25 is composed of \$263,491,000, the remainder of the amount

1 authorized to be appropriated for the third postwar fiscal
2 year by section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of
3 1944 ~~\$135,509,000~~ \$115,509,000, a part of the amount
4 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1950
5 by section 1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948,
6 and \$1,828,050 and \$4,171,950, the latter sums being
7 for reimbursement of the sums expended for the repair
8 or reconstruction of highways and bridges which have
9 been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, or land-
10 slides, as provided by section 3 of the Act approved June
11 18, 1934, and section 7 of the Act approved July 13, 1943
12 (23 U. S. C. 13a and 13b).

13 Elimination of grade crossings: For the elimination of
14 hazards to life at railroad grade crossings, including the
15 separation or protection of grades at crossings, the recon-
16 struction of existing railroad grade-crossing structures, and
17 the relocation of highways to eliminate grade crossings, to
18 remain available until expended, \$4,600,000, which sum is
19 a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the
20 fiscal year 1943 by section 5 of the Act approved Septem-
21 ber 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 869).

22 Forest highways: For expenses necessary for carrying
23 out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act
24 of November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a),
25 in accordance with section 3a of the Federal-Aid Highway

1 Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1105), to remain available until
2 expended, \$22,500,000, which sum is composed of \$4,900,-
3 000, the remainder of the amount authorized by section 9
4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 842)
5 to be appropriated for the second postwar fiscal year and
6 \$17,600,000, a part of the amount authorized by section 3
7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, to be appropriated
8 for the fiscal year 1950: *Provided*; That this appropriation
9 shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or
10 alteration of buildings and sites necessary for the storage and
11 repair of equipment and supplies used for road construction
12 and maintenance, but the total cost of any such item under
13 this authorization shall not exceed \$15,000.

14 Access roads: During the current fiscal year, not to
15 exceed \$70,000 of funds remaining unexpended upon com-
16 pletion of access road projects authorized to be constructed
17 under the provisions of the Defense Highway Act of 1941,
18 as amended by the Act of July 2, 1942 (23 U. S. C. 106),
19 shall be available for the maintenance of roads and bridges
20 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Public Roads on
21 Government-owned land in Arlington County, Virginia.

22 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

23 For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions
24 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (5 U. S. C. 591, 597;
25 15 U. S. C. 271-278), and Acts supplementary thereto

1 affecting the functions of the Bureau and the functions set
2 forth under the Bureau of Standards in the "Department of
3 Commerce Appropriation Act, 1935", including personal
4 services in the District of Columbia; rental of laboratories
5 in the field; repairs and alterations to buildings and other
6 plant facilities, and not to exceed ~~\$540,000~~ \$700,000
7 for improvements to buildings, grounds, and other plant
8 facilities including construction of minor buildings and other
9 facilities in the District of Columbia and in the field to house
10 special apparatus or material which must be isolated from
11 other activities; building of temporary experimental struc-
12 tures; expenses of the visiting committee; demonstration of
13 the results of the Bureau's work by exhibits or otherwise
14 as may be deemed most effective; purchase, repair, and
15 cleaning of uniforms for guards; printing and binding; not
16 to exceed \$100,000 for services as authorized by section
17 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and
18 purchase of reprints from trade journals or other periodicals
19 of articles prepared officially by Government employees, as
20 follows:

21 Operation and administration: For the general operation
22 and administration of the Bureau; improvement and care
23 of the grounds; plant equipment; maintenance and protection
24 of buildings, including repairs and alterations thereto;
25 ~~\$1,270,000~~ \$1,430,000.

1 Research and testing: For calibrating and certifying

2 measuring instruments, apparatus, and standards in terms

3 of the national standards; the preparation and distribution

4 of standard materials; the testing of equipment, materials,

5 and supplies in connection with Government purchases; the

6 improvement of methods of testing; advisory services to

7 governmental agencies on scientific and technical matters;

8 the maintenance and development of national standards of

9 measurement; the development of improved methods of

10 measurement; the determination of physical constants and

11 the properties of materials; the investigation of mechanisms

12 and structures, including their economy, efficiency, and

13 safety; the study of fluid resistance and the flow of fluids

14 and heat; the investigation of radiation, radioactive sub-

15 stances, and X-rays; the development of methods of

16 chemical analysis and synthesis, and the investi-

17 gation of the properties of rare substances; investigations

18 relating to the utilization of materials, including lubricants

19 and liquid fuels; the study of new processes and methods

20 of fabrication; the solutions of problems arising in connec-

21 tion with standards; cooperation with Government purchas-

22 ing agencies, industries, and national organizations in

23 developing specifications and facilitating their use; encour-

24 agement of the application of the latest developments in the

25 utilization and standardization of building materials; the

1 development of engineering and safety codes, simplified
2 practice recommendations, and commercial standards of
3 quality and performance; and the compilation of and dis-
4 semination of scientific and technical data; \$4,300,000.

5 Radio propagation and standards: For development and
6 maintenance of primary standards of measurement of elec-
7 trical quantities at radio frequencies; calibrating and certify-
8 ing radio measuring instruments, apparatus, and standards
9 in terms of the national primary standards; investigation of
10 the phenomena affecting the propagation of radio waves;
11 the broadcasting of radio signals of standard frequency; the
12 compilation and dissemination of scientific and technical data
13 relating to the propagation of radio waves, and measurement
14 of electrical quantities at radio frequencies: *Provided*, That
15 for employees conducting observations on radio propagation
16 phenomena in the Arctic region, the funds appropriated and
17 the funds transferred or advanced from other Government
18 agencies to the National Bureau of Standards shall be avail-
19 able for the appointment of such employees at base rates
20 not in excess of \$5,000 per annum without regard to the civil
21 service and classification laws and titles II and III of the
22 Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945; and for the furnishing
23 of food, shelter, and protective clothing and equipment,
24 without repayment therefor, to employees of the Govern-
25 ment assigned to Arctic stations; and the Departments of

1 the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized, subject to the
 2 approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to transfer without
 3 charge to the National Bureau of Standards materials, equip-
 4 ment, and supplies, surplus to their needs and necessary
 5 for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of Arctic
 6 ionosphere observation stations, ~~\$2,100,000~~ \$3,000,000.

7 Construction of laboratories: For the acquisition of sites
 8 a site, the preparation of drawings and specifications, and
 9 the construction and equipping of a radio laboratory build-
 10 ing and a guided missile laboratory building, together with
 11 necessary utilities and appurtenances, as authorized by Acts
 12 the Act of October 25, 1949 (~~Public Laws 266~~ Public Law
 13 386), ~~\$500,000~~ \$134,000, to remain available until ex-
 14 pended; and, in addition, the Secretary of Commerce is
 15 authorized to enter into contracts and to incur obligations
 16 for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to
 17 exceed ~~\$5,675,000~~ \$1,766,000.

18 WEATHER BUREAU

19 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 20 Weather Bureau, including personal services in the District of
 21 Columbia; maintenance and operation of aircraft; printing
 22 and binding; not to exceed \$25,000 for services as authorized
 23 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
 24 and not to exceed \$10,000 for maintenance of a printing of-

1 fice in the City of Washington, as authorized by law; not to
2 exceed \$10,000 for the United States contribution to the
3 cost of the secretariat of the International Meteorological
4 Committee; ~~\$24,447,000~~ \$24,897,000: *Provided, That*
5 during the current fiscal year, the maximum amount author-
6 ized under section 3 (a) of the Act of June 2, 1948 (Public
7 Law 573), for extra compensation to employees of other
8 Government agencies for taking and transmitting meteoro-
9 logical observations, shall be \$5 per day; and the maximum
10 base rate of pay authorized under section 3 (b) of said Act,
11 for employees conducting meteorological investigations in
12 the Arctic region, shall be \$5,000 per annum, except that
13 not more than five of such employees at any one time may
14 receive a base rate of \$7,500 per annum, *and such employees*
15 *may be appointed without regard to the Classification Act*
16 *of 1949.*

17 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

18 SEC. 302. During the current fiscal year applicable ap-
19 propriations and funds available to the Department of Com-
20 merce shall be available for the activities specified in the
21 Act of October 26, 1949 (Public Law 390), to the extent
22 and in the manner prescribed by said Act.

23 SEC. 303. The appropriations of the Department of
24 Commerce available for salaries and expenses shall be avail-

1 able for health programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C.
2 150), and for the payment of tort claims pursuant to law
3 (28 U. S. C. 2672).

4 SEC. 304. Appropriations of the Department of Com-
5 merce available for salaries and expenses shall be available
6 for attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with
7 the activities for which the appropriations are made.

8 This title may be cited as the "Department of Com-
9 merce Appropriation Act, 1951".

10 TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

11 SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

12 SALARIES

13 For the Chief Justice and eight Associate Justices,
14 and all other officers and employees, whose compensation
15 shall be fixed by the Court, except as otherwise provided
16 by law, and who may be employed and assigned by the
17 Chief Justice to any office or work of the Court, \$915,000.

18 PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS

19 For printing and binding the advance opinions, pre-
20 liminary prints, and bound reports of the Court, \$91,200.

21 MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

22 For miscellaneous expenses to be expended as the Chief
23 Justice may approve, \$52,100.

1 CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS

2 For such expenditures as may be necessary to enable the
 3 Architect of the Capitol to carry out the duties imposed
 4 upon him by the Act approved May 7, 1934 (40 U. S. C.
 5 13a-13d), including improvements, maintenance, repairs,
 6 equipment, supplies, materials, and appurtenances; special
 7 clothing for workmen; and personal and other services (in-
 8 cluding temporary labor without reference to the Classifica-
 9 tion and Retirement Acts, as amended), and for snow
 10 removal by hire of men and equipment or under contract
 11 without compliance with sections 3709, as amended, and
 12 3744 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5, 16);
 13 \$159,200.

14 COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges,
 17 and all other officers and employees of the court, and neces-
 18 sary expenses of the court, including exchange of books,
 19 traveling expenses, and printing and binding, as may be
 20 approved by the chief judge, \$192,200.

21 CUSTOMS COURT

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For salaries of the chief judge, eight judges, and all
 24 other officers and employees of the court, and necessary
 25 expenses of the court, including exchange of books, traveling

1 expenses, and printing and binding, as may be approved
 2 by the chief judge, ~~\$417,465~~ \$411,465: *Provided*, That
 3 traveling expenses of judges of the Customs Court shall be
 4 paid upon the written certificate of the judge.

5 COURT OF CLAIMS

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges,
 8 seven regular and six additional commissioners, and all other
 9 officers and employees of the court, and for other necessary
 10 expenses, including stenographic and other fees and charges
 11 necessary in the taking of testimony, travel, and printing
 12 and binding, ~~\$587,000~~ \$575,000.

13 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS

14 For necessary repairs and improvements to the Court
 15 of Claims buildings, to be expended under the supervision
 16 of the Architect of the Capitol, ~~\$10,700~~ \$140,700.

17 OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

18 HAWAII

19 For salaries of the chief justice and two associate
 20 justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii,
 21 of judges of the circuit courts in Hawaii, and of judges re-
 22 tired under title 28, United States Code, section 373,
 23 \$106,500

1 SALARIES OF JUDGES

2 For salaries of circuit judges; district judges (including
3 judges of the district courts of Alaska, the Virgin Islands,
4 and the Panama Canal Zone); and justices and judges re-
5 tired or resigned under title 28, United States Code, sections
6 371, 372, and 373; \$5,095,000.

7 SALARIES OF CLERKS OF COURTS

8 For salaries of clerks of United States courts of appeals
9 and United States district courts, their deputies, and other
10 assistants, ~~\$4,500,000~~ \$4,470,000.

11 PROBATION SYSTEM

12 For salaries of probation officers and their clerical assist-
13 ants, as authorized by title 18, United States Code, sections
14 3654 and 3656, \$2,145,000: *Provided*, That nothing
15 herein contained shall be construed to abridge the right
16 of the district judges to appoint probation officers, or to
17 make such orders as may be necessary to govern probation
18 officers in their own courts: *Provided further*, That no part
19 of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary or ex-
20 penses of any probation officer who, in the judgment of the
21 chief or presiding judge certified to the Attorney General,
22 fails to carry out the official orders of the Attorney General
23 with respect to supervising or furnishing information con-

cerning any prisoner released conditionally or on parole from
any Federal penal or correctional institution.

SALARIES OF CRIERS

For salaries of criers as authorized by title 28, United
States Code, sections 713 (a) and 755, ~~\$540,000~~ \$520,000.

FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

For fees of the United States commissioners and other
committing magistrates acting under title 18, United States
Code, section 3041, including fees and expenses of concili-
ation commissioners, United States courts, including the
objects and subject to the conditions specified for such fees
and expenses of conciliation commissioners in the Depart-
ment of Justice Appropriation Act, 1937, \$475,000.

FEES OF JURORS

For fees, expenses, and costs of jurors; meals and lodg-
ing for jurors in Alaska, as provided by section 193, title II,
of the Act of June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 362); and compensa-
tion for jury commissioners; \$2,700,000: *Provided*, That
the compensation of jury commissioners for the District of
Columbia shall conform to the provisions of section 1401,
title 11 of the District of Columbia Code, but such com-
pensation shall not exceed \$250 each per annum.

MISCELLANEOUS SALARIES

For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal
judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, \$2,600,-

1 000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and
2 law clerks of circuit and district judges shall be fixed by
3 the Director of the Administrative Office without regard
4 to the Classification Act of 1949, except that the salary of
5 a secretary shall conform with that of the General Schedule
6 grades (GS) 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, as the appointing judge shall
7 determine, and the salary of a law clerk shall conform with
8 that of the General Schedule grades (GS) 5, 7, 9, 11, or 12,
9 as the appointing judge shall determine, subject to review
10 by the judicial council of the circuit if requested by the
11 Director, such determination by the judge otherwise to be
12 final: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of step-increases
13 corresponding with those provided for by title VII of the
14 Classification Act of 1949 and of compensation paid for
15 temporary assistance needed because of an emergency) the
16 aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed
17 by one judge shall not exceed \$9,600 per annum, except in
18 the case of the chief judge of each circuit and the chief judge
19 of each district court having five or more district judges, in
20 which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed \$13,050
21 per annum.

22 MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

23 For miscellaneous expenses of the United States courts
24 and their officers; rent in the District of Columbia; printing

1 and binding; purchase of firearms and ammunition; and
2 purchase of envelopes without regard to the Act of June 26,
3 1906 (34 Stat. 476) ; ~~\$725,000~~ \$675,000: *Provided*, That
4 this appropriation shall be available for payment of the cost
5 of contract statistical services for the Office of Register of
6 Wills of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That not
7 to exceed \$1,000 of this appropriation shall be available for
8 the payment of fees to attorneys appointed in accordance
9 with the Act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 625), not exceeding
10 \$25 in any one case.

11 TRAVEL EXPENSES

12 For necessary traveling expenses, not otherwise pro-
13 vided for, incurred by the Judiciary, including traveling
14 expenses of probation officers and their clerks, ~~\$725,000~~
15 \$650,000: *Provided*, That this sum shall be available, in an
16 amount not to exceed \$8,500, for expenses of attendance at
17 meetings concerned with the work of Federal probation
18 when incurred on the written authorization of the Director
19 of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

20 SALARIES OF COURT REPORTERS

21 For salaries of court reporters for the district courts of
22 the United States, as authorized by title 28, United States
23 Code, section 753, \$972,000.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

2 For necessary expenses of the Administrative Office of
 3 the United States Courts, including personal services in the
 4 District of Columbia, travel, printing and binding, adver-
 5 tising, rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and
 6 examination of estimates for appropriations in the field,
 7 ~~\$530,000~~ \$520,000.

8 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, DISTRICT COURT OF THE

9 UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

10 For repairs and improvements to the courthouse, includ-
 11 ing repair and maintenance of the mechanical equipment,
 12 and for labor and material and every item incident thereto,
 13 ~~\$15,600~~ \$7,100, to be expended under the direction of the
 14 Architect of the Capitol.

15 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, UNITED STATES COURT OF

16 APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

17 For repairs and improvements to the United States
 18 Court of Appeals Building, including repair and mainte-
 19 nance of the mechanical equipment and for labor and ma-
 20 terial and every item incident thereto, \$6,200, to be ex-
 21 pended under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol.

SALARIES OF REFEREES

For salaries of referees as authorized by the Act of June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68), \$879,000 to be derived from the referees' salary fund established in pursuance of said Act.

EXPENSES OF REFEREES

For miscellaneous expenses of referees, United States courts, including the salaries of their clerical assistants, travel, printing and binding, purchase of envelopes without regard to the Act of June 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 476), \$960,000 to be derived from the referees' expense fund established in pursuance of the Act of June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68 (c) (4)).

Any surplus arising in the referees' salary and expense funds for the fiscal years 1949 and 1950 shall remain available until June 30, 1951, for the payment of salaries and expenses of referees within the limitations prescribed hereinbefore.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE JUDICIARY

SEC. 402. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia from all appropriations under this title and 30 per centum of the expenditures for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia from all appropriations under this title shall be reimbursed to the United States

1 from any funds in the Treasury to the credit of the District
2 of Columbia.

3 SEC. 403. The reports of the United States Court of
4 Appeals for the District of Columbia shall not be sold for
5 a price exceeding that approved by the court and for not
6 more than \$6.50 per volume.

7 This title may be cited as the "Judiciary Appropriation
8 Act, 1951".

9 TITLE V—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

10 The following corporations, respectively, are hereby au-
11 thorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds
12 and borrowing authority available to each such corporation
13 and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and com-
14 mitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided
15 by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act,
16 as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the pro-
17 grams set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for
18 each such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

19 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

20 Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated: Not to exceed
21 \$327,000 of the funds of the Corporation shall be avail-
22 able for its administrative expenses, and not to exceed
23 \$388,000 for the expenses of vocational training of
24 prisoners, both amounts to be computed on an accrual
25 basis and to be determined in accordance with the Cor-

1 poration's prescribed accounting system in effect on July 1,
2 1946, and shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of
3 claims, expenditures which the said accounting system re-
4 quires to be capitalized or charged to cost of commodities
5 acquired or produced, including selling and shipping ex-
6 penses, and expenses in connection with acquisition, con-
7 struction, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection,
8 or disposition of facilities and other property belonging to
9 the Corporation or in which it has an interest.

10 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

11 The Institute of Inter-American Affairs: Not to exceed
12 ~~\$600,000~~ \$767,500 of the funds available to the Corpora-
13 tion shall be available during the current fiscal year for
14 its administrative expenses, including administrative serv-
15 ices performed for the Corporation by other Government
16 agencies.

17 This title may be cited as "Federal Prison Industries,
18 Incorporated, and The Institute of Inter-American Affairs
19 Appropriation Act, 1951".

20 This chapter may be cited as the "Departments of
21 State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation
22 Act, 1951".

1 CHAPTER IV—TREASURY AND POST OFFICE

2 DEPARTMENTS

3 TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

4 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

5 SALARIES

6 For personal services in the District of Columbia,
7 \$940,000.

8 DAMAGE CLAIMS

9 For payment of claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C.
10 2672), \$30,000.

11 HEALTH SERVICE PROGRAMS

12 For health service programs, as authorized by law, in
13 the District of Columbia, \$80,000: *Provided*, That other
14 appropriations in this title shall be available for such pro-
15 grams in the field.

16 OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

17 SALARIES

18 For personal services in the District of Columbia,
19 \$340,000.

1 tive offices: *Provided further*, That the limiting amount
2 heretofore stated for administrative expenses shall be
3 increased by an amount which does not exceed the aggre-
4 gate cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses
5 of persons employed outside the continental United
6 States; the expenses of services performed on a contract
7 or fee basis in connection with termination of contracts
8 or in the performance of legal services; and all administra-
9 tive expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies:
10 *Provided further*, That the distribution of administrative
11 expenses to the accounts of the Corporation shall be made
12 in accordance with generally recognized accounting
13 principles and practices.

14 This chapter may be cited as the "Treasury-Post Office
15 Departments Appropriation Act, 1951".

1 CHAPTER V—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND
2 FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

3 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

4 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
6 Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title re-
7 ferred to as the Secretary), including personal services in
8 the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section
9 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); health
10 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150);
11 purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for
12 replacement only; teletype news service; and payment in
13 advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees
14 for library membership in organizations whose publications
15 are available to members only or to members at a price lower
16 than to the general public; \$1,382,000.

17 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor: For ex-
18 penses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, including
19 personal services in the District of Columbia, \$1,861,000:

1 *Provided, That the compensation of the Solicitor shall be*
2 *\$14,000 per annum.*

3 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards: For
4 expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety,
5 employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations
6 for labor and industry; performance of the functions
7 vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Manage-
8 ment Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and
9 (g)); and not to exceed \$75,000 for the work of the
10 President's Committee on National Employ the Physically
11 Handicapped Week, as authorized by the Act of July 11,
12 1949 (63 Stat. 409), including personal services in the Dis-
13 trict of Columbia; purchase of reports and of material for
14 informational exhibits; \$714,000.

15 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemploy-
16 ment Rights: For expenses necessary to render assistance in
17 connection with the exercise of reemployment rights of vet-
18 erans under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service
19 Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 308), the Serv-
20 ice Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army Reserve
21 and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as amended,
22 and section 9 (h) of title I of the Selective Service Act of
23 1948 (50 U. S. C., App. 459 (h)), and, under the Act
24 of June 23, 1943, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 1472),
25 of persons who have performed service in the Merchant

1 Marine, including personal services in the District of
2 Columbia, \$281,000.

3 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

4 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable
5 the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging appren-
6 tice training, as authorized by the Act of August 16, 1937
7 (29 U. S. C. 50), including personal services in the District
8 of Columbia, \$2,788,000.

9 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
11 general administration of the employment service and unem-
12 ployment compensation programs, including personal serv-
13 ices in the District of Columbia; temporary employment of
14 persons, without regard to the civil service laws, for the
15 farm placement migratory labor program; for cooperation
16 with the United States Immigration and Naturalization
17 Service and the Secretary of State in negotiating and carry-
18 ing out agreements relating to the employment of foreign
19 agricultural workers, subject to the immigration laws and
20 when necessary to supplement the domestic labor force;
21 and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by
22 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
23 \$5,531,000, of which \$1,587,000 shall be for carrying into
24 effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the
25 Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

1 Grants to States for unemployment compensation and
2 employment service administration: For grants to the several
3 States (including Alaska and Hawaii) in accordance with
4 the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29
5 U. S. C. 49-491), for carrying into effect section 602 of the
6 Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants to
7 the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security
8 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon
9 the request of any State, the purchase of equipment and the
10 payment of rental for space made available to such State in
11 lieu of grants for such purpose, and for necessary expenses
12 in connection with the operation of employment office
13 facilities and services in the District of Columbia and for
14 use in carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's
15 Readjustment Act of 1944 in Puerto Rico, \$178,500,000,
16 of which \$8,500,000 shall be available only to the extent
17 that the Secretary finds necessary to meet increased costs
18 of administration resulting from changes in a State law or
19 increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or
20 salary costs over those upon which the State's basic grant
21 (or the allocation for the District of Columbia or Puerto
22 Rico) was based, which increased costs of administration
23 cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments:
24 *Provided*, That no State shall be required to make
25 any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of said

1 Act of June 6, 1933, prior to July 1, 1952: *Provided*
2 *further*, That, notwithstanding any provision to the contrary
3 in section 5 (a) or section 6 of the Act of June 6, 1933, or
4 in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended,
5 the Secretary of Labor shall from time to time certify to
6 the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State
7 found to be in compliance with the requirements of the
8 Act of June 6, 1933, and with the provisions of section
9 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts
10 as he determines to be necessary for the proper and effi-
11 cient administration of its unemployment compensation law
12 and of its public employment offices: *Provided further*,
13 That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Depart-
14 ment of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be
15 used for the payment, in such manner as said parties may
16 jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official
17 mail matter in connection with the administration of unem-
18 ployment compensation systems and employment services
19 by States receiving grants herefrom.

20 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,
21 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social
22 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and
23 maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall
24 apply.

25 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the

1 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State
2 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation
3 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of
4 officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld
5 from the said agencies of any States which have established
6 by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit
7 system and classification and compensation plan covering
8 the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their
9 employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel
10 or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said
11 States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

12 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For
13 making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year payments
14 to States under title III of the Social Security Act, as
15 amended, and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended,
16 for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such
17 sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the
18 expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title
19 and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to
20 the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

21 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

22 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
23 work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement to
24 State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for
25 services rendered; personal services in the District of Colum-

1 bia; and not to exceed \$15,000 for services as authorized
2 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ;
3 \$5,720,700.

4 Revision of consumers' price index: For expenses neces-
5 sary to enable the Bureau to revise the Consumers' Price
6 Index, including personal services in the District of Columbia;
7 temporary employees at rates to be fixed by the Secretary
8 without regard to the civil service and classification laws
9 and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended;
10 and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
11 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$2,000,000.

12 WOMEN'S BUREAU

13 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
14 work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of
15 June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including personal
16 services in the District of Columbia and purchase of reports
17 and material for informational exhibits; \$399,000.

18 WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

19 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for per-
20 forming the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards
21 Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions
22 for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by
23 the United States, approved June 30, 1936 (41 U. S. C.
24 38), including personal services in the District of Columbia;
25 reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their

1 employees for inspection services rendered; and expenses of
2 attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at con-
3 ferences concerned with the work of the Wage and Hour
4 Division; \$9,396,400.

5 GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available
7 for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses
8 of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or
9 activity for which any such appropriation is made.

10 SEC. 103. Appropriations under this title available
11 for salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic
12 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
13 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

14 SEC. 104. Appropriations under this title available
15 for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment
16 of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

17 SEC. 105. Appropriations under this title available
18 for salaries and expenses shall be available for printing and
19 binding.

20 SEC. 106. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appro-
21 priation in this title may be transferred to any other
22 such appropriation but no such appropriation shall be in-
23 creased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfer:
24 *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for creation
25 of new functions within the Department.

1 This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor
2 Appropriation Act, 1951".

3 TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

4 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

5 Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of
6 August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$115,000.

7 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

8 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative
9 expenses, including personal services in the District of
10 Columbia and not to exceed \$49,600 for the Employees'
11 Compensation Board of Appeals; \$1,935,000, together
12 with not to exceed \$119,000 to be derived from the War
13 Claims Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims
14 Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

15 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of
16 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except ad-
17 ministrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing
18 during the current or any prior fiscal year, including pay-
19 ments to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital
20 services pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of
21 Employees' Compensation; continuation of payment of
22 benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Bene-
23 fits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act,
24 1947; the advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries

1 in third-party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital
2 services and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial
3 expenses, including transportation and other expenses inci-
4 dental to such services, treatment, and burial, for such
5 enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified
6 by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital services
7 and treatment at Government expense on June 30, 1943,
8 and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian em-
9 ployees of the United States, and the limitations and au-
10 thority of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5
11 U. S. C. 796), shall apply in providing such services, treat-
12 ment, and expenses in such cases; \$25,000,000, together
13 with not to exceed \$5,000,000 to be derived from the War
14 Claims Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims
15 Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012) and to be available for
16 payments pursuant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of such Act,
17 which amounts may be accounted for as one fund.

18 COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

19 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Co-
20 lumbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal services
21 and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements,
22 \$368,200.

23 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

24 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for
25 carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act,

1 as amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392) ; the Tea Importation
2 Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50) ; the Import Milk
3 Act (21 U. S. C. 141-149) ; the Federal Caustic Poison
4 Act (15 U. S. C. 401-411) ; and the Filled Milk Act, as
5 amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64) ; including personal services
6 in the District of Columbia; purchase of not to exceed
7 ~~seventeen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only~~
8 *sixty-five passenger motor vehicles, of which seventeen shall*
9 *be for replacement only*; reporting and illustrating the results
10 of investigations; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scien-
11 tific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for payment in
12 advance for special tests and analyses by contract; and pay-
13 ment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection with studies
14 of new developments pertinent to food and drug enforce-
15 ment operations; ~~\$5,066,700~~ \$5,666,700.

16 Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection serv-
17 ices: For expenses necessary for the certification or inspec-
18 tion of certain products in accordance with sections 406,
19 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food,
20 Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346,
21 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of the
22 advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover
23 payment of fees by applicants for certification or inspection
24 of such products, to remain available until expended. The
25 total amount herein appropriated shall be available for per-

1 sonal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere;
2 purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment;
3 and the refund of advance deposits for which no service has
4 been rendered.

5 FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

6 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for
7 operation and maintenance, including repairs; purchase of one
8 passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; furnish-
9 ing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by
10 employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer
11 of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses,
12 Howard University" for salaries of technical and profes-
13 sional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the
14 appropriation of Howard University for instruction of nurses
15 and actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such
16 university; \$2,600,000: *Provided*, That no intern or resident
17 physician receiving compensation from this appropriation
18 on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form
19 of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title.

20 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

21 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of
22 Howard University, including personal services and miscel-
23 laneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds,
24 \$2,500,000.

25 Plans and specifications: For the preparation of plans

1 and specifications for construction, under the supervision of
2 the General Services Administration, on the grounds of
3 Howard University of a preclinical medical building, includ-
4 ing engineering and architectural services, printing and
5 binding, advertising, and travel, \$100,000, which amount,
6 except such part as may be necessary for the incidental
7 expenses of the University, may be transferred to the Gen-
8 eral Services Administration for the above purposes, to
9 remain available until expended.

10 Construction of buildings: For construction of buildings
11 on the grounds of Howard University, under the supervision
12 of the General Services Administration, to remain avail-
13 able until expended, as follows:

14 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
15 provided under this head in the Federal Security Agency
16 Appropriation Act, 1950, for construction of a law school
17 building, biology building and greenhouse, administration
18 building, and men's dormitory units, \$1,250,000;

19 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
20 provided under this head in the First Deficiency Appropria-
21 tion Act, 1948, as amended by the Second Deficiency Appropria-
22 tion Act, 1949, to enter into contracts for construction
23 of an engineering building and women's dormitory units,
24 \$412,000.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), and section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), \$19,977,760: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$19,842,760 for the current fiscal year.

Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 329), \$2,480,000.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of public and school library service; coordination of library service on the national level with other forms of adult education; developing library participation in Federal projects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and the development of library service throughout the country; personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and

1 cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles
2 of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative
3 of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education,
4 and repairing the same; ~~\$1,900,000~~ \$2,023,420, of which
5 not less than \$533,700 shall be available for the Division
6 of Vocational Education as authorized: *Provided*, That all
7 receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reimburse-
8 ment for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of
9 Education performing advisory functions to said agencies
10 shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the
11 credit of this appropriation.

12 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

13 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
14 Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska,
15 Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Voca-
16 tional Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C. ch. 4),
17 including payments, in accordance with regulations of the
18 Administrator, for one-half of necessary expenditures for
19 the acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in
20 accordance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for
21 the use of blind persons, such stands or other equipment
22 to be controlled by the State agency, \$20,600,000, of
23 which not to exceed \$170,000 shall be available to
24 the Federal Security Administrator for providing re-
25 habilitation services to disabled residents of the District

1 of Columbia, as authorized by section 6 of said Act, which
2 latter amount shall be available for administrative expenses
3 in connection with providing such services in the District
4 of Columbia, printing and binding, including the purchase
5 of reprints, and travel: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15
6 per centum of the appropriation shall be used for adminis-
7 trative purposes.

8 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
9 Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after
10 May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States in
11 accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as
12 amended (including the objects specified in the preceding
13 paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal
14 year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred
15 and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the
16 appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That
17 the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not
18 exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter
19 of the current fiscal year.

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carry-
21 ing out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,
22 as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20
23 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including personal services in the District
24 of Columbia and not to exceed \$3,000 for production, pur-
25 chase, and distribution of educational films; \$705,000.

1 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

2 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public
3 Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A)
4 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and other Acts, in-
5 cluding (with the exception of the appropriation "Pay, and
6 so forth, commissioned officers, Public Health Service")
7 personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of
8 reports, documents, and other material for publication;
9 preparation and display of posters and exhibits by con-
10 tract or otherwise; packing, unpacking, crating, uncrating,
11 drayage, and transportation of personal effects of commis-
12 sioned officers and transportation of their dependents on
13 change of station; and increased allowances to Reserve
14 Officers for foreign service; as follows:

15 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections
16 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases,
17 including the operation and maintenance of centers for the
18 diagnosis, treatment, support, and clothing of persons afflicted
19 with venereal diseases; transportation and subsistence of such
20 persons and their attendants to and from the place of treat-
21 ment or allowance in lieu thereof; diagnosis and treatment
22 (including emergency treatment for other illnesses) of such
23 persons through contracts with physicians and hospitals and
24 other appropriate institutions; fees for case finding
25 and referral to such centers of voluntary patients;

1 reasonable expenses of preparing remains or burial of de-
2 ceased patients; recreational supplies and equipment; leasing
3 of facilities and repair and alteration of leased facilities; the
4 purchase of not to exceed twenty passenger motor
5 vehicles for replacement only, and for grants of money, serv-
6 ices, supplies, equipment, and use of facilities to States, as
7 defined in the Act, and with the approval of the respective
8 State health authorities, to counties, health districts, and
9 other political subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing
10 purposes, in such amounts and upon such terms and condi-
11 tions as the Surgeon General may determine; ~~\$14,900,000~~
12 *\$14,500,000.*

13 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314
14 (b) of the Act, including the purchase of not to exceed
15 two passenger motor vehicles, ~~\$10,000,000~~ *\$9,600,000.*

16 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes
17 of section 314 (c) of the Act; to provide consultative serv-
18 ices to States pursuant to section 311 of the Act; to make
19 field investigations and demonstrations pursuant to section
20 301 of the Act; and to provide for collecting and compiling
21 mortality, morbidity, and vital statistics (including procure-
22 ment by contract of transcripts of State, municipal, and other
23 records), including the purchase of not to exceed fourteen
24 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, *\$16,915,000.*

1 Communicable diseases: To carry out those provisions
2 of sections 301, 311, 361, and 704 of the Act relating to the
3 prevention and suppression of communicable diseases, and
4 the interstate transmission and spread thereof, including the
5 purchase of not to exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles
6 for replacement only; and hire, maintenance, and operation
7 of aircraft; \$6,415,000.

8 Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For
9 expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out
10 those provisions of sections 301, 311, and 361 of the Act
11 relating to sanitation and other aspects of environmental
12 health, including enforcement of applicable quarantine laws
13 and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carrying out
14 the functions of the Surgeon General under the Water
15 Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466–466 (j)), including
16 purchase of not to exceed twenty-one passenger motor
17 vehicles, of which seven shall be for replacement only;
18 \$3,670,030.

19 Grants, water pollution control: For grants to carry out
20 section 8 (a) of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S.
21 C. 466–466 (j)), \$1,000,000, to remain available until
22 expended.

23 Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Terri-
24 tory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct,
25 in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory

1 of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the in-
2 vestigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases,
3 and the establishment and maintenance of health and sani-
4 tation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in
5 sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of
6 subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set
7 forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361, 363, and 704
8 of the Act, including the purchase of one passenger motor
9 vehicle, and hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft,
10 \$1,259,000: *Provided*, That property of the Public Health
11 Service located in Alaska and used in carrying out the
12 activities herein authorized may be transferred, without
13 reimbursement, to the Territory of Alaska at the discretion
14 of the Surgeon General.

15 Grants for hospital construction: For liquidation of
16 contractual obligations authorized by the Congress to be
17 incurred during the fiscal year 1948 or any subsequent fiscal
18 year for construction grants under part C, title VI, of the
19 Act, as amended, \$100,000,000, to remain available until
20 expended. Allotments under such part C to the several
21 States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis
22 of \$150,000,000. Whenever the Surgeon General shall have
23 approved an application for a construction project in ac-
24 cordance with section 625 of the Act, subject to the amount
25 of the allotments available to the States for such purposes,

1 the Federal share of the cost of such project, as provided
2 by the Act, shall constitute a contractual obligation of the
3 Federal Government.

4 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:
5 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI
6 of the Act, as amended, including the purchase of not to
7 exceed four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only,
8 ~~\$1,357,000~~ \$2,107,000.

9 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the pur-
10 poses of sections 321, 322, 324, 326, 331, 332, 341, 343,
11 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the Act, and Executive Order
12 9079 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and ex-
13 change of farm products and livestock; purchase of not to
14 exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles, including ten am-
15 bulances, for replacement only; and firearms and ammuni-
16 tion; \$29,000,000.

17 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-
18 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to preventing
19 the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign
20 countries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance
21 with section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment
22 of quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the
23 Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of
24 the Public Health Service are not available, including in-

1 surance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when
2 required by law of such countries; and the purchase of not
3 to exceed ten passenger motor vehicles for replacement
4 only, \$3,104,000.

5 Employee health service programs: For carrying out
6 the functions of the Public Health Service under the Act of
7 August 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), \$50,000: *Provided,*
8 That when the Public Health Service, at the request of
9 any department or agency of the Government, establishes
10 or operates a health service program for such department
11 or agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made
12 in advance by check for deposit to the credit of this
13 appropriation.

14 National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For
15 the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not other-
16 wise provided for, including research fellowships and grants
17 for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; the
18 regulation and preparation of biologic products; the purchase
19 of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles for replace-
20 ment only; not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visit-
21 ing scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon
22 General; and erection of temporary structures for storage
23 of equipment and supplies and housing of animals,
24 \$15,750,000, of which not less than \$3,600,000 shall be
25 available exclusively for grants for studies with adreno-

1 corticotropic hormone (ACTH) and cortisone (compound
2 E), including *grants of adrenocorticotripic hormone*
3 *(ACTH), cortisone, and other chemical substances, and for*
4 development of other related compounds for treatment of
5 arthritis, rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, neurological and
6 metabolic diseases, and including studies in the basic sciences
7 related to such diseases and including not to exceed
8 \$200,000 for transfer to the Department of Agriculture for
9 research into utilization of plant material and vegetable
10 sources of cortisone.

11 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon Gen-
12 eral, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory
13 Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and train-
14 ing projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State
15 health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit
16 institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of
17 cancer by providing consultative services, demonstrations,
18 and grants-in-aid; for the purchase of not to exceed six
19 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and to
20 otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of
21 the Act, ~~\$20,086,000~~ \$20,686,000, of which not less than
22 \$5,000,000 shall be available exclusively for payment of
23 obligations for research and training grants incurred under
24 authority heretofore granted under this head.

25 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for

1 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311,
 2 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental dis-
 3 eases, ~~\$9,944,000~~ \$10,000,000, of which not less than
 4 \$2,375,000 shall be available exclusively for payment of
 5 obligations for research and training grants incurred under
 6 authority heretofore granted under this head.

7 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to
 8 carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act, including
 9 the purchase of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles,
 10 ~~\$14,150,000~~ \$14,750,000, of which \$5,350,000 shall be
 11 available exclusively for payment of obligations for research
 12 and training grants incurred under authority heretofore
 13 granted under this head.

14 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise pro-
 15 vided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry
 16 out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental diseases
 17 and conditions, including the purchase of twelve passenger
 18 motor vehicles for replacement only, ~~\$2,040,000~~ \$2,140,000.

19 Construction of research facilities: For construction of
 20 research facilities, to be transferred (except such part as may
 21 be necessary for incidental expenses and purchase of equip-
 22 ment by the Public Health Service) to the General Services
 23 Administration, and to remain available until expended, as
 24 follows:

25 For payment of obligations incurred under authority

1 heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction
2 of a combined hospital and research building as authorized
3 under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropria-
4 tion Acts of 1949 and 1950, \$7,500,000.

5 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
6 heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction of
7 auxiliary service area structures, as authorized under this
8 head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act,
9 1950, \$3,600,000.

10 For construction of additional auxiliary structures to
11 provide station quarters for personnel and a grounds main-
12 tenance building, including necessary distribution facilities
13 and roads and walks, \$1,025,000; and in addition, con-
14 tracts may be entered into an amount not to exceed \$350,-
15 000 toward completion of such construction at a cost not
16 to exceed \$1,375,000: *Provided, That the Surgeon General*
17 *is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed upon such terms*
18 *and conditions as he may prescribe not to exceed twenty-five*
19 *thousand square feet of land presently included in the site of*
20 *the National Institutes of Health to the Bethesda Fire De-*
21 *partment, a body corporate of the State of Maryland, for*
22 *the purpose of erecting and maintaining a fire station to*
23 *provide protection for the facilities of the National Institutes*
24 *of Health and for the adjacent community: Provided fur-*
25 *ther, That such terms and conditions may include an agree-*

1 *ment by the Surgeon General to pay to such department on*
2 *behalf of the United States 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per centum of the cost of*
3 *the construction of the station but not to exceed \$20,000,*
4 *to be charged to the maximum limits of costs set out in this*
5 *paragraph.*

6 For purchase and installation of additional equipment
7 and furnishings to partially equip and furnish structures
8 heretofore or herein provided under this head (except struc-
9 tures for station quarters), \$3,000,000.

10 Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth: For pay, uni-
11 forms and subsistence allowances, increased allowances for
12 foreign service and commutation of quarters for not to exceed
13 one thousand five hundred regular active commissioned
14 officers; for medals, decorations, and retired pay of regular
15 and reserve commissioned officers; for payment of claims
16 for private property lost, destroyed, captured, abandoned,
17 or damaged in the military service of the United States, as
18 authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 222c, h; 42 U. S. C. 213);
19 and for six months' death gratuity pay and burial payments
20 for regular commissioned officers; \$1,790,000, and the
21 Surgeon General is authorized to advance to this appro-
22 priation from appropriations made available to the Public
23 Health Service for the current fiscal year such additional
24 amounts as may be necessary for pay and allowances of the
25 officers herein authorized.

1 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of
 2 the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous ex-
 3 penses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for
 4 elsewhere, including conducting research on technical nursing
 5 standards and furnishing consultative nursing services; pre-
 6 paring information, articles, and publications related to public
 7 health; conducting studies and demonstrations in public
 8 health methods; carrying on international health activities,
 9 including not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of officials
 10 of other countries when specifically authorized by the Sur-
 11 geon General; and purchase of not to exceed two passenger
 12 motor vehicles for replacement only; \$2,918,000.

13 SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

14 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 15 maintenance and operation of the hospital, including pur-
 16 chase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles, includ-
 17 ing one bus-ambulance, for replacement only, clothing for
 18 patients and cooperation with organizations or individuals
 19 in scientific research into the nature, causes, prevention, and
 20 treatment of mental illness, ~~\$1,948,000~~ \$2,005,000.

21 Construction and equipment, building for the housing,
 22 care, and treatment of mentally sick patients: For payment
 23 of obligations incurred under authority provided in the Fed-
 24 eral Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1949, for comple-
 25 tion of a building for the housing, care, and treatment of

1 mentally sick patients, Saint Elizabeths Hospital, \$100,000,
2 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any
3 part of this amount may be transferred to the General Serv-
4 ices Administration.

5 Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds:
6 For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and
7 equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including prep-
8 aration of plans and specifications, advertising, and super-
9 vision of construction, \$406,000, to remain available until
10 expended: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be
11 transferred to the General Services Administration.

12 Construction and equipment of treatment building: For
13 construction and equipment, including administrative ex-
14 penses, of a treatment building (providing separate male
15 and female facilities), and demolition and removal of those
16 buildings designated as Oaks and Toner Buildings with
17 their appurtenances and attachments, within the grounds
18 of Saint Elizabeths Hospital, \$1,500,000, to remain avail-
19 able until expended; and, in addition, contracts may be
20 entered into in an amount not to exceed \$3,938,000
21 toward completion of such work at a total cost not to ex-
22 ceed \$5,588,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation in
23 the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1950, for
24 preparation of plans and specifications for two treatment
25 buildings, shall be consolidated with this appropriation, to

1 be disbursed and accounted for as one fund which shall be
 2 available for all of the foregoing purposes, and any part of
 3 such consolidated appropriation may be transferred to the
 4 General Services Administration.

5 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

6 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions:

7 For expenses necessary for the supervision of Federal credit
 8 unions, including personal services in the District of Colum-
 9 bia, ~~\$200,000~~ \$300,000, together with the aggregate of
 10 amounts received from certificate, supervision, and exami-
 11 nation fees collected from Federal credit unions as authorized
 12 by law.

13 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors
 14 Insurance: For necessary expenses, including personal serv-
 15 ices in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and furnish-
 16 ing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equip-
 17 ment used by building guards; not more than \$45,988,000
 18 may be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors
 19 insurance trust fund, *of which not more than \$404 shall be*
 20 *available for payment in advance when authorized by the*
 21 *Federal Security Administrator for dues or fees for library*
 22 *membership in organizations whose publications are avail-*
 23 *able to members only or to members at a price lower than*
 24 *to the general public: Provided, That any sums received by*
 25 the Administrator as payment for services performed for

1 any department or agency of the Government by persons
2 whose salaries are paid from the amount made available
3 under this paragraph shall be deposited to the credit of
4 this appropriation for the fiscal year in which such sums
5 are received, and shall be available for the same purposes.

6 Reimbursement to Federal old-age and survivors insur-
7 ance trust fund: For reimbursement to the Federal old-age
8 and survivors insurance trust fund for benefits paid during
9 the fiscal year 1949 to the survivors of veterans of World
10 War II eligible for benefits as provided under section 210
11 of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 410),
12 \$3,694,000.

13 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to
14 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and
15 aid to the blind as authorized in titles I, IV, and X of the
16 Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch.
17 I, IV, and X), \$1,200,000,000, of which such amount as
18 may be necessary shall be available for grants for any
19 period in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that
20 year.

21 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For
22 expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance, in-
23 cluding personal services in the District of Columbia,
24 \$1,413,400.

25 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For neces-

1 sary expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as
2 amended (29 U. S. C. 18a), and title V of the Social
3 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
4 including personal services in the District of Columbia
5 and purchase of reports and material for the publications
6 of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution,
7 ~~\$1,500,000~~ \$1,510,000: *Provided*, That no part of any
8 appropriation contained in this title shall be used to promul-
9 gate or carry out any instruction, order, or regulation relating
10 to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminate between
11 persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics:
12 *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so
13 construed as to prevent any patient from having the services
14 of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this
15 fund, so long as State laws are complied with: *Provided*
16 *further*, That any State plan which provides standards for
17 professional obstetrical services in accordance with the laws
18 of the State shall be approved.

19 Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For
20 grants to States for maternal and child-health services, serv-
21 ices for crippled children, and child-welfare services as
22 authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security
23 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), \$22,000,-
24 000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to
25 section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not be included

1 in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of
2 sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or
3 estimated to be expended by the State.

4 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For
5 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner for
6 Social Security, including personal services in the District of
7 Columbia, \$223,000, together with not to exceed \$112,000
8 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors
9 insurance trust fund.

10 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For
11 making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments
12 to States under titles I, IV, V, and X, respectively, of the
13 Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter of the
14 next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary,
15 the obligations incurred and the expenditures made there-
16 under for payments under each of such titles to be charged
17 to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

18 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, and X, respec-
19 tively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, payments to
20 a State under any of such titles for any quarter in the
21 period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending
22 June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect
23 to a State plan approved under such title prior to or during
24 such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect

1 to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which
2 such plan was submitted for approval.

3 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

4 Salaries, Office of the Administrator: Salaries, Office
5 of the Administrator, including personal services in the
6 District of Columbia, \$2,383,100, together with not to
7 exceed \$334,900 to be transferred from the Federal old-age
8 and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That the
9 Administrator may advance to this appropriation from appro-
10 priations of constituent organizations of the Federal Security
11 Agency such sums as may be necessary to finance the
12 regional office activities of such constituent organizations.

13 Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations:
14 For expenses necessary for the Office of the Administrator,
15 including personal services in the District of Columbia for
16 the Division of Service Operations, \$1,090,000, together
17 with not to exceed \$165,600 to be transferred from the
18 Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund: *Pro-*
19 *vided*, That the Administrator may advance to this appro-
20 priation from appropriations of constituent organizations of
21 the Federal Security Agency such sums as may be nec-
22 essary to cover the charges for services, supplies, equip-
23 ment and materials furnished.

24 Salaries, Office of the General Counsel: Salaries, Office
25 of the General Counsel, including personal services in the

1 District of Columbia, ~~\$511,100~~ \$535,100, together with not
2 to exceed \$22,950 to be transferred from the appropriation
3 "Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services",
4 and not to exceed \$321,100 to be transferred from the Fed-
5 eral old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

6 Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for
7 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k)
8 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of
9 1949, relating to disposal of real and personal excess property
10 for educational purposes and protection of public health,
11 including personal services in the District of Columbia,
12 \$333,300.

13 GENERAL PROVISIONS

14 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for
15 salaries and expenses shall be available for payment of tort
16 claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

17 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for
18 salaries and expenses shall be available for examination of
19 estimates of appropriations in the field, for exchange of books.

20 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for
21 salaries and expenses shall be available for health service
22 programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), and such
23 amounts as may be necessary may be transferred to the

1 appropriations of the organizational units operating such
2 programs.

3 SEC. 205. Appropriations under this title available for
4 salaries and expenses shall be available for printing and bind-
5 ing, including the purchase of reprints.

6 SEC. 206. Appropriations under this title available for
7 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as author-
8 ized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
9 55a).

10 SEC. 207. *Appropriations under this title available for*
11 *salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses*
12 *and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with*
13 *the function or activity for which any such appropriation*
14 *is made.*

15 SEC. ~~207~~ 208. None of the funds appropriated by this
16 title to the Social Security Administration for grants in
17 aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost
18 of operation of said agencies including the salaries and ex-
19 penses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be
20 withheld from the said agencies of any States which have
21 established by legislative enactment and have in operation
22 a merit system and classification and compensation plan
23 covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of
24 their employees, because of any disapproval of their per-

sonnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

This title may be cited as the "Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1951".

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including personal services in the District of Columbia; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the General Counsel; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) ; and a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ; ~~\$8,550,000~~ \$8,615,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947,

1 and as defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938
2 (52 Stat. 1060).

3 This title may be cited as the "National Labor Relations
4 Board Appropriation Act, 1951".

5 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

6 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
7 National Mediation Board, including personal services in the
8 District of Columbia, printing and binding, and stenographic
9 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
10 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$412,200.

11 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses neces-
12 sary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of the
13 Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157), and
14 emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant to
15 section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including printing
16 and binding, and stenographic reporting services as author-
17 ized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
18 55a), \$150,000.

19 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
21 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including printing
22 and binding, and stenographic reporting services as author-
23 ized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S.
24 C. 55a), \$797,300, of which not less than \$296,700, shall

1 be available for compensation (at rates not in excess of
2 \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees appointed pursuant
3 to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

4 This title may be cited as the "National Mediation Board
5 Appropriation Act, 1951".

6 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

7 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust
8 fund) : For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement
9 Board, including personal services in the District of Colum-
10 bia; not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attendance at
11 meetings concerned with the work of the Board when
12 specifically authorized by the Board; printing and binding;
13 stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15
14 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; payment
15 of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) ; a health
16 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ;
17 \$5,446,000, to be derived from the railroad retirement
18 account.

19 Railroad retirement account: For an amount sufficient
20 as an annual premium for the payments required under the
21 Railroad Retirement Acts of August 29, 1935, and June
22 24, 1937, and authorized to be appropriated to the railroad
23 retirement account established under section 15 (a) of the
24 latter Act, \$457,832,724: *Provided*, That such total
25 amount shall be available until expended for making

1 payments required under said retirement Acts, and the
2 amount not required for current payments shall be invested
3 by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the
4 provisions of said Railroad Retirement Act of June 24,
5 1937.

6 This title may be cited as the "Railroad Retirement
7 Board Appropriation Act, 1951".

8 TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND
9 CONCILIATION SERVICE

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
11 Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-
12 Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171-180,
13 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel
14 as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employ-
15 ment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor rela-
16 tions at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses
17 of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and indus-
18 trial relations; printing and binding; services as authorized
19 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
20 55a); health service program as authorized by law (5
21 U. S. C. 150); and payment of tort claims pursuant to law
22 (28 U. S. C. 2672); \$2,949,700.

23 Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay neces-
24 sary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the President
25 pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations

1 Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176–180, 182), including printing
2 and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
3 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and rent in the District
4 of Columbia, \$50,000.

5 This title may be cited as the “Federal Mediation and
6 Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1951”.

7 This chapter may be cited as the “Labor-Federal Security
8 Appropriation Act, 1951”.

1 CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

2 TITLE I

3 RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

4 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provi-
5 sions of section 9 of title I and title II of the Act of August
6 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 427, 427h, 427j, 1621-
7 1629), as follows:

8 For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico
9 for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9 of
10 the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as
11 amended by the Act of August 14, 1946, \$5,000,000;

12 For the improvement and development, independently
13 or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies,
14 and others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution
15 and marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the "Agri-
16 cultural Marketing Act of 1946" (title II of the Act of Au-
17 gust 14, 1946, as amended), including the objects for which
18 funds are available for titles II and III of such Act of August

1 14, 1946, \$6,000,000: *Provided*, That not less than
2 \$650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in
3 accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act:
4 *Provided further*, That the Secretary may make available
5 to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such
6 amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to
7 carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts
8 made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the
9 Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those
10 which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon
11 with representatives of the Department, shall determine),
12 and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts trans-
13 ferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation
14 items of the Department: *Provided further*, That no part
15 of this appropriation shall be available for work relating
16 to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the
17 support of equitable transportation rates before Federal
18 agencies concerned with such rates and for development of
19 foreign markets.

20 In all, \$11,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this
21 appropriation shall be used for beginning construction of
22 any building costing in excess of \$15,000, except that a poul-
23 try breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University
24 at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed \$29,000.

25 *To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, inde-*

pendently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products under the provisions of title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1621-1629), including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such Act of August 14, 1946, \$6,000,000: Provided, That not less than \$650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act: Provided further, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act establishing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (5 U. S. C. 673) and related Acts, as follows:

Economic investigations: For conducting investigations and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, farm structures, costs, prices and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, ~~\$2,600,000~~ \$2,720,000: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Economic investigations" shall be used for State and county land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices.

Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,

1 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
 2 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, produc-
 3 tion, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin
 4 pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b),
 5 and for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts
 6 as provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended
 7 May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951-957), and data on farm
 8 construction as provided by title V of the Housing Act
 9 of 1949 (Public Law 171), \$2,725,000 \$2,904,000: *Pro-*
 10 *vided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall
 11 be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating,
 12 or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to
 13 the acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple
 14 production for other than the commercial crop.

15 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

16 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

17 For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator,
 18 including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, travel
 19 and subsistence expenses of ~~Advisory Committee~~ *advisory*
 20 *committees* authorized by title III of the Act of August 14,
 21 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1628-1629), and the maintenance, oper-
 22 ation, and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agri-
 23 cultural Research Center, \$600,000: *Provided*, That the
 24 appropriation current at the time services are rendered
 25 may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements

1 based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appro-
2 priations, to cover the charges, including handling and
3 other related services, for equipment rentals (including
4 depreciation, maintenance, and repairs) ; for services, sup-
5 plies, equipment, and material furnished: *Provided further,*
6 That of the several appropriations of the Agricultural
7 Research Administration, not to exceed \$15,000 shall
8 be available for employment pursuant to the second sen-
9 tence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5
10 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of Au-
11 gust 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) : *Provided further,* That the
12 several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Adminis-
13 tration shall be available for the construction, alteration, and
14 repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided, however,*
15 That unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any
16 one building (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses)
17 shall not exceed \$5,000, the total amount for construction of
18 buildings costing more than \$2,500 each shall be within the
19 limits of the estimates submitted and approved therefor, and
20 the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year
21 shall not exceed \$2,500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the
22 building as certified by the Research Administrator, which-
23 ever is greater.

1

2

3

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 Laboratory, Wyndmoor, Pennsylvania, to provide pilot plant
2 facilities for tannin extraction, and such amount shall be in
3 addition to amounts otherwise available for alterations.

4 RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

5 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
6 conduct research into the basic agricultural needs and prob-
7 lems of the Territory of Alaska, through such agencies of
8 the Department as he may designate, independently or in
9 cooperation with appropriate agencies of the Territory of
10 Alaska, ~~\$260,000~~ \$280,000.

11 OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

12 Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico

13 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
14 Rico to be paid quarterly in advance *where applicable*, to
15 carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating
16 to agricultural experiment stations:

17 Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related
18 Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7
19 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377-379), \$720,000; Adams
20 Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),
21 \$720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,
22 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373-376, 380, 382),
23 \$2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act
24 approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427-427g), ~~\$2,863,-~~
25 ~~708~~ Sections 3 and 5, \$2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11

1 of said Act as added by the Act of August 14, 1946 (7
 2 U. S. C. 427h, 427j), including administration by the Office
 3 of Experiment Stations in the United States Department of
 4 Agriculture, \$5,000,000, no part of which latter amount
 5 shall be used for beginning construction of any building
 6 costing in excess of \$15,000, except that a poultry breeding
 7 house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to
 8 this appropriation of not to exceed \$29,000; Hawaii, the
 9 Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386-386b),
 10 extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to
 11 the Territory of Hawaii, \$90,000; Alaska, the Act
 12 approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c),
 13 extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory
 14 of Alaska, \$15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of
 15 the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a),
 16 extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to
 17 the Territory of Alaska, ~~\$27,500~~ \$37,500; Puerto Rico, the
 18 Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d-
 19 386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress
 20 to Puerto Rico, \$90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii,
 21 Alaska, and Puerto Rico, ~~\$7,406,208~~ \$12,416,208.

22 Salaries and Expenses

23 For necessary expenses in connection with adminis-
 24 tration of grants and coordination of research with States,
 25 to carry out the provisions of the Acts approved March 2,

1 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928,
 2 February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936,
 3 and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361-363, 365-
 4 383, 386-386f), and title I of the Act approved June 29,
 5 1935, as amended by the Act of ~~December~~ *September* 21,
 6 1944 (7 U. S. C. 427-427g), relative to their administration
 7 and for the administration of an agricultural experiment sta-
 8 tion in Puerto Rico, ~~\$237,500~~ *\$252,500*; and the Secretary
 9 shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement
 10 required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the ex-
 11 penditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate
 12 the research work of the State agricultural colleges and ex-
 13 periment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with
 14 research of the Department in similar lines, and make report
 15 thereon to Congress.

16 Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico

17 For expenses necessary to establish and maintain an
 18 agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, including
 19 the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and
 20 bulletins, and not to exceed \$24,950 to replace water supply
 21 line and increase capacity of reservoir, \$175,000.

22 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

23 For necessary expenses in connection with conducting
 24 investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricul-

1 tural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the
 2 home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for
 3 the more effective utilization of such products for these pur-
 4 poses, and such economic investigations, including housing
 5 and household buying, as have for their purpose the improve-
 6 ment of the rural home, for coordinating nutrition services
 7 made available by Federal, State, and other agencies, and
 8 for disseminating useful information on these subjects,
 9 ~~\$1,500,000~~ \$1,763,200.

10 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

11 Salaries and Expenses

12 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the
 13 Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry,
 14 and related Acts, and for investigations concerned with the
 15 livestock and meat industries and the domestic raising of
 16 fur-bearing animals, as follows:

17 Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments
 18 in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and
 19 breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101
 20 (b) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authoriz-
 21 ing cooperation with State authorities in the administration
 22 of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry prod-
 23 ucts, and hatcheries, ~~\$2,250,000~~ \$2,319,000.

24 Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of
 25 diseases of animals, and for investigations of tuberculin,

1 serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, \$1,300,000
 2 \$1,350,000, including not to exceed \$8,000 for the purchase
 3 of land and appurtenances near Ames, Iowa, for continuation
 4 of a hog cholera experiment station.

5 Animal disease control and eradication: For the control
 6 and eradication, including inspections and quarantines, of
 7 tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuber-
 8 culosis, Bang's disease of cattle, scabies in sheep and cattle,
 9 southern cattle ticks, hog cholera and related swine diseases,
 10 and dourine in horses, and inspection and quarantine work;
 11 for supervision of the transportation of livestock, including
 12 administration of the twenty-eight-hour law; for inspection
 13 of vessels; and for carrying out the provisions of the Act
 14 of March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151-158), relating to
 15 veterinary biological products, \$7,950,000,—including not to
 16 exceed \$30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction
 17 of four buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian
 18 border ports of entry: *Provided*, That no payment hereunder
 19 as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter for
 20 tuberculosis, paratuberculosis, or Bang's disease shall exceed
 21 (1) \$25 for any grade animal or \$50 for any purebred
 22 animal, (2) one-third of the difference between the appraised
 23 value and the value of salvage thereof, or (3) the amount
 24 paid or to be paid by the State or other cooperating agency,
 25 and no payment hereunder shall be made for any animal if

1 at the time of test or condemnation it shall belong to or be
2 upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to
3 which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for slaughter:
4 *Provided further*, That inspection service shall be maintained
5 at all stockyards having such service during the current fiscal
6 year.

7 Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of
8 laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food
9 products, \$12,800,000.

10 Marketing Agreements, Hog Cholera Virus and Serum

11 The sum of \$49,300 of the appropriation made by
12 section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, ap-
13 proved May 12, 1933 (7 U. S. C. 612), is hereby made
14 available during the fiscal year for which appropriations are
15 herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive,
16 of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851-855).

17 Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth and Other Contagious
18 Diseases of Animals

19 For expenses necessary in the arrest and eradication of
20 foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneu-
21 monia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals,
22 or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry,
23 including the payment of claims growing out of past and
24 future purchases and destruction of animals (including
25 poultry) affected by or exposed to, or of materials contami-

1 nated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found
2 and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially
3 similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with
4 all lawful quarantine regulations; and for foot-and-mouth
5 disease and rinderpest programs undertaken pursuant to the
6 provisions of the Act of February 28, 1947 (21 U. S. C.
7 Supp. II, 114b-114d), and the Act of May 29, 1884,
8 as amended (7 U. S. C., 391; 21 U. S. C., 111-122),
9 including expenses in accordance with section 2 of said Act
10 of February 28, 1947, the Secretary may transfer from other
11 appropriations or funds available to the bureaus, corpora-
12 tions, or agencies of the Department such sums as he may
13 deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency which
14 threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the country,
15 and any unexpended balances of funds transferred under
16 this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged
17 with such transferred amounts: *Provided*, That, except for
18 payments made pursuant to said Act of February 28, 1947,
19 the payment for such animals hereafter purchased may be
20 made on appraisement based on the meat, egg-production,
21 dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisement based
22 on breeding value no appraisement of any such animal shall
23 exceed three times its meat, egg-production, or dairy value,
24 and, except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be
25 determined by the Secretary, the payment by the United

1 States Government for any such animals shall not exceed
 2 one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further*, That
 3 poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for
 4 appraisal is the same for each bird.

5 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

6 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions
 7 of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401-404),
 8 including investigations, experiments, and demonstrations
 9 in dairy industry, for carrying out the applicable provisions
 10 of the Act of May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)),
 11 relating to process or renovated butter, as amended, and the
 12 Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it
 13 relates to the exportation of process or renovated butter,
 14 *not to exceed \$100,000 for construction of ten or more hous-*
 15 *ing units for employees, ~~\$1,600,000~~ \$1,735,000.*

16 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

17 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
 18 and demonstrations established under the provisions of sec-
 19 tion 202 (a) to 202 (e) , inclusive, of title II of the Agri-
 20 cultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292) ; for
 21 the development of new and extended food, feed, and in-
 22 dustrial uses for agricultural commodities, both plant and
 23 animal, and potential replacement crops, and processing,
 24 biological, chemical, physical, pharmacological, toxico-
 25 logical, and technological investigation thereof, ~~\$7,750,000~~

1 \$8,500,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$20,000 shall be
2 available for the alteration to buildings of the Naval Stores
3 Station at Olustee, Florida.

4 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL
5 ENGINEERING

6 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
7 and demonstrations in connection with the production and
8 improvement of farm crops and other plants and plant
9 industries; soils and soil-plant relationships, and the appli-
10 cation of engineering principles to agriculture; plant diseases,
11 including nematodes, and methods for their prevention and
12 control; plant and plant-disease collections, and surveys; the
13 distribution of weeds and means for their control; methods
14 of handling, processing, transportation, and storage of agri-
15 cultural products; and plants in foreign countries and our
16 possessions for introduction into the United States, including
17 explorations and surveys, and propagation and testing in
18 this country; and for the operation and maintenance of
19 airplanes, as follows:

20 Field crops: For investigations on the production, im-
21 provement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn, cotton,
22 flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums, soybeans,
23 sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other field crops,
24 ~~\$3,400,000~~ \$3,475,000.

25 Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: For investiga-

1 tions on the production, improvement, and diseases of fruit,
2 vegetable, nut, ornamental, and related crops and plants,
3 ~~\$2,950,000~~ \$3,075,000.

4 Forest diseases: For investigations of diseases of forest
5 and shade trees and forest products, and methods for their
6 control, ~~\$450,000~~ \$455,000.

7 Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: For investigations of
8 soil management methods to increase and maintain produc-
9 tivity, including fertilization, liming, crop rotations, tillage
10 practices, and other means of improving soils; fertilizers,
11 fertilizer ingredients, and their improvement for agricul-
12 tural use; soil management and crop production on dry
13 and irrigated lands, and the quality of irrigation water and
14 its use by crops; and for the classification of soils in a
15 national system and indication of their extent and distribu-
16 tion on maps, and determination of their potential produc-
17 tivity under adapted cropping and improved soil manage-
18 ment, ~~\$2,680,000~~ \$2,767,500, including not to exceed
19 \$100,000 for construction or acquisition of buildings, facili-
20 ties, and equipment for the station at Brawley, California.

21 Agricultural engineering: For investigations involving
22 the application of engineering principles to agriculture,
23 including farm power and equipment, rural water supply
24 and sanitation, and rural electrification; farm buildings and

1 their appurtenances and buildings for processing and storing
 2 farm products, and the preparation and distribution of build-
 3 ing plans and specifications; cotton ginning, and other engi-
 4 neering problems relating to the production, processing,
 5 transportation, and storage of agricultural products;
 6 ~~\$1,120,000~~ \$1,140,000.

7 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and develop-
 8 ment of the National Arboretum established under the pro-
 9 visions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.
 10 191-194), \$152,700.

11 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

12 Salaries and Expenses

13 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
 14 demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic
 15 entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best
 16 means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to
 17 agriculture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and
 18 bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related
 19 pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of
 20 destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best
 21 ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect
 22 the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20,
 23 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151-167), the Honey Bee
 24 Act (7 U. S. C. 281-283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C.
 25 141-144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149),

1 and the Organic Act of 1944. (7 U. S. C. 147a) , as amended,
2 authorizing the eradication, control, and prevention of spread
3 of injurious insects and plant pests; including the operation
4 and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to
5 exceed two, as follows:

6 Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects
7 affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest
8 products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range
9 crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other
10 plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and
11 man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management;
12 for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to
13 determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for
14 investigations in connection with introduction of natural
15 enemies of injurious insects and related pests and for the
16 exchange with other countries of useful and beneficial insects
17 and other arthropods; for developing methods, equipment,
18 and apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in
19 the eradication and control of insect pests and plant dis-
20 eases; and for investigations of insecticides and fungicides,
21 including methods of their manufacture and use and the
22 effects of their application, ~~\$4,100,000~~ \$4,165,000: *Pro-*
23 *vided*, That of the amount allotted for oriental fruitfly, not
24 to exceed \$250,000 may be used for contracts with public or
25 private agencies for research without regard to provisions of

1 existing law, and the amounts obligated for contract research
2 shall remain available until expended: ~~Provided further,~~
3 That \$50,000 shall be transferred to applicable appropria-
4 tions of the Public Health Service for investigations and
5 studies of effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on
6 human health.

7 Insect and plant-disease control: For carrying out opera-
8 tions or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to pre-
9 vent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato
10 weevil, Mexican fruitflies, phony peach and peach mosaic,
11 cereal rusts, pink bollworm and *Thurberia* weevil, golden
12 nematode, citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, and the
13 Hall scale, including the enforcement of quarantine regu-
14 lations and cooperation with States to enforce plant quaran-
15 tines as authorized by the Plant Quarantine Act of August
16 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151-167), and including
17 the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be neces-
18 sary to stamp out any infestation of the pink bollworm as
19 authorized by the Act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67),
20 and for cooperation with States in the compensation of grow-
21 ers for losses resulting from the destruction of or for not plant-
22 ing potatoes and tomatoes on lands infested or exposed to
23 infestations of the golden nematode for the purpose author-
24 ized by the Golden Nematode Act (Public Law 645,
25 approved June 15, 1948), and for the enforcement

1 of domestic plant quarantines through inspection in
2 transit, including the interception and disposition of ma-
3 terials found to have been transported interstate in violation
4 of Federal plant quarantine laws or regulations, and opera-
5 tions under the Terminal Inspection Act (7 U. S. C. 166),
6 ~~\$4,185,900~~ \$4,651,000: *Provided*, That no part of this ap-
7 propriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees,
8 farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or de-
9 stroyed, except potatoes and tomatoes as authorized under
10 the Golden Nematode Act: *Provided further*, That, in the
11 discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation
12 shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in
13 any State until such State has provided cooperation necessary
14 to accomplish this purpose, or for barberry eradication until
15 a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have
16 been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, coun-
17 ties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for
18 the accomplishment of this purpose, or with respect to the
19 golden nematode except as prescribed in section 4 of the
20 Golden Nematode Act.

21 Foreign plant quarantines: For operations against the
22 introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United
23 States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quaran-
24 tines and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7
25 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended

1 (7 U. S. C. 151-167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7
 2 U. S. C. 141-144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7
 3 U. S. C. 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quaran-
 4 tines as they pertain to Territories of the United States and
 5 enforcement of regulations governing the movement of
 6 plants into and from the District of Columbia promulgated
 7 under section 15 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August
 8 20, 1912, as amended, and for inspection and certification
 9 of plants and plant products to meet the sanitary require-
 10 ments of foreign countries, as authorized in section 102 of
 11 the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), \$2,325,000
 12 \$2,384,400.

13 Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insects and Plant 14 Diseases

15 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
 16 the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148-
 17 148e), including the operation and maintenance of airplanes
 18 and the purchase of not to exceed two, and surveys and
 19 control operations in Canada in cooperation with the Cana-
 20 dian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the
 21 employment of Canadian citizens, ~~\$850,000~~ \$2,350,000, of
 22 which \$1,500,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to
 23 section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said
 24 joint resolution only to the extent that the Secretary, with the

1 *approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet*
 2 *emergency conditions.*

3 CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS

4 For expenses necessary for carrying out operations,
 5 measures, or surveys necessary to eradicate, suppress, con-
 6 trol, or to prevent or retard the spread of insects or diseases
 7 which endanger forest trees on any lands in the United
 8 States, and for such quarantine measures relating thereto as
 9 may be necessary pursuant to the Plant Quarantine Act
 10 of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151-167),
 11 including the purchase (not to exceed three) and operation
 12 and maintenance of airplanes, construction and alteration
 13 of necessary buildings, not to exceed \$23,500 for the pur-
 14 chase of one building at Greenfield, Massachusetts: *Pro-*
 15 *vided*, That the cost of constructing or altering any one build-
 16 ing during the fiscal year shall not exceed \$2,500, as follows:

17 Gypsy and brown-tail moths: Gypsy and brown-tail
 18 moths, pursuant to section 102 of the Act of September 21,
 19 1944 (7 U. C. C. 147a), ~~\$539,500~~ \$590,000.

20 Forest Pest Control Act: For carrying out the provi-
 21 sions of the Act approved June 25, 1947 (16 U. S. C.,
 22 Supp. I, 594-1—594-5), ~~\$900,000~~ \$1,900,000, of which
 23 \$1,000,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section
 24 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said Act

1 *only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of*
 2 *the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency*
 3 *conditions.*

4 White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pursuant
 5 to the Act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a),
 6 ~~\$3,280,000~~ \$3,700,000, of which amount ~~\$508,750~~
 7 \$565,350 shall be available to the Department of the In-
 8 terior for the control of white pine blister rust on or en-
 9 dangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of that De-
 10 partment or lands of Indian tribes which are under the juris-
 11 diction of or retained under restrictions of the United States;
 12 ~~\$1,727,800~~ \$1,947,150 of said amount to the Forest Service
 13 for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering
 14 lands under its jurisdiction; and ~~\$1,043,450~~ \$1,187,500 of
 15 said amount to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarant-
 16 ine for leadership and general coordination of the entire
 17 program, method development, and for operations conducted
 18 under its direction for such control, including, but not con-
 19 fined to, the control of white pine blister rust on or endanger-
 20 ing State and privately owned lands.

21 FOREST SERVICE

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For expenses necessary including not to exceed \$10,000
 24 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section
 25 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as

1 amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
2 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; to experiment and make investigations
3 and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and
4 lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used
5 for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction
6 of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands
7 as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test
8 American timber and timber trees and their uses, and
9 methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek,
10 through investigations and the planting of native and foreign
11 species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect neces-
12 sary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building
13 purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost
14 (not to exceed \$1,000) of constructing a water-supply
15 shall be placed in reserve pending determination by the Sec-
16 such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower
17 upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not
18 exceed \$15,000, with the exception that any building
19 erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was
20 \$15,000 or more, may be improved out of the appropria-
21 tions made under this chapter for the Forest Service by an
22 amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such
23 building as certified by the Chief of the Forest Service, and
24 that not to exceed \$8,000 may be expended for the installa-
25 tion of an elevator in the Yeon Avenue warehouse in Port-

1 land, Oregon; to protect, administer, and improve the
2 national forests, including tree planting and other measures to
3 prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the forma-
4 tion of floods, and to conserve water; to ascertain the natural
5 conditions upon and utilize the national forests, to transport
6 and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national
7 forests or the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and
8 illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made
9 by the Forest Service, as follows:

10 General administrative expenses: For general adminis-
11 tration, including expenses of the National Forest Reserva-
12 tion Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of
13 March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), \$665,000.

14 National forest protection and management: For the
15 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
16 and development of the national forests, including the estab-
17 lishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including
18 the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase,
19 production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the
20 care of plantations and young growth; the operation and
21 maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to ex-
22 ceed three; the maintenance of roads and trails and the
23 construction and maintenance of all other improvements
24 necessary for the proper and economical administration, pro-

1 tection, development, and use of the national forests, includ-
2 ing experimental areas under Forest Service administration,
3 except that where direct purchases will be more economical
4 than construction, improvements may be purchased; the
5 construction (not to exceed \$15,000 for any one structure),
6 equipment, and maintenance of sanitary and recreational
7 facilities; timber cultural operations; development and appli-
8 cation of fish and game management plans; propagation
9 and transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semiarid
10 portions of the national forests; estimating and appraising of
11 timber and other resources and development and application
12 of plans for their effective management, sale, and use; ex-
13 amination, classification, surveying, and appraisal of land
14 incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law and of
15 lands within the boundaries of the national forests that may
16 be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the Act
17 of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16
18 U. S. C. 506-509), as provided by the Act of March 4,
19 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment
20 of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or
21 interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of
22 water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the
23 administration and public use of the national forests; and
24 all expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improve-
25 ment, protection, and general administration of the national

1 forests, ~~\$26,890,000~~ \$29,320,500, of which not to exceed
2 \$75,000 shall be available for the purchase of three nursery
3 sites, and not to exceed \$5,000 shall be available for the pur-
4 chase of administrative sites.

5 *Cooperative range improvements: For artificial revege-*
6 *tation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements,*
7 *control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious*
8 *plants on national forest lands, pursuant to section 12 of the*
9 *Act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law Numbered 478),*
10 *\$750,000, to remain available until expended.*

11 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
12 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service adminis-
13 tration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
14 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and
15 for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal
16 year for such purpose, \$6,000,000, of which \$2,500,000
17 shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of
18 the Revised Statutes, as amended, only to the extent that
19 the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,
20 finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

21 Forest research: For forest research in accordance with
22 the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act
23 approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581,
24 581a, 581f-581i), including the construction and mainte-
25 nance of improvements, as follows:

1 Forest and range management investigations: Fire, silvi-
 2 cultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and
 3 experiments under said section 2, as amended, and inves-
 4 tigations and experiments to develop improved methods of
 5 management of forest and other ranges under section 7, at
 6 forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere, \$2,995,000.

7 Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests
 8 of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products
 9 Laboratory, or elsewhere, \$1,300,000, *of which \$30,000*
 10 *shall be made available for the establishment of a forest*
 11 *utilization service unit in the Southwest.*

12 Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest
 13 survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics
 14 under section 10, ~~\$880,000~~ \$1,000,000.

15 FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

16 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions
 17 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved
 18 November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a),
 19 relating to forest development roads and trails, including the
 20 construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and
 21 trails on experimental areas under Forest Service adminis-
 22 tration, ~~\$10,348,000~~ \$12,000,000, which sum is authorized
 23 to be appropriated by the Act of June 29, 1948 (Public Law
 24 834), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this
 25 appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase,

1 construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the
2 storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road
3 and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost
4 of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under
5 this authorization shall not exceed \$15,000 with the excep-
6 tion that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the
7 cost of which was \$15,000 or more, may be improved
8 within any fiscal year by an amount not to exceed 2 per
9 centum of the cost of such buildings certified by the Chief
10 of the Forest Service.

11 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

12 Weeks Act: For the acquisition of forest lands under the
13 provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended
14 (16 U. S. C. 513-519, 521), ~~\$100,000~~ \$401,000, to be
15 available only for payment toward the purchase price of any
16 lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection
17 with such acquisition: *Provided*, That no part of such funds
18 shall be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair,
19 Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, with-
20 out the specific approval of the Board of County Commis-
21 sioners of the county in which such lands are situated.

22 Superior National Forest: For the acquisition of forest
23 land within the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, under
24 the provisions of the Act approved June 22, 1948 (Public
25 Law 733), \$150,000, to remain available until expended.

1 Special Acts: For the acquisition of land to facilitate
2 the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating with-
3 in the exterior boundaries of the following national forests,
4 in accordance with the provisions of the following Acts au-
5 thorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such
6 purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from
7 such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah,
8 Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended,
9 \$40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11,
10 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, \$10,000; San Ber-
11 nardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County,
12 California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as
13 amended, \$22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests.
14 Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as
15 amended, \$10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act
16 of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), \$20,000; Cleveland
17 National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of June
18 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), \$5,000; Sequoia National
19 Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637),
20 \$35,000; in all \$142,000.

21 FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

22 For cooperation with the various States or other appro-
23 priate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression and
24 the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accordance
25 with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act ap-

1 proved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564-566),
 2 \$9,500,000.

3 FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

4 To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to
 5 advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using in-
 6 dustries or other appropriate agencies in the application of
 7 forest management principles to federally owned lands
 8 leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain
 9 sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber
 10 resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabiliza-
 11 tion of employment and economic continuance of forest indus-
 12 tries, and to carry into effect, through such agencies of the
 13 Department as he may designate, the provisions of the
 14 Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937
 15 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed ~~\$490,382~~ \$785,034)
 16 and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed ~~\$671,392~~
 17 \$449,200) and 5 (not to exceed ~~\$138,226~~ \$65,766) of the
 18 Act approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567-568), and
 19 Acts supplementary thereto; \$1,300,000.

20 FLOOD CONTROL

21 For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood
 22 Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738),
 23 as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary exam-
 24 inations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement,
 25 and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of

1 the Columbia Basin area in accordance with the provisions
2 of laws relating to the activities of the Department, to
3 remain available until expended, ~~\$10,750,000~~ \$9,880,000,
4 with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of
5 funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Depart-
6 ment for flood-control purposes: *Provided*, That no part of
7 such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the
8 Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific
9 approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in
10 which such lands are situated, nor shall any part of such
11 funds be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of
12 Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma,
13 without the specific approval of the Board of County Com-
14 missioners of the county in which such lands are situated.

15 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

16 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the
17 Act approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a-590f),
18 which provides for a national program of erosion control
19 and soil and water conservation, furnishing of subsistence to
20 employees, operation and maintenance of aircraft, and the
21 purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings:
22 *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected,
23 or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water
24 supply or sanitary system and connecting the same with

1 any such building, shall not exceed \$2,500 except where
2 buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being pur-
3 chased for other purposes and except for eight buildings
4 to be constructed at a cost not to exceed \$15,000 per
5 building: *Provided further*, That no money appropriated
6 in this chapter shall be available for the construction of
7 any such building on land not owned by the Government:
8 *Provided further*, That in the State of Missouri where the
9 State has established a central State agency authorized
10 to enter into agreements with the United States or any of
11 its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving
12 of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conserva-
13 tion district in such State, the agreements made by or on
14 behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation
15 district shall have the prior approval of such central State
16 agency before they shall become effective as to such district,
17 as follows:

18 **SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

19 Soil conservation research: For research and investiga-
20 tions into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of
21 erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil and
22 water conservation (including the construction and hydro-
23 logic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and water
24 regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the
25 Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all

1 work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not
 2 in excess of funds made available for such work by the State
 3 of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof) ; and for con-
 4 struction, operation, and maintenance of experimental
 5 watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations,
 6 \$1,500,000.

7 Soil conservation operations: For carrying out pre-
 8 ventive measures to conserve soil and water, including such
 9 special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and
 10 the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement
 11 of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and
 12 operation of conservation nurseries, the making of conserva-
 13 tion plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information,
 14 ~~\$52,900,000~~ \$52,400,000: *Provided*, That no part of this
 15 appropriation may be expended for soil and water conserva-
 16 tion operations in demonstration projects: *Provided further*,
 17 That not to exceed \$5,000 may be used for employment
 18 pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the
 19 Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by sec-
 20 tion 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

21 LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL

22 LAND

23 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
 24 title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved
 25 July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010-1012), and the provisions

1 of the Act approved August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011
2 note), ~~\$1,490,000~~ \$1,665,175.

3 WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

4 For expenses necessary to carry into effect the functions
5 of the Department under the Acts of May 10, 1939 (53
6 Stat. 685, 719), October 14, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 590y-z-
7 10), as amended and supplemented, and June 28, 1949
8 (Public Law 132), relating to the construction, operation,
9 and maintenance of water conservation and utilization proj-
10 ects, to remain available until expended, ~~\$400,000~~ \$500,000,
11 which sum shall be merged with the unexpended balances
12 of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to said De-
13 partment for the purposes of said Act.

14 PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

15 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND

16 RESOURCES

17 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provi-
18 sions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation
19 and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936,
20 as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g-590q), including not to
21 exceed \$6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits,
22 including such displays at State, interstate, and international
23 fairs within the United States; ~~\$282,500,000~~ \$283,000,000,
24 to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding
25 fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building

1 practices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized
2 under this head in the Department of Agriculture Approp-
3 priation Act, 1950, carried out during the period July 1,
4 1949, to December 31, 1950, inclusive: *Provided*, That not
5 to exceed \$25,500,000 of the total sum provided under this
6 head shall be available during the current fiscal year for
7 salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out
8 such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however,
9 not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than
10 \$5,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account,
11 "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjust-
12 ment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to
13 claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of
14 the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the
15 Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the con-
16 servation practice or practices and has complied with all
17 other requirements as conditions for such payments and that
18 the statements and information contained in the application
19 for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowl-
20 edge and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States
21 Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein
22 appropriated or made available for the functions assigned
23 to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the
24 Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942,
25 shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional

1 information employees or any State information employees,
2 but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or
3 supplying of information at the county level to individual
4 farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be avail-
5 able for salaries and other administrative expenses in con-
6 nection with the formulation and administration of the
7 1951 program of soil-building practices and soil- and
8 water-conserving practices, under the Act of February 29,
9 1936, as amended (amounting to \$285,000,000, including
10 administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution
11 of the funds available for payments and grants among the
12 several States in accordance with their conservation needs
13 as determined by the Secretary, except that the proportion
14 allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per
15 centum from the distribution for the next preceding
16 program year, and no participant shall receive more than
17 \$2,500) ; but the payments or grants under such programs
18 shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect
19 to which such payments or grants are to be made in con-
20 formity with farming practices which will encourage and
21 provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving
22 practices in the most practical and effective manner and
23 adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined
24 and approved by the State committees appointed pursuant
25 to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic

1 Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590b (b)),
2 for the respective States: ~~Provided further, That not to~~
3 exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the agricultural
4 conservation program for any county may be allotted to the
5 Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in
6 formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation
7 program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by
8 the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than
9 technical and other assistance in such county: *Provided*
10 *further, That such amounts shall be available for the pur-*
11 *chase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming*
12 *materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants*
13 *thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out*
14 *farming practices approved by the Secretary under pro-*
15 *grams provided for herein: Provided further, That no part*
16 *of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau,*
17 *office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of*
18 *such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year*
19 *for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person*
20 *who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An*
21 *Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved*
22 *August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in*
23 *accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States*
24 *Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate*
25 *such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropria-*

1 tions for the payment of personal services or other expenses
 2 designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress
 3 to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Con-
 4 gress except upon request of any Member or through the
 5 proper official channels.

6 ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

7 To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acre-
 8 age allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to
 9 the provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment
 10 Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301-1393),
 11 \$32,300,000, of which not more than \$5,500,000 shall be
 12 transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative
 13 expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of
 14 1938": *Provided*, That \$4,000,000 of this appropriation
 15 shall be placed in reserve pending determination by the Sec-
 16 retary as to necessity of marketing quotas on the 1951 crops
 17 of wheat, corn, and rice, to be released in such amounts and
 18 at such times as determined by the Bureau of the Budget
 19 to be necessary in connection with such marketing quotas.

20 SUGAR ACT

21 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
 22 visions of the Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1101-1160),
 23 ~~\$60,000,000~~ \$63,750,000, to remain available until June 30
 24 of the next succeeding fiscal year: *Provided*, That expendi-
 25 tures (including transfers) from this appropriation for other

1 than payments to sugar producers shall not exceed
2 \$1,500,000.

3 NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

4 To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of
5 the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751-1760),
6 \$83,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation
7 shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said
8 Act.

9 MARKETING SERVICES

10 For expenses necessary in conducting investigations,
11 experiments, and demonstrations, as follows:

12 Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and
13 distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely infor-
14 mation on the market supply and demand, commercial move-
15 ment, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market
16 prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy
17 and poultry products (including broilers), fruits and vege-
18 tables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds,
19 cottonseed, and seeds, and other agricultural products,
20 ~~\$2,050,000~~ \$2,187,000.

21 Market inspection of farm products: For the investiga-
22 tion and certification, in one or more jurisdictions, to ship-
23 pers and other interested parties of the class, quality, and
24 condition of any agricultural commodity or food product,
25 whether raw, dried, canned, or otherwise processed, and any

1 product containing an agricultural commodity or derivative
2 thereof when offered for interstate shipment or when received
3 at such important central markets as the Secretary may
4 from time to time designate, or at points which may be
5 conveniently reached therefrom under such rules and regu-
6 lations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees
7 as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the
8 cost for the service rendered, \$780,000.

9 Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing
10 among the people of the United States useful information
11 relative to the needed supplies, standardization, classification,
12 grading, preparation for market, handling, transportation,
13 storage, and marketing of farm and food products, including
14 the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform
15 standards of classification of American farm and food products
16 throughout the world, for making analyses of cotton fiber
17 as provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d),
18 for carrying out the provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d),
19 inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of
20 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), including not to exceed \$25,000
21 for employment at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem, pur-
22 suant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the
23 Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by
24 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),
25 and not to exceed \$20,000 for transportation and other

1 necessary expenses including not to exceed \$10 per diem
2 of persons serving without compensation while away from
3 their homes or regular places of business, \$1,260,000:
4 *Provided*, That the Secretary may make available to any
5 bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts
6 from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out
7 the functions for which this appropriation is made, and
8 any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts trans-
9 ferred or otherwise made available to appropriation items
10 in this Act.

11 Tobacco Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the
12 Act to establish and promote the use of standards of classi-
13 fication for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official
14 tobacco-inspection service, approved August 23, 1935 (7
15 U. S. C. 511-511q), the Act to provide for the collection
16 and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department,
17 approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501-508), as
18 amended, and the Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco
19 seed and plants, approved June 5, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 516),
20 \$1,660,500.

21 Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts:
22 To carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing
23 the Secretary to collect and publish statistics of the grade
24 and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as
25 amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471-

1 476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by
 2 chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton
 3 futures (26 U. S. C. 1920-1935), and to carry into effect
 4 the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act,
 5 approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51-65),
 6 \$1,675,000.

7 Marketing regulatory Acts: For expenses necessary to
 8 carry into effect the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural
 9 Commodities Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a-499r),
 10 the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping of farm prod-
 11 uce (7 U. S. C. 491-497), the Act to provide standards
 12 for baskets and containers for fruits and vegetables, as
 13 amended (15 U. S. C. 251-256), the Act to fix standards
 14 for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for
 15 fruits and vegetables (15 U. S. C. 257-257i), the Act to
 16 provide export standards for apples and pears (7 U. S. C.
 17 581-589), the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U. S.
 18 C. 71-87), the United States Warehouse Act (7 U. S. C.
 19 241-273), the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1551-1610),
 20 the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended (7 U. S. C.
 21 181-229), the Naval Stores Act (7 U. S. C. 91-99), and
 22 the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act
 23 (7 U. S. C. 135-135k), ~~\$3,550,000~~ \$3,495,000.

1 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

2 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
3 visions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7
4 U. S. C. 1-17a), \$650,000.

5 FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

6 For operating and administrative expenses, ~~\$6,854,000~~
7 \$7,204,000.

8 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

9 To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electri-
10 fication Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901-915),
11 as follows:

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For administrative expenses, including not to exceed \$500
14 for financial and credit reports, ~~\$8,150,000~~, \$8,750,000.

15 LOAN AUTHORIZATION

16 For loans in accordance with said Act, and for carrying
17 out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed from
18 the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the pro-
19 visions of section 3 (a) of said Act as follows: Rural electrifi-
20 cation program, \$350,000,000; and rural telephone program,
21 ~~\$25,000,000~~ \$40,000,000; and additional amounts, not to
22 exceed a total of \$150,000,000 (including the uncommitted
23 balance available as a carry-over from the fiscal year 1950),

1 may be borrowed for the rural electrification program
2 under the same terms and conditions if and to the
3 extent that the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify, from
4 time to time, to the Secretary of the Treasury that such
5 additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1951,
6 under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and
7 orderly development of the program.

8 FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

9 To carry into effect the provisions of titles I, II, and
10 the related provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones
11 Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1000-1031),
12 the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (7 U. S. C.
13 1001, note; 31 U. S. C. 82h; 12 U. S. C. 371; 35 D. C.
14 Code 535; 60 Stat. 1062-1080) ; the Act of July 30, 1946
15 (40 U. S. C. 436-439) ; the Act of October 19, 1949
16 (Public Law 361) ; the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended
17 (16 U. S. C. 590r-590x, 590z-5), for the development of
18 facilities for water storage and utilization in the arid and
19 semiarid areas of the United States; and the provisions of
20 title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating to financial
21 assistance for farm housing (Public Law 171, approved July
22 15, 1949), as follows:

23 LOAN AUTHORIZATION

24 For loans (including payments in lieu of taxes and
25 taxes under section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant

1 Act, as amended, and advances incident to the acquisition
2 and preservation of security of obligations under the fore-
3 going several authorities) : Title I and section 43 of title
4 IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended
5 and title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (except grants
6 under 504 (a)) ~~\$56,350,000~~ \$71,350,000, of which not
7 to exceed \$3,500,000 of the amount available for the purposes
8 of title I and section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant
9 Act, as amended, may be distributed to States and Territories
10 without regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy,
11 in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto, for
12 loans in reclamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented
13 public land (sums available for loans under title V of
14 the Housing Act of 1949 to remain available until
15 expended) ; title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant
16 Act, as amended, \$85,000,000; the Act of August
17 28, 1937, as amended, \$4,000,000: *Provided*, That not
18 to exceed the foregoing several amounts shall be borrowed
19 in one account from the Secretary of the Treasury on the
20 request of the Secretary of Agriculture at such rate of
21 interest as may be determined by the Secretary of the
22 Treasury, but not in excess of 3 per centum per annum;
23 and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized
24 and directed to lend such sums to the Secretary upon the
25 security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secre-

1 tary under the provisions of said Acts: *Provided further,*
 2 That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments
 3 of principal and interest under such Acts to repay the
 4 Secretary of the Treasury the amounts borrowed therefrom
 5 for the purposes of such Acts: *Provided further, That for*
 6 *the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing*
 7 *authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use*
 8 *as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any*
 9 *securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as*
 10 *amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued*
 11 *under that Act are extended to include such loans to the*
 12 *Secretary: Provided further, That repayments to the Secretary*
 13 *of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-*
 14 *debt transaction.*

GRANTS

16 For grants and for the grant portion of combination
 17 loans and grants for the purpose of section 504 (a) of the
 18 Housing Act of 1949, \$650,000, to remain available until
 19 expended.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For the making, servicing, and collecting of loans and
 22 insured mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made
 23 under prior authority, the liquidation of assets transferred to
 24 Farmers Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers
 25 Home Administration Act of 1946, and the extension of

1 financial assistance under the Housing Act of 1949, ~~\$27,~~
2 ~~700,000~~ \$29,000,000, together with a transfer to this appro-
3 priation item of not to exceed \$80,000 of the fees and
4 administrative expense charges made available by subsec-
5 tions (d) and (e) of section 12 of the Bankhead-Jones
6 Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

7 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

8 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed \$5,000
9 for attendance at meetings or conventions of members of or-
10 ganizations at which matters of importance to the work of the
11 Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or trans-
12 acted; library membership fees or dues in organizations which
13 issue publications to members only or to members at a lower
14 price than to others, payment for which may be made in
15 advance; not to exceed \$20,000 for expenditures authorized
16 by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C.
17 833) ; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (for replace-
18 ment only) for use in the District of Columbia and else-
19 where; garage rental in the District of Columbia; payment
20 of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and
21 not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons
22 serving, while away from their homes, without other com-
23 pensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity
24 to the Farm Credit Administration, except that such expend-
25 itures shall not exceed \$10,000; examination of corporations,

1 banks, associations, and institutions operated, supervised, or
 2 regulated by the Farm Credit Administration \$585,000,
 3 together with not to exceed \$2,325,000 of collections from
 4 Federal Farm Credit agencies of assessments and charges,
 5 to be advanced by transfer and counter warrant to this
 6 appropriation, to cover the cost of Farm Credit Administra-
 7 tion facilities, examinations, and other services rendered to
 8 such agencies; \$2,910,000.

9 EXTENSION SERVICE

10 PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO 11 RICO

12 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
 13 Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:

14 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:

15 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
 16 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), \$1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
 17 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935,
 18 (7 U. S. C. 343c), \$12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
 19 section 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935,
 20 as amended by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C.
 21 343d-1), \$12,500,000; additional extension work, the Act
 22 approved April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c-1),
 23 \$555,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929
 24 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-
 25 Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, \$13,950, and section

1 3 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e),
 2 extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the
 3 Territory of Alaska, ~~\$10,000~~ *the Act approved October 27,*
 4 *1949 (Public Law 417), extending to the Territory of*
 5 *Alaska the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act and sections*
 6 *21 and 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act, \$42,150;*
 7 *Puerto Rico, section 3 of the Act of March 4, 1931 (7*
 8 *U. S. C. 386f), authorizing extension of the Capper-*
 9 *Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico, \$31,348; the Act approved*
 10 *August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f-343g), extending the*
 11 *benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto*
 12 *Rico, \$408,000, and the Act approved October 26, 1949*
 13 *(Public Law 406), extending the benefits of section 23 of*
 14 *title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, \$40,000;*
 15 *and section 506a of title V of the Housing Act of 1949*
 16 *(Public Law 171), \$33,050; in all, payments to States,*
 17 *Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, ~~\$27,000,000~~ \$27,103,498.*

18

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of
 20 the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C.
 21 341-348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto,
 22 and to coordinate the extension work of the Department
 23 and the several States, Territories, and insular possessions,
 24 ~~\$900,000~~ \$915,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, ~~\$2,143,300~~ \$2,179,300, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary not exceeding a total of \$109,280, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are

1 appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reduc-
2 tions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

3 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

4 For necessary expenses, including payment of fees or
5 dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field
6 service, ~~\$2,450,000~~ \$2,675,000, together with such amounts
7 from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided
8 in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for
9 such expenses which several amounts not exceeding a total
10 of \$207,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this
11 appropriation.

12 OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

13 For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agri-
14 cultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordi-
15 nate and integrate activities of the Department in connection
16 with foreign agricultural work, \$600,000.

17 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

18 For necessary expenses in connection with the publica-
19 tion, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins,
20 documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and
21 display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and ex-
22 hibits, and the coordination of informational work in the
23 Department, \$1,265,800, together with such amounts from
24 other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the
25 schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such

1 expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may
2 be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of
3 \$16,200, shall be transferred to and made a part of this
4 appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not ex-
5 ceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumer-
6 ated as follows: For preparation and display of exhibits,
7 \$109,959; for preparation, distribution, and display of motion
8 and sound pictures, \$58,700; for farmers' bulletins, which
9 shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different
10 sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths
11 of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the
12 addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representa-
13 tives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7
14 U. S. C. 417) and not less than two hundred thirty thousand
15 eight hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and
16 House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of
17 the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture), as
18 authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895
19 (44 U. S. C. 241), \$611,128: *Provided, That when and*
20 *to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricul-*
21 *tural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the*
22 *authorized programs of the various agencies of the Depart-*
23 *ment can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or*
24 *distributed by the Office of Information, as the central*
25 *agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not*

1 *exceeding \$300,000 for these purposes may be transferred*
 2 *to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds*
 3 *applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified*
 4 *herein: Provided further, That in the preparation of motion*
 5 *pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a*
 6 *total of \$10,000 may be used for employment pursuant to*
 7 *the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act*
 8 *of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of*
 9 *the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): Provided*
 10 *further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used*
 11 *for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State*
 12 *field offices, or for the compensation of employees in such*
 13 *offices except that not to exceed \$10,000 may be used to*
 14 *maintain the San Francisco radio office.*

LIBRARY

16 For necessary expenses, including dues, for library mem-
 17 bership in societies or associations which issue publications
 18 to members only or at a price to members lower than to
 19 subscribers who are not members; \$713,293.

20 Not to exceed \$12,900,000 of the funds appropriated
 21 in this title shall be available for travel expenses. Amounts
 22 available from appropriations contained in this title are
 23 hereby reduced by the total sum of \$645,496, such amount
 24 to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the
 25 Treasury immediately upon approval of this chapter.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this chapter shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided*, That not to exceed ~~\$16,000,000~~ \$16,350,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*. That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative

1 expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That
2 the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and
3 directed to discharge ~~\$170,515,131~~ \$66,698,457 of the in-
4 debtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the
5 Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes in such amount
6 issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury
7 pursuant to section 4 of the Act of March 8, 1938, as
8 amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-4).

9 Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Not to exceed
10 \$1,280,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of
11 the funds of the Corporation shall be available for
12 administrative expenses, including employment on a contract
13 or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the per-
14 formance of special services, including legal services, and the
15 use of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, na-
16 tional farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and
17 agencies of the Government as authorized by the Act of
18 January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020-1020h); and said
19 total sum shall be exclusive of services and facilities furnished
20 and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration
21 central office, interest expense, and expenses in connection
22 with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement,
23 protection, or disposition of real or personal property be-
24 longing to the Corporation or in which it has an interest:
25 *Provided*, That promptly after June 30 of each fiscal year

1 all cash funds in excess of the estimated operating require-
2 ments for the current fiscal year shall be declared as divi-
3 dends and paid into the general fund of the Treasury: *Pro-*
4 *vided further*, That the aggregate amount of bonds the Cor-
5 poration may issue and have outstanding at any one time
6 shall not exceed \$500,000,000.

7 Federal intermediate credit banks: Not to exceed
8 \$1,496,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the
9 funds of the banks shall be available for administrative
10 expenses and services performed for the banks by other Gov-
11 ernment agencies (except services and facilities furnished and
12 examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration cen-
13 tral office, and services performed by any Federal Reserve
14 bank and by the United States Treasury in connection with
15 the financial transactions of the banks) ; and said total sum
16 shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special ser-
17 vices performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses in
18 connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, im-
19 provement, protection, or disposition of real or personal
20 property belonging to the banks or in which they have an
21 interest.

22 Production credit corporations: Not to exceed \$1,358,-
23 000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the
24 corporations shall be available for administrative expenses and
25 services performed for the corporations by other Govern-

1 ment agencies (except services and facilities furnished and
2 examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration
3 central office); and said total sum shall be exclusive of
4 interest expense, legal and special services performed on a
5 contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the
6 acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, pro-
7 tection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging
8 to the corporations or in which they have an interest.

9 TITLE III—REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

10 Amounts available from appropriations are hereby re-
11 duced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be
12 carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury
13 immediately upon the approval of this Chapter:

14 An amount of \$199,990,000 in the revolving fund held
15 in the Treasury available to the Governor, Farm Credit
16 Administration, as authorized by the Federal Farm Mortgage
17 Corporation Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1020b), for
18 resubscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal Farm
19 Mortgage Corporation.

20 The total amount of \$125,000,000 in the revolving
21 fund appropriated to the Office of the Secretary, Treasury
22 Department, as authorized by the Federal Farm Loan Act,
23 as amended (12 U. S. C. 698), for subscriptions to the
24 capital stock of the Federal land banks.

1 TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

2 SEC. 401. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law,
3 the lump-sum appropriations and authorizations made for
4 the Department under this chapter shall be available for
5 the purchase of not to exceed 497 passenger motor vehicles
6 for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles,
7 necessary in the conduct of the work of the Department
8 outside the District of Columbia.

9 SEC. 402. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting
10 the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the tem-
11 porary employment of translators when competent citizen
12 translators are not available; (2) employment in cases of
13 emergency of persons in the field service of the Department
14 for periods of not more than sixty days; and (3) employ-
15 ment under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agri-
16 cultural Relations.

17 SEC. 403. Appropriations and authorizations made in
18 this chapter shall be available for health service programs as
19 authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) .

20 SEC. 404. Funds available to the Department during the
21 current fiscal year shall be available for the payment of tort
22 claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) .

23 SEC. 405. Funds available to the Department of Agri-
24 culture during the current fiscal year may be expended for
25 personal services in the District of Columbia.

1 SEC. 406. Funds available to the Department of Agri-
2 culture may be used for printing and binding, including the
3 purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles.

4 SEC. 407. Of appropriations herein made which are
5 available for the purchase of lands, not to exceed \$1 may
6 be expended for each option to purchase any particular tract
7 or tracts of land.

8 SEC. 408. No part of the funds appropriated by this
9 chapter shall be used for the payment of any officer or
10 employee of the Department who, as such officer or em-
11 ployee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, com-
12 mission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued,
13 any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to
14 damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with
15 respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

16 SEC. 409. Except to provide materials required in or
17 incident to research or experimental work where no suitable
18 domestic product is available, no part of the funds appro-
19 priated by this chapter shall be expended in the purchase
20 of twine manufactured from commodities or materials pro-
21 duced outside of the United States.

22 SEC. 410. Not less than \$575,000 shall be available for
23 contracts in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of
24 August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i) from appropriations
25 herein made for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics;

1 Bureau of Animal Industry; Bureau of Dairy Industry;
2 Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineer-
3 ing; Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine; Bureau
4 of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry; Bureau of Human
5 Nutrition and Home Economics; and the Forest Service.

6 *SEC. 411. Of the funds appropriated in this chapter for*
7 *travel expenses, \$791,888 shall be carried to the surplus fund*
8 *and covered into the Treasury on or before August 1, 1950;*
9 *but such amount shall be credited toward any other reduction*
10 *in amounts available for such travel expenses resulting from*
11 *decreases in appropriations made by this Act below the*
12 *budget estimates.*

13 This chapter may be cited as the “Department of Agri-
14 culture Appropriation Act, 1951”.

1 CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

2 TITLE I

3 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary
 6 of the Interior (hereafter in this chapter referred to as the
 7 Secretary), including personal services in the District of
 8 Columbia and elsewhere; for purchase of one passenger motor
 9 vehicle for replacement only at not to exceed \$4,500; print-
 10 ing and binding; employment of a Director of the Oil and
 11 Gas Division without regard to the civil service laws; and
 12 teletype rentals and service; ~~\$2,315,000~~ \$2,100,000.

13 STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

14 *For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions*
 15 *of the Act of July 25, 1947 (43 U. S. C. 364), including*
 16 *personal services in the District of Columbia and printing*
 17 *and binding, \$14,000.*

18 ENFORCEMENT OF THE CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

19 For expenses necessary for controlling the interstate
 20 shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U. S. C.

1 715), including personal services in the District of Columbia;
2 purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles for
3 replacement only; and printing and binding; \$200,000
4 \$180,000.

5 WORKING CAPITAL FUND

6 For establishment of a working capital fund, to be avail-
7 able without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary
8 for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central repro-
9 duction service; (2) communication services; (3) a central
10 supply service for stationery, supplies, equipment, blank
11 forms, and miscellaneous materials, for which adequate stocks
12 may be maintained to meet in whole or in part requirements
13 of the bureaus and offices of the Department in the city of
14 Washington and elsewhere; (4) a central library service;
15 (5) health services; and (6) such other similar service
16 functions as the Secretary determines may be performed more
17 advantageously on a reimbursable basis; \$300,000. Said
18 fund shall be reimbursed from available funds of bureaus,
19 offices, and agencies for which services are performed at
20 rates which will return in full all expenses of operation,
21 including reserves for accrued annual leave and depreciation
22 of equipment.

23 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER

24 MARKETING AREA

25 For necessary expenses of marketing electric power and

1 energy produced or to be produced at multiple-purpose
2 projects of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army,
3 in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood
4 Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the
5 area east of the Mississippi River, including purchase (not
6 to exceed two) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and
7 printing and binding; ~~\$150,000~~ \$100,000.

8 CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

9 For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,
10 substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administra-
11 tive expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provi-
12 sions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16
13 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area,
14 to remain available until expended, ~~\$10,350,000~~ \$8,620,000,
15 of which not to exceed \$5,000,000 is for liquidation of
16 obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted;
17 and, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into
18 contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount
19 not to exceed ~~\$6,000,000~~ \$1,730,000: *Provided*, That the
20 unexpended balances of funds appropriated under the head
21 "Construction, operation, and maintenance, power transmis-
22 sion facilities" in the Interior Department Appropriation
23 Act, 1950, for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to
24 and merged with this appropriation.

1 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER

2 ADMINISTRATION

3 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance
4 of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric
5 power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5
6 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s),
7 as applied to the southwestern power area, ~~\$760,000~~
8 \$660,000.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

10 Appropriations of the Southwestern Power Administra-
11 tion shall be available for personal services in the District
12 of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed eight, of which six
13 shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor
14 vehicles; and printing and binding. Appropriations made
15 herein to the Southwestern Power Administration shall be
16 available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein
17 made for operation and maintenance shall be available only
18 for the service of the current fiscal year.

19 COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing
22 a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U. S. C. 104), including
23 personal services in the District of Columbia, hire of pas-
24 senger motor vehicles, printing and binding and payment
25 of actual traveling expenses of the members and secretary

1 of the Commission in attending meetings and committee
 2 meetings of the Commission either within or outside of the
 3 District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers approved
 4 by the Commission, \$12,530.

5 BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

6 CONSTRUCTION

7 For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,
 8 substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law,
 9 to remain available until expended, ~~\$41,500,000~~ \$39,500,-
 10 000, of which not to exceed \$17,000,000 is for liquidation
 11 of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously
 12 granted; and, in addition, the Administrator is authorized
 13 to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation
 14 in an amount not to exceed ~~\$21,750,000~~ \$20,000,000: *Pro-*
 15 *vided*, That unexpended balances of prior year appropria-
 16 tions, including unused balances of related contract
 17 authorizations, for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred
 18 to and merged with this appropriation.

19 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

20 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance
 21 of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing
 22 electric power and energy, ~~\$5,000,000~~ \$4,500,000.

23 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

24 Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administra-
 25 tion shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed

1 upon the Administrator pursuant to law, including personal
2 services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed
3 seventeen of which twelve shall be for replacement only)
4 and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not to ex-
5 ceed two) of aircraft; and printing and binding. Appro-
6 priations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administra-
7 tion shall be available in one fund, except that the appro-
8 priation herein made for operation and maintenance shall
9 be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

10 Not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation for
11 construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Admin-
12 istration shall be available for construction work by force
13 account or on a hired-labor basis, except in case of emer-
14 gencies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville
15 Power Administrator.

16 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

17 MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

18 For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement,
19 development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and
20 performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the
21 management of lands and their resources under the juris-
22 diction of the Bureau of Land Management, ~~\$6,756,800~~
23 *\$7,127,810: Provided, That this appropriation may be ex-*
24 *pended on a reimbursable basis for surveys of lands other*
25 *than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land*

1 Management: *Provided further, That of the appropriations*
 2 *herein made in connection with the Revested Oregon and*
 3 *California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road*
 4 *grant lands, expenditures may be made for weed control on*
 5 *such lands, including those under cooperative weed control*
 6 *agreements with the State and counties.*

7 CONSTRUCTION

8 For construction of access roads on the revested Oregon
 9 and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon
 10 Road grant lands; acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing
 11 connecting roads adjacent to such lands; and for acquisition,
 12 construction, or reconstruction of buildings and appurtenant
 13 facilities in Alaska; to remain available until expended,
 14 ~~\$600,000~~ \$800,000, of which not to exceed \$200,000 is for
 15 liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority
 16 granted under the head "Revested Oregon and California
 17 Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant
 18 lands" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950:
 19 *Provided, That the amounts of appropriation made herein*
 20 *for road construction shall be transferred to the Bureau of*
 21 *Public Roads, Department of Commerce.*

22 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

23 Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management
 24 shall be available for personal services in the District of
 25 Columbia; purchase (not to exceed twenty-eight for replace-

1 ment only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase
2 of two aircraft; printing and binding; and alteration and
3 maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facili-
4 ties to which the United States has title: *Provided*, That of
5 appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Man-
6 agement expenditures in connection with the revested
7 Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay
8 Wagon Road grant lands shall be reimbursed from the 25
9 per centum referred to in section c, title II, of the Act
10 approved August 28, 1937, of the special fund designated
11 the "Oregon and California Land Grant Fund" and section
12 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939, of the special fund
13 designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund";
14 *Provided further*, That no part of such appropriations shall
15 be available for expenditure in connection with such lands
16 in excess of such reimbursements during the current fiscal
17 year *Provided*, That of appropriations herein made for the
18 Bureau of Land Management, expenditures in connection
19 with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and re-
20 conveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands for payment
21 of current expenses in connection with the management of
22 such lands of a type paid from the separate appropriation
23 heretofore made in connection with such lands shall be re-
24 imbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in section c,
25 title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937, of the special

1 fund designated the "Oregon and California Land Grant
 2 Fund" and section 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939, of
 3 the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road
 4 Grant Fund": Provided further, That no part of such appro-
 5 priations for such current expenses shall be available in excess
 6 of such reimbursements for the current fiscal year.

7 RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

8 For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range
 9 improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10
 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315),
 11 sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received (*not*
 12 *to exceed \$350,000*) as range improvement fees under sec-
 13 tion 3 of said Act and of 25 per centum of all moneys
 14 received under section 15 of said Act during the current
 15 and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated, to remain
 16 available until expended.

17 PAYMENTS TO STATES (PROCEEDS OF SALES)

18 For payment to the several States of 5 per centum of
 19 the net proceeds of sales of public lands *and materials* lying
 20 within their limits, for the purpose of education or of making
 21 public roads and improvements, sums equal to the aggregate
 22 of receipts (*not to exceed \$20,000*) covered into the Treasury
 23 in accordance with section 4 of the Act of June 26, 1934
 24 (31 U. S. C. 725c), during the current and prior fiscal
 25 years but not yet appropriated.

PAYMENT TO OKLAHOMA

For payment to the State of Oklahoma in lieu of all State and local taxes upon tribal funds accruing under the provisions of the joint resolution of June 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 740), to be expended by the State in the same manner as if received under section 35 of the Act approved February 25, 1920 (30 U. S. C. 191), sums equal to $37\frac{1}{2}$ per centum of the royalties received (*not to exceed \$4,000*) during the current and prior fiscal years (but not yet appropriated) from the south half of Red River in Oklahoma under the provisions of said joint resolution of June 12, 1926.

LEASING OF GRAZING LANDS

For leasing State, county, or privately owned lands in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-1), sums equal to the aggregate of receipts (*not to exceed \$6,000*) covered into the Treasury in accordance with the Act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-4), during the current and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated.

PAYMENTS TO STATES (GRAZING FEES)

Sums not in excess of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per centum of all grazing fees received (*not to exceed \$300*) during the current and prior fiscal years (but not yet appropriated) from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-land laws, to be paid to the

1 State in which said lands are situated, in accordance with
2 the provisions of section 11 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as
3 amended (43 U. S. C. 315j).

4 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

5 HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES

6 For expenses necessary to provide health, education, and
7 welfare services for Indians, either directly or in coopera-
8 tion with States and other organizations, including payment
9 (in advance or from date of admission) of care, tuition,
10 assistance, and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes,
11 institutions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy
12 Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of
13 rewards for information or evidence concerning violations
14 of law on Indian reservations or lands; *research among*
15 *mixed Indians and non-Indian groups including cooperation*
16 *in medical research of benefit to Indians*; operation of Indian
17 arts and crafts shops and museums; and per diem in lieu
18 of subsistence and other expenses of Indians participating
19 in folk festivals; ~~\$37,929,000~~ \$40,252,328.

20 RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

21 For expenses necessary for management, development,
22 improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant
23 facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian
24 Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and
25 charges; acquisition of water rights; conducting agricultural

1 experiments and demonstrations; furnishing plants or seed
 2 to Indians; advances for Indian industrial and business
 3 enterprises; payment of expenses of Indian fairs, including
 4 premiums for exhibits; and development of Indian arts and
 5 crafts as authorized by law (25 U. S. C. 305), including
 6 expenses of exhibits; ~~\$10,542,000~~ \$10,814,576.

7 CONSTRUCTION

8 For construction, major repair, and improvement of
 9 irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, roads and
 10 trails, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests
 11 in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and archi-
 12 tectural and engineering services by contract; to remain
 13 available until expended, ~~\$22,422,000~~ \$23,635,151, of
 14 which not to exceed \$3,737,500 is for liquidation of obliga-
 15 tions incurred pursuant to authority previously granted; and,
 16 in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into con-
 17 tracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount
 18 not to exceed ~~\$2,500,000~~ \$5,000,000: *Provided, That no*
 19 *part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the*
 20 *acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California,*
 21 *Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming*
 22 *outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations:*
 23 *Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall*
 24 *be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within*

1 *the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside*
 2 *or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.*

3 The unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore
 4 made, including unused balances of related contract author-
 5 izations, under the heads "Construction, and so forth, build-
 6 ings and utilities, Indian Service," "Construction, and so
 7 forth, irrigation systems, Indian Service," "Roads, Indian
 8 Service," "Navajo and Hopi construction and maintenance
 9 services," and "Acquisition of lands for Indian tribes", shall
 10 be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

11 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

12 For expenses necessary for the general administration
 13 of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses
 14 in field offices, ~~\$3,500,000~~ \$3,644,000.

15 REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

16 For an additional amount for loans as authorized by
 17 sections 10 and 11 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (25
 18 U. S. C. 470, 471), as amended and supplemented,
 19 \$2,400,000.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

21 Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (ex-
 22 cept the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for
 23 personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not
 24 to exceed ~~two hundred and twenty-seven~~ *two hundred and*
 25 *fifty*, of which two hundred and twenty shall be for replace-

1 ment only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, which
2 may be used for the transportation of Indians; printing and
3 binding, including illustrations and purchase of reprints;
4 purchase of ice for official use of employees; services as
5 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
6 U. S. C. 55a, including not to exceed \$5,000 for expendi-
7 ture at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem
8 on irrigation and power matters, when authorized by the
9 Secretary; and expenses required by continuing or perma-
10 nent treaty provisions.

11 CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

12 For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of
13 New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and pay-
14 ment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as
15 provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary during
16 the current fiscal year.

17 PROCEEDS FROM POWER

18 Sums not in excess of the amount of power revenues
19 covered into the Treasury to the credit of each of the power
20 projects, including revenues credited prior to August 7,
21 1946, to be available for the purposes authorized by sec-
22 tion 3 of the Act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 647),
23 as amended, including printing and binding, in connection
24 with the respective projects from which such revenues are
25 derived.

TRIBAL FUNDS

1
2 In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended
3 by existing law, there is hereby appropriated ~~\$2,430,965~~
4 \$2,437,965 from tribal funds not otherwise available for
5 expenditure for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes,
6 including pay and travel expenses of employees; care, tui-
7 tion and other assistance to Indian children attending public
8 and private schools (which may be paid in advance or from
9 date of admission) ; purchase of land and improvements on
10 land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United
11 States in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of
12 lands and water rights; printing and binding; compensa-
13 tion and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed
14 by Indian tribes under approved contracts; pay, travel and
15 other expenses of tribal officers, councils, and committees
16 thereof, or other tribal organizations, including mileage for
17 use of privately owned automobiles and per diem in lieu
18 of subsistence at rates established administratively but not
19 to exceed those applicable to civilian employees of the
20 Government; relief of Indians, without regard to section
21 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391), including
22 cash grants; and employment of a recreational director for
23 the Menominee Reservation and a curator for the Osage
24 Museum, each of whom shall be appointed with the
25 approval of the respective tribal councils and without re-

1 gard to the classification laws: *Provided*, That in addition
2 to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be
3 advanced to Indian tribes for such purposes as may be
4 designated by the governing body of the particular tribe
5 involved and approved by the Secretary. Any tribal funds
6 advanced under this authority shall be reported to the
7 Congress in the annual Budget for the next succeeding fiscal
8 year: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be
9 used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the
10 States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington, either inside
11 or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations.

12 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

13 For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Rec-
14 lamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act
15 of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof
16 or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that
17 Bureau, as follows:

18 GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

19 For engineering and economic investigations of proposed
20 Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conserva-
21 tion and development plans; engineering and economic
22 investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports
23 thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development
24 and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; formulating
25 plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized

1 Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to appro-
 2 priations for construction of such projects or parts; and
 3 activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and
 4 betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing
 5 projects; to remain available until expended, ~~\$5,150,000~~
 6 ~~\$6,500,000~~, of which ~~\$4,400,000~~ \$5,791,000 shall be de-
 7 rived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 shall be
 8 derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Pro-*
 9 *vided*, That the expenditure of any sums from this appro-
 10 priation for investigations of any nature requested by States,
 11 municipalities, or other interests shall be upon the basis
 12 of the State, municipality, or other interest advancing
 13 at least 50 per centum of the estimated cost of such in-
 14 vestigations: *Provided further*, That the limitation on the
 15 amount available for surveys and preconstruction work
 16 in connection with the North Side pumping division,
 17 Minidoka project, Idaho, stated in the Interior Depart-
 18 ment Appropriation Act, 1950, is increased from \$725,000
 19 to \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That, except as herein ex-
 20 pressly provided with respect to investigations in Alaska,
 21 no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the
 22 conduct of activities which are not authorized by law.

23 CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

24 For construction and rehabilitation of authorized recla-

1 mation projects or parts thereof (including power transmis-
2 sion facilities *and emergency reconstruction of the La Prele*
3 *unit, Wyoming)* and for other related activities, as authorized
4 by law, to remain available until expended, ~~\$297,467,000~~
5 ~~\$294,713,000~~, of which ~~\$22,897,700~~ ~~\$25,135,700~~ shall be
6 derived from the reclamation fund, *and in addition thereto*
7 *the Commissioner of Reclamation is hereby authorized to*
8 *incur obligations and enter into contracts for additional work,*
9 *materials, and equipment in an amount not exceeding*
10 *\$3,000,000 for power transmission lines and substations in*
11 *the fiscal year 1951: Provided, That hereafter when funds*
12 *appropriated under this head are transferred to the credit of*
13 *the appropriate regional disbursing officer of the Treasury*
14 *Department for expenditure in connection with Hoover Dam*
15 *and related works, such funds, solely for the purpose of*
16 *computing interest on advances under the provisions of*
17 *section 2 of the Act of December 21, 1928, as amended*
18 *(43 U. S. C. 617a (b), 617a (d), 618e), shall be con-*
19 *sidered as if advanced to the Colorado River Dam fund:*
20 *Provided, That \$1,000,000 of the funds provided in this*
21 *paragraph for the construction of transmission lines in*
22 *South Dakota shall be available only for connecting the load*
23 *centers of Armour with Watertown via Sioux Falls, and of*
24 *Midland with Rapid City, and of Winner with Randall Dam*
25 *: Provided further, That \$3,000,000 of the funds provided*

1 *in this paragraph plus \$3,000,000 contract authority shall*
2 *be available for construction of transmission lines and sub-*
3 *stations in South Dakota, to include a transmission loop*
4 *from Fort Randall through the load centers of Armour,*
5 *Huron, Aberdeen, Andover, Watertown, Brookings, Sioux*
6 *Falls, and Gavins Point to Fort Randall, and lines from*
7 *Fort Randall to Winner and from Rapid City to Midland.*

8 Of the amount appropriated under the preceding para-
9 graph, \$1,600,000 is for liquidation of the contract au-
10 thority granted under the appropriation "Reclamation fund,
11 special fund, construction, Santa Barbara County project,
12 California, Cachuma unit", in the Interior Department
13 Appropriation Act, 1949; \$225,700 is for partial liquida-
14 tion of the contract authority granted under the appropriation
15 "General fund, construction, advances to Colorado River
16 dam fund, Boulder Canyon project (All-American Canal)"
17 in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950;
18 \$1,000,000 is for liquidation of the contract authority pro-
19 vided under the appropriation "General fund, construction,
20 Fort Sumner project, New Mexico", in the Interior Depart-
21 ment Appropriation Act, 1950; and \$1,770,000 is for partial
22 liquidation of the contract authority granted under the appro-
23 priation "General fund, construction, Missouri River Basin",
24 in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950.

25 *Such amount of the \$1,300,000 appropriated in the*

1 *Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, under the*
2 *heading "Bureau of Reclamation", "General fund, construc-*
3 *tion", "Fort Peck project, Montana", for the Havre-Shelby*
4 *transmission line and substations as may be determined by*
5 *the Secretary of the Interior not to be required for termination*
6 *of work on these facilities and the meeting of obligations*
7 *heretofore incurred against said appropriation for such facili-*
8 *ties shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the*
9 *Treasury.*

10 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

11 For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects
12 or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law;
13 and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands
14 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pur-
15 suant to law, \$15,491,000, of which \$12,001,400 shall be
16 derived from the reclamation fund and \$1,808,000 shall
17 be derived from the Colorado River dam fund: *Provided,*
18 *That funds advanced for operation and maintenance of*
19 *reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to*
20 *the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the*
21 *same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated*
22 *herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of*
23 *such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the*
24 *next succeeding fiscal year.*

1 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

2 For necessary expenses of general administration and
3 related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Recla-
4 mation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclama-
5 tion, ~~\$7,000,000~~ \$7,400,000, to be derived from the recla-
6 mation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act
7 of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377) : *Provided*, That no
8 part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available
9 for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year
10 as general administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That
11 not exceeding \$150,000 of funds available for expenditure
12 under this appropriation shall be used for salaries and ex-
13 penses in connection with information work.

14 SPECIAL FUNDS

15 Sums herein referred to as being derived from the recla-
16 mation fund, the Colorado River dam fund, or the Colorado
17 River development fund, are appropriated from the special
18 funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902
19 (43 U. S. C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43
20 U. S. C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U. S. C.
21 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon
22 request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended
23 under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended bal-

ances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads "Operation and maintenance" and "General administrative expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special fund from which derived.

PRIOR YEAR APPROPRIATIONS

Except for the emergency fund established in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, the unexpended balances on June 30, 1950, of sums heretofore appropriated for the Bureau of Reclamation which were made available until expended shall be classified under the corresponding heads herein established, shall be transferred to and merged with the amounts appropriated under those headings, and shall be available for the purposes therein specified.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed two hundred for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of not to exceed three aircraft for replacement only; printing and binding; not to exceed \$75,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of

1 *\$100 per diem (not exceeding \$100,000 for individuals);*
2 *payment of claims for damage to or loss of property,*
3 *personal injury, or death arising out of activities of*
4 *the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as otherwise*
5 *provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on*
6 *the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as author-*
7 *ized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation*
8 *and administration of interstate compacts; and, without reim-*
9 *bursement or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for*
10 *information or evidence concerning violations of law involv-*
11 *ing property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclama-*
12 *tion; payments to school districts as authorized by law (43*
13 *U. S. C. 385a and 618 (a) (e)), including payments on*
14 *account of dependents of employees in field offices in project*
15 *areas engaged in construction and related activities; per-*
16 *formance of the functions specified under the head "Operation*
17 *and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclamation,*
18 *in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945, to be*
19 *reimbursable to the extent therein provided; preparation and*
20 *dissemination of useful information including recordings,*
21 *photographs, and photographic prints;—and studies of recrea-*
22 *tional uses of reservoir areas, as authorized by law: Provided,*
23 *That funds appropriated for the Bureau of Reclamation*
24 *shall be available for expenditure through the facilities of*
25 *the National Park Service in amounts of not to exceed*

1 \$25,000 for any one reservoir area for studies of recrea-
 2 tional areas and planning for their utilization, and funds so
 3 expended shall not be reimbursable or returnable under the
 4 reclamation law: ~~Provided, That no part of any appropria-~~
 5 ~~tion made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of~~
 6 ~~April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than~~
 7 ~~those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects~~
 8 ~~except \$7,000,000 under the head "General Administrative~~
 9 ~~Expenses" and \$375,000 (\$175,000 for reconnaissance and~~
 10 ~~\$200,000 for general engineering and research) under the~~
 11 ~~head "General Investigations.":~~ *Provided further, That, ex-*
 12 *cept as otherwise provided by the Act of April 19, 1945*
 13 *(43 U. S. C. 377), or by any other law, no part of any*
 14 *appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to*
 15 *the said Act of April 19, 1945, for expenses other than those*
 16 *incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except*
 17 *expenses under the head "General administrative expenses"*
 18 *and under the head "General investigations".*

19 Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the
 20 appropriation under the head "Construction and rehabilita-
 21 tion" shall be available additionally for said project for those
 22 functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under
 23 the head "General investigations" (but this authorization
 24 shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head
 25 within that area), and for the continuation of investigations

1 by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the
2 development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments
3 may be expended through or in cooperation with State and
4 other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are
5 hereby authorized.

6 Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the
7 performance of functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall
8 be reimbursable or returnable to the extent and in the manner
9 provided by law.

10 Any agency of the United States Government having title
11 thereto is authorized to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation,
12 without reimbursement, parts, equipment and supplies for
13 aircraft excess to its needs.

14 No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Recla-
15 mation, contained in this chapter or in any prior Act, which
16 represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but
17 remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose,
18 regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*,
19 That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this
20 paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section 665 of
21 title 31 of the United States Code.

22 No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation
23 for operation and maintenance, except those derived from
24 advances by water users, shall be used for the particular
25 benefit of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation

1 district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization,
2 or (c) of any individual, when such district, organization,
3 or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months in
4 the payment of charges due under a contract entered into
5 with the United States pursuant to laws administered by
6 the Bureau of Reclamation.

7 Not to exceed 12 per centum of the construction allot-
8 ment made by the Bureau of Reclamation for any project
9 from the appropriation "Construction and Rehabilitation"
10 contained in this chapter shall be available for construction
11 work by force account or on a hired-labor basis; except that
12 not to exceed \$225,000 may on approval of the Commis-
13 sioner be expended for construction work by force account
14 on any one project or Missouri Basin unit when the work
15 is unsuitable for contract or when excessive bids are received;
16 and except in cases of emergencies local in character, so
17 declared by the Commissioner.

18 APPROPRIATION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS

19 There are hereby appropriated from the reclamation
20 fund such sums as may be necessary after June 30, 1950,
21 to make payments, to the extent authorized by the Act of
22 May 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 273), to the Farmers' Irrigation
23 District on behalf of the Northport Irrigation District
24 (North Platte project, Nebraska-Wyoming) for water car-

1 riage in accordance with contracts entered into pursuant to
2 said Act.

3 REFUNDS AND RETURNS

4 There are hereby appropriated such amounts as may be
5 necessary after June 30, 1950, for the Bureau of Reclama-
6 tion to refund overcollections, and to return deposits in
7 excess of amounts applied to the purposes for which the
8 deposits were accepted, each such refund or return to be
9 derived from the account into which such overcollection or
10 deposit shall have been covered.

11 TRANSFER OF EPHRATA AIR FORCE BASE

12 *For the purpose of assisting in the construction, opera-*
13 *tion, and maintenance, and settlement programs on the*
14 *Columbia Basin project in the State of Washington, the*
15 *Armed Services, General Services Administration, or other*
16 *Federal agency having ownership or custody thereof or*
17 *interest therein, is authorized and directed to transfer to*
18 *the Bureau of Reclamation, without reimbursement or trans-*
19 *fer of funds, all of their right, title, and interest to certain*
20 *buildings, facilities, and equipment at the Ephrata Air*
21 *Force Base, Ephrata, Washington, including the following*
22 *buildings in accordance with block and building numbers:*
23 *Block 800, building numbered 68; block 1900, buildings*
24 *numbered 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17; block 2000, four*
25 *buildings numbered 75, two buildings numbered 56; block*

1 3000, buildings numbered 56, 131, 58; block 2900, buildings
 2 numbered 59, 53, 55, 57, 66, 89, 90, 85, 84, 124, 141,
 3 two buildings numbered 60, two buildings numbered 64, two
 4 buildings numbered 65; block 3300, eleven buildings num-
 5 bered 28; block 3400, seven buildings numbered 28; block
 6 3500, buildings numbered 43, 46; block 3600, buildings
 7 numbered 34, 35, 36, 38, two buildings numbered 37; block
 8 3700, buildings numbered 35, 38, four buildings numbered
 9 31, two buildings numbered 32, two buildings numbered 34,
 10 two buildings numbered 37; block 3800, buildings numbered
 11 35, 38, 39, 42, two buildings numbered 37; block 4300,
 12 buildings numbered 19, 20, 21, 22; block 4400, buildings
 13 numbered 113, 114, two buildings numbered 112; block
 14 4600, buildings numbered 134; block 4700, buildings num-
 15 bered 94, 95, 96, 99, 109, 100, 35, 108, 104, 110, six
 16 buildings numbered 97; block 4800, buildings numbered 53,
 17 40, 102, 101, 103, 105, 107, 111, two buildings numbered
 18 32, five buildings numbered 106, three buildings numbered
 19 98, together with one sewage-disposal plant numbered 116,
 20 one water tank numbered 115, one well, one flag pole num-
 21 bered 118, two garbage racks numbered 155, two garbage
 22 racks numbered 158, one wash rack numbered 63, two
 23 grease racks numbered 62, and sewer system, water lines,
 24 electric-power lines, railroad spur and siding, road improve-

1 *ments, and all other facilities and equipment incident to the*
 2 *foregoing property, and including land and rights-of-way*
 3 *formerly under Reclamation withdrawal to other federally*
 4 *owned land on which said buildings are situate, which have*
 5 *heretofore or which may hereafter be declared surplus to the*
 6 *needs of the Armed Forces.*

7 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

8 SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

9 For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to per-
 10 form surveys, investigations, and research covering topog-
 11 raphy, geology, and the mineral and water resources of
 12 the United States, its territories and possessions; classify
 13 lands as to mineral character and water and power resources;
 14 give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal
 15 Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations
 16 applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits,
 17 licenses, and operating contracts; and publish and disseminate
 18 data relative to the foregoing activities; ~~\$19,129,000~~ \$19,-
 19 382,000, of which \$3,100,000 shall be available only for
 20 cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources
 21 investigations: *Provided*, That the share of the Geological
 22 Survey in any topographic mapping or water resources in-
 23 vestigations carried on in cooperation with any State or
 24 municipality shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost
 25 thereof.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed one hundred and twenty-nine, of which eighty-five shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including purchase of reprints; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service for protection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging stations; and payment of compensation and expenses (not to exceed \$10,000) of the person appointed by the President to participate as the representative of the United States in the administration of the compact consented to by the Act of May 31, 1949 (Public Law 82): *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President is authorized to appoint a retired officer as such representative, without prejudice to his status as a retired Army officer, and he shall receive such compensation and expenses in addition to his retired pay.

1

BUREAU OF MINES

2

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL

3

RESOURCES

4 For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation,
5 exploration, development, production, and utilization of
6 mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its
7 Territories, and possessions; developing synthetics and sub-
8 stitutes; producing and distributing helium; and controlling
9 fires in inactive coal deposits on public lands, and on private
10 lands, with the consent of the owner; \$17,758,000: *Pro-*
11 *vided*, That the Secretary is hereby authorized and directed
12 to make suitable arrangements with owners of private
13 property or with a State or its subdivisions for payment in
14 the current fiscal year of a sum equal to not less than one-
15 half the amount of expenditure to be made for control or
16 extinguishment of fires in inactive coal deposits from funds
17 provided under the authorization of this Act except that
18 expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose in any pri-
19 vately owned operating coal mine shall be limited to in-
20 vestigation and supervision.

21

HEALTH AND SAFETY

22

23 For expenses necessary for promotion of health and
24 safety in mines and in the minerals industries as authorized
by law, \$3,805,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, to remain available until expended, ~~\$1,372,600~~ \$1,268,100, of which not to exceed \$550,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under the heads "Anthracite research laboratory" and "Drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colorado", in The Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950: *Provided*, That unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made, including unused balances of related contract authorizations, under the heads, "Synthetic liquid fuels", "Drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colorado", "Lignite research laboratory", and "Anthracite research laboratory" shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Mines, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$1,300,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Mines may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed ~~one hundred and forty-five~~ *one hundred and fifty*, of which *one hundred and forty-five* shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including purchase of

1 reprints; providing transportation services in isolated areas
2 for employees, student dependents of employees, and other
3 pupils, and such activities may be financed under coopera-
4 tive arrangements; temporary and emergency contracts for
5 personal services and employment of persons without regard
6 to civil-service regulations as required in the conduct of
7 programs for the control of fires in inactive coal deposits
8 and flood prevention in anthracite mines; purchase and
9 bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine
10 rescue and first-aid work: *Provided*, That the Secretary
11 is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment and other
12 contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute
13 projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State,
14 or private: *Provided further*, That power produced in the
15 operation of the power plant of the Bureau of Mines at
16 Louisiana, Missouri, in excess of the Bureau's needs may
17 be sold to non-Federal purchasers, but the expenses of the
18 Bureau in the production and sale of such excess power
19 shall not exceed the total amount of such sales, and expendi-
20 tures for the production of excess power shall not be deemed
21 a charge against the total appropriations authorized by the
22 Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, as amended: *Provided further*,
23 That the sums made available for the current fiscal year in
24 the Act making appropriations for the Departments of the
25 Army, Navy, and Air Force for the acquisition of helium

1 from the Bureau of Mines shall be transferred to the Bureau
 2 of Mines on July 1 of said fiscal year: *Provided further,*
 3 That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current
 4 fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government
 5 agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral prod-
 6 uct that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by
 7 the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall
 8 be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

9 *The Veterans' Administration is authorized to transfer*
 10 *to the Department of the Interior, for the use of the Bureau*
 11 *of Mines, without compensation therefor, full jurisdiction,*
 12 *possession, and control of a parcel of forty-three acres, more*
 13 *or less, within the boundaries of the Fort Snelling Govern-*
 14 *ment Reservation in Hennepin County, Minnesota.*

15 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

16 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

17 For expenses necessary for the management and protec-
 18 tion of the areas and facilities administered by the National
 19 Park Service, including protection of lands in process of
 20 condemnation; and for plans, investigations, and studies of
 21 the recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of de-
 22 tailed plans and working drawings) and archaeological
 23 values in river basins of the United States (except the Mis-
 24 souri River Basin); \$7,688,700: *Provided,* That the unex-
 25 pended balance of the appropriation under the head "Missis-

1 sippi River Parkway” in the Second Supplemental Approp-
2 priation Act, 1950, shall be transferred to and merged with
3 this appropriation.

4 MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL
5 FACILITIES

6 For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance,
7 and rehabilitation of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, and
8 other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas
9 administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service,
10 ~~\$7,250,000~~ \$7,448,100.

11 CONSTRUCTION

12 For construction and improvement, without regard to
13 the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U. S. C. 451),
14 of roads, trails, parkways, buildings, utilities, and other
15 physical facilities; and the acquisition of lands, interests
16 therein, improvements, and water rights; to remain available
17 until expended, ~~\$20,542,000~~ \$19,667,000, of which not to
18 exceed ~~\$8,935,000~~ \$7,935,000 is for liquidation of obliga-
19 tions incurred pursuant to authority granted under the heads
20 "Independence National Historical Park, Pennsylvania",
21 "Parkways, National Park Service", and "Roads and Trails,
22 National Park Service", in the Interior Department Appro-
23 priation Act, 1950, *and, in addition, the Secretary is au-*
24 *thorized to incur obligations and enter into contracts, not*
25 *exceeding a total of \$100,000 for the construction of a public*

1 *information building in the Theodore Roosevelt National*
 2 *Memorial Park, North Dakota: Provided, That the unex-*
 3 *pended balances of prior year appropriations, including un-*
 4 *used balances of related contract authorizations, for the*
 5 *foregoing purposes, shall be transferred to and merged with*
 6 *this appropriation: Provided further, That not to exceed*
 7 *\$150,000 of the funds available for the Independence Na-*
 8 *tional Historical Park, Pennsylvania, shall be available after*
 9 *January 1, 1951, for the management, protection, mainte-*
 10 *nance, and rehabilitation of Independence Hall, grounds, and*
 11 *structures in that Park.*

12 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

13 For expenses necessary for general administration of
 14 the National Park Service, including such expenses in the
 15 regional offices, ~~\$1,264,500~~ \$1,314,500.

16 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

17 Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be
 18 available for personal services in the District of Columbia;
 19 purchase (not to exceed nineteen, of which sixteen shall
 20 be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehi-
 21 cles; printing and binding; cleaning and repair of uniforms
 22 for National Capital Parks police and guards; and the
 23 objects and purposes specified in the Act of August 7, 1946
 24 (16 U. S. C. 17j-2).

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; purchase or rent of land, and functions related to wildlife management in California (16 U. S. C. 695-695c); *and not to exceed \$30,000 for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service; ~~\$7,157,000~~ \$7,082,000.*

INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies and investigations respecting conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, including related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such studies and investigations; and the performance of other functions related thereto; as authorized by law; ~~\$3,900,000~~ \$4,125,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other

1 facilities required in the conservation, management, pro-
 2 tection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources and
 3 the acquisition of lands and interests therein, including
 4 continuing the construction of fish cultural facilities on lands
 5 owned by the State of South Dakota; to remain available
 6 until expended, ~~\$2,401,000~~ \$2,423,450, of which not to
 7 exceed \$50,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred
 8 pursuant to authority granted under the head "Investiga-
 9 tions respecting food fishes" in the Interior Department
 10 Appropriation Act, 1950.

11 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

12 For expenses necessary for general administration of the
 13 Fish and Wildlife Service, including such expenses in the
 14 regional offices, \$917,500.

15 FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION

16 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of Sep-
 17 tember 2, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 669-669j),
 18 amounts equal to the sums credited during the next preceding
 19 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter to the special fund
 20 created by said Act.

21 MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION FUND

22 For carrying into effect section 4 of the Act of March
 23 16, 1934, as amended (~~16 U. S. C. 718-718h~~), an amount
 24 equal to the sum received during the current fiscal year

1 from the proceeds from the sale of stamps, to be warranted
2 monthly and to remain available until expended.

3 *For carrying into effect section 4 of the Act of March*
4 *16, 1934, as amended (16 U. S. C. 718-718h), amounts*
5 *equal to the sums received during the current year and each*
6 *fiscal year thereafter from the proceeds from the sale of*
7 *stamps, to be warranted monthly and to remain available*
8 *until expended.*

9 MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES

10 For management of national wildlife refuges, including
11 the construction, improvement, repair, and alteration of
12 buildings, roads, and other facilities, and enforcement of the
13 Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918, as amended
14 (16 U. S. C. 703-711), amounts equal to 75 per centum
15 of the net proceeds received during the next preceding fiscal
16 year and each fiscal year thereafter under the provisions of
17 section 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 715s),
18 to remain available until expended.

19 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

20 Appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service shall be
21 available for personal services in the District of Columbia;
22 purchase (not to exceed ninety, of which sixty shall be for
23 replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;
24 purchase (not to exceed ten, of which six shall be for replace-

1 ment only) of aircraft; printing and binding, including
2 purchase of reprints; publication and distribution of bulle-
3 tins as authorized by law (7 U. S. C. 417); rations or
4 commutation of rations for officers and crews of vessels at
5 rates not to exceed \$2 per man per day; repair of damage
6 to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas
7 caused by operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service;
8 options for the purchase of land at not to exceed \$1 for
9 each option; facilities incident to such public recreational
10 uses on conservation areas as are not inconsistent with their
11 primary purposes; and the maintenance and improvement
12 of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the juris-
13 diction of the Fish and Wildlife Service and to which the
14 United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant to
15 law in connection with management and investigation of fish
16 and wildlife resources.

17 TERRITORIES AND ISLAND POSSESSIONS

18 ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

19 For expenses necessary for the administration of Terri-
20 tories and possessions under the jurisdiction of the Depart-
21 ment of the Interior, including expenses of the Offices of
22 the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam, and the Gov-
23 ernment of the Virgin Islands, including the agricultural
24 station; compensation and mileage of members of the legis-
25 latures in Alaska and Hawaii; compensation of members of

1 the Supreme Court and the legislature in Guam; care of
 2 insane as authorized by law for Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46-
 3 50) ; grants to the Virgin Islands and Guam, in addition to
 4 current local revenues, for support of governmental functions;
 5 personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and
 6 utilities necessary in the operation of the several Governors'
 7 houses; and personal services in the District of Columbia;
 8 ~~\$3,329,500~~ \$3,392,180: *Provided*, That the territorial and
 9 local governments of the Virgin Islands and Guam are au-
 10 thorized to make purchases for their public institutions
 11 through the General Services Administration.

12 CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS, ALASKA

13 For construction of roads, tramways, buildings, ferries,
 14 bridges, and trails, including surveys and plans for new road
 15 construction; acquisition of lands or interests in lands by
 16 purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise; to remain
 17 available until expended, ~~\$20,400,000~~ \$18,883,212, of which
 18 not to exceed \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations in-
 19 curred pursuant to authority previously granted; and, in addi-
 20 tion, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the
 21 purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed
 22 \$8,000,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of prior
 23 year appropriations, including unused balances of related
 24 contract authorizations, for the foregoing purposes, shall be
 25 transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

1 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS, ALASKA

2 For operation and maintenance of roads, tramways,
3 buildings, ferries, bridges, and trails, \$2,600,000.

4 The total of the amounts appropriated for construction,
5 operation and maintenance of roads in Alaska shall be
6 available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein
7 made for operation and maintenance shall be available only
8 for the service of the current fiscal year.

9 CLAIMS, ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION

10 *For payment of claims certified by the Comptroller Gen-*
11 *eral of the United States to be due for overtime compensation*
12 *earned in 1945 and prior fiscal years under the provisions*
13 *of section 23 of the Act of March 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 522),*
14 *\$12,893, to remain available until June 30, 1952: Pro-*
15 *vided, That no part of the amount received by any claimant*
16 *in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered*
17 *to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services*
18 *rendered in connection with any such claim, and the same*
19 *shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstand-*
20 *ing, and any person violating this provision shall be deemed*
21 *guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall*
22 *be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

23 CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA RAILROAD

24 For the authorized work of the Alaska Railroad, in-
25 cluding improvements and new construction, to remain

1 available until expended, ~~\$31,000,000~~ \$28,700,000, of which
2 not to exceed \$17,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations
3 incurred pursuant to authority granted in the Interior De-
4 partment Appropriation Act, 1950: *Provided*, That funds
5 appropriated under this head may be transferred to the Alaska
6 Railroad Special Fund for purposes of accounting and ad-
7 ministration.

8 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA RAILROAD

9 The Alaska Railroad Special Fund shall continue avail-
10 able until expended for the work authorized by law, including
11 personal services in the District of Columbia; operation of
12 facilities under the jurisdiction of the railroad in Mount
13 McKinley National Park; operation and maintenance of
14 oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or
15 arrangement with other branches of the Government service,
16 for the purpose of providing additional facilities for trans-
17 portation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed neces-
18 sary for the benefit and development of industries or travel
19 in the area served; and payment of compensation and
20 expenses as authorized by section 42 of the Act of September
21 7, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein pro-
22 vided: *Provided*, That no one other than the general manager
23 of said railroad, and one assistant general manager at not
24 to exceed \$13,000 per annum, shall be paid an annual salary
25 out of said fund of more than \$11,000.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

2 Appropriations for Territories and island possessions
3 shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles and
4 printing and binding.

5 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

6 SEC. 102. Appropriations made in this chapter shall be
7 available for the purchase of station wagons without such
8 vehicles being considered as passenger motor vehicles.

9 SEC. 103. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the
10 contrary, aliens may be employed during the current fiscal
11 year in the field service of the Department for periods of
12 not more than thirty days in cases of emergency caused by
13 fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage.

14 SEC. 104. Appropriations in this chapter available for
15 travel expenses shall be available, under regulations pre-
16 scribed by the Secretary, for expenses of attendance of
17 officers and employees at meetings or conventions of mem-
18 bers of societies or associations concerned with the work of
19 the bureau or office for which the appropriation concerned
20 is made.

21 SEC. 105. Appropriations made in this chapter shall
22 be available, with the approval of the Secretary, for the
23 emergency reconstruction, replacement or repair of build-
24 ings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or
25 destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes:

1 *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this
2 authority until funds specifically made available to the
3 Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been
4 exhausted.

5 SEC. 106. The Secretary may authorize the use of any
6 appropriation in this chapter, in addition to the amounts
7 included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for
8 the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range
9 fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Depart-
10 ment of the Interior: *Provided*, That appropriations made
11 in this chapter for fire suppression purposes shall be avail-
12 able for the payment of obligations incurred during the
13 preceding fiscal year.

14 SEC. 107. Appropriations made in this chapter shall be
15 available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and
16 similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will
17 contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations
18 shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other
19 activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of
20 June 30, 1932 (31 U. S. C. 686): *Provided*, That reim-
21 bursements for cost of supplies, materials and equipment,
22 and for services rendered may be credited to the appro-
23 priation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

24 SEC. 108. Appropriations made in this chapter shall be
25 available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act

1 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) when authorized by
2 the Secretary; maintenance and operation of aircraft; exami-
3 nation of estimates of appropriations in the field; payment
4 for telephone service in private residences in the field, when
5 authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary;
6 health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C.
7 150) ; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C.
8 2672) ; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the
9 Secretary, for library membership in societies or associa-
10 tions which issue publications to members only or at a price
11 to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

12 SEC. 109. During the current fiscal year the head of any
13 Department or establishment of the Government having funds
14 available for scientific and technical investigations within the
15 scope of the functions of the Department of the Interior may,
16 with the approval of the Secretary, transfer to the Depart-
17 ment such sums as may be necessary therefor, which sums so
18 transferred may be expended for the same objects and in the
19 same manner as sums appropriated herein but without their
20 limitations.

21 SEC. 110. Transfers to the Department of the Interior,
22 pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Serv-
23 ices Act of 1949, of equipment, material and supplies, excess
24 to the needs of Federal agencies may be made at the request
25 of the Secretary without reimbursement or transfer of funds

1 when required by the Department for operations conducted
2 in Territories and island possessions.

3 TITLE II—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

4 GRANTS

5 For payment to the Virgin Islands Corporation in the
6 form of grants, \$474,000, for estimated losses to be sus-
7 tained during the fiscal years 1950 and 1951, as authorized
8 by section 8 (a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act, in
9 the conduct of activities budgeted as predominantly revenue
10 producing.

11 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

12 During the current fiscal year the Virgin Islands Cor-
13 poration is hereby authorized to make such expenditures,
14 within the limits of funds available to it and in accord with
15 law, and to make such contracts and commitments without
16 regard to fiscal-year limitations as provided by section 104
17 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended,
18 as may be necessary in carrying out its programs as set forth
19 in the budget for the fiscal year 1951: *Provided*, That not
20 to exceed \$121,480 shall be available for administrative
21 expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the Cor-
22 poration, covering the categories set forth in the 1951
23 Budget estimates for such expenses.

24 This chapter may be cited as the "Interior Department
25 Appropriation Act, 1951".

1 CHAPTER VIII—EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT

2 OFFICES

3 TITLE I

4 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

5 COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

6 For compensation of the President, including an expense
7 allowance at the rate of \$50,000 per annum, as authorized
8 by the Act of January 19, 1949 (Public Law 2), \$150,000.

9 THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for The
11 White House Office, including personal services in the District
12 of Columbia; printing and binding; not to exceed \$100,000
13 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
14 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at such per diem rates for
15 individuals as the President may specify, and other personal
16 services without regard to the provisions of law regulating
17 the employment and compensation of persons in the Govern-
18 ment service; and travel and official entertainment expenses
19 of the President, to be accounted for solely on his cer-
20 tificate; \$1,585,553.

1 EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT

2 To provide for emergencies affecting the national interest
3 or security, without regard to such provisions of law regu-
4 lating the expenditure of Government funds as the President
5 may specify, and for supplementing the efforts and available
6 resources of State and local governments or other agencies
7 in alleviating hardship or suffering caused by flood, fire,
8 hurricane, earthquake, or other catastrophe in any part of
9 the United States, \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That assistance in
10 alleviating hardship or suffering caused by such a catastrophe
11 may be rendered through such agency or agencies as the
12 President may designate and in such manner as he shall
13 determine, without regard to such provisions of law regu-
14 lating the expenditure of Government funds or the employ-
15 ment of persons in the Government service as he shall
16 specify, whenever he finds that such a catastrophe is of
17 sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant emergency
18 assistance by the Federal Government in alleviating hard-
19 ship or suffering caused thereby, and if the Governor of any
20 State in which such a catastrophe shall occur shall certify
21 that such assistance is required, and shall have entered into
22 an agreement with such agency of the Government as the
23 President may designate, giving assurance of expenditure of
24 a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such
25 State, local governments therein, or other agencies, for the

1 same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe:
 2 *Provided further*, That within any affected area Federal
 3 agencies are authorized to participate in any such emergency
 4 assistance: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropria-
 5 tion which may be allocated for alleviating hardship or
 6 suffering caused by a catastrophe shall be expended for
 7 departmental personal services or for permanent construc-
 8 tion: *And provided further*, That no part of this appropria-
 9 tion shall be available for allocation to finance a function or
 10 project for which function or project a budget estimate of
 11 appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the
 12 Eighty-first Congress or the first session of the Eighty-second
 13 Congress and such appropriation denied after consideration
 14 thereof by the Senate or House of Representatives or by
 15 the Committee on Appropriations of either body.

16 EXECUTIVE MANSION AND GROUNDS

17 For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refur-
 18 nishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including
 19 electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion and
 20 the Executive Mansion grounds, and traveling expenses, to
 21 be expended as the President may determine, notwith-
 22 standing the provisions of any other Act, \$266,000.

23 BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

24 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 25 Bureau of the Budget, personal services in the District of

1 Columbia and elsewhere; exchange of books; newspapers
 2 and periodicals (not exceeding \$200); teletype news serv-
 3 ice (not exceeding \$900); printing and binding; not to
 4 exceed \$20,000 for services as authorized by section 15
 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates
 6 not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals; a health service
 7 program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and the
 8 payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672);
 9 ~~\$3,386,000~~ \$3,412,000.

10

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

11

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the
 12 Council in carrying out its functions under the Employment
 13 Act of 1946 (15 U. S. C. 1021), including personal serv-
 14 ices in the District of Columbia; travel expenses; purchase
 15 of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; print-
 16 ing and binding; newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding
 17 \$200); press clippings (not exceeding \$300); a health
 18 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150);
 19 and payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C.
 20 2672); \$300,000.

21

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

22

PHILIPPINE ALIEN PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION

23

Administrative expenses, Philippine Alien Property
 24 Administration: The Philippine Alien Property Adminis-
 25 trator is hereby authorized to pay out of any funds or other

1 property or interest vested in him or transferred to him,
2 necessary expenses incurred in carrying out the powers and
3 duties conferred on him pursuant to the Trading With the
4 Enemy Act, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.), and the
5 Philippine Property Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 418) : *Provided*,
6 That not to exceed ~~\$160,000~~ \$215,500 shall be available for
7 the current fiscal year for the general administrative ex-
8 penses of the Philippine Alien Property Administration;
9 printing and binding; rent of private or Government-
10 owned space in the District of Columbia; employment
11 outside the United States of persons without regard
12 to the civil service and classification laws including services
13 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
14 (5 U. S. C. 55a); personal services in the District of
15 Columbia and expenses of attendance at meetings of organ-
16 izations concerned with the work of the agency: *Provided*
17 *further*, That on or before November 1 of the current fiscal
18 year the Philippine Alien Property Administrator shall
19 make a report to the Appropriations Committees of the
20 Senate and the House of Representatives giving detailed
21 information on all administrative and nonadministrative
22 expenses incurred during the next preceding fiscal year,
23 in connection with the activities of the Philippine Alien
24 Property Administration: *Provided further*, That the Philip-
25 pine Alien Property Administration shall cease to exist after

1 June 30, 1951, and all duties being performed by such
2 Administration as of that date shall be transferred to the
3 Office of Alien Property Custodian, including all records,
4 files, and other property.

5 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

6 AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

7 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, as
8 authorized by the Act of June 26, 1946 (36 U. S. C. 121,
9 123-132, 138), including the acquisition of land or interest
10 in land in foreign countries; personal services in the District
11 of Columbia; purchase and repair of uniforms for caretakers
12 of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United
13 States and its Territories and possessions at a cost not exceed-
14 ing \$4,845; travel expenses; rent of office and garage space
15 in foreign countries; the purchase of one passenger motor
16 vehicle; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign
17 countries when required by law of such countries; and
18 printing, binding, engraving, lithographing, photographing,
19 and typewriting; ~~\$695,000~~ \$670,000: *Provided*, That where
20 station allowance has been authorized by the Department
21 of the Army for officers of the Army serving the Army at
22 certain foreign stations, the same allowance shall be author-
23 ized for officers of the armed forces assigned to the Commis-
24 sion while serving at the same foreign stations, and this
25 appropriation is hereby made available for the payment of

1 such allowance: *Provided further*, That when traveling on
2 business of the Commission, officers of the armed forces serv-
3 ing as members or as secretary of the Commission may be
4 reimbursed for expenses as provided for civilian members
5 of the Commission.

6 Construction of memorials and cemeteries: For the per-
7 manent design and construction of memorials and cemeteries
8 in foreign countries as authorized by the Act of June 26,
9 1946 (36 U. S. C. 121, 123-132, 138), and the Act of
10 August 5, 1947 (50 U. S. C. 1819), and personal services
11 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, ~~\$8,680,000~~
12 \$8,500,000, of which \$5,000,000 is for payment of obliga-
13 tions incurred under authority provided under this head in
14 the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, to remain
15 available until expended; and in addition the Commission
16 is authorized to enter into contracts in the amount of
17 \$1,500,000 for the purposes of this appropriation.

18 ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

19 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes
20 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, including personal
21 services in the District of Columbia and employment of
22 aliens; purchase of land and interests in land; services
23 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
24 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; purchase of not to exceed one hundred
25 and fifty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only;

1 purchase, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; printing
2 and binding; health service program as authorized by law
3 (5 U. S. C. 150) ; publication and dissemination of atomic
4 information; payment of tort claims pursuant to law; pur-
5 chase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; purchase of news-
6 papers and periodicals (not to exceed \$8,000) and travel ex-
7 penses; official entertainment expenses (not to exceed
8 \$5,000) ; reimbursement of the General Services Administra-
9 tion for security guard services; and payment of obligations
10 incurred under prior year contract authorizations; \$647,820,-
11 000, together with the unexpended balances, as of June 30,
12 1950, of prior year appropriations to the Atomic Energy
13 Commission, of which amounts \$100,000 may be expended
14 for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case
15 the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the
16 expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify
17 the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher
18 for the sum therein expressed to have been expended; from
19 which appropriation transfers of sums may be made to
20 other agencies of the Government for the performance of
21 the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such
22 cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the
23 appropriation to which transferred; and in addition to the
24 amount herein provided, the Commission is authorized
25 to contract for the purposes of this appropriation during

1 the current fiscal year in an amount not exceeding
2 \$300,150,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropria-
3 tion shall be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee
4 (except such officers and employees whose compensation
5 is fixed by law, and scientific and technical personnel)
6 whose position would be subject to the Classification Act
7 of 1923, as amended, if such Act were applicable to such
8 position, at a rate in excess of the rate payable under such
9 Act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility:
10 *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation or
11 contract authorization shall be used—

12 (A) to start any new construction project for
13 which an estimate was not included in the budget for
14 the current fiscal year;

15 (B) to start any new construction project the cur-
16 rently estimated cost of which exceeds the estimated
17 cost included therefor in such budget; or

18 (C) to continue any community facility construc-
19 tion project whenever the currently estimated cost
20 thereof exceeds the estimated cost included therefor in
21 such budget;

22 unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically
23 approves the start of such construction project or its continu-
24 ation and a detailed explanation thereof is submitted forth-

1 with by the Director to the Appropriations Committees of
2 the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Joint
3 Committee on Atomic Energy; the limitations contained in
4 this proviso shall not apply to any construction project the
5 total estimated cost of which does not exceed \$500,000;
6 and, as used herein, the term "construction project" includes
7 the purchase, alteration, or improvement of buildings, and
8 the term "budget" includes the detailed justification support-
9 ing the budget estimates: *Provided further*, That whenever
10 the current estimate to complete any construction project
11 (except community facilities) exceeds by 15 per centum
12 the estimated cost included therefor in such budget or the
13 estimated cost of a construction project covered by clause
14 (A) of the foregoing proviso which has been approved by
15 the Director, the Commission shall forthwith submit a de-
16 tailed explanation thereof to the Director of the Bureau of
17 the Budget and the Committees on Appropriations of the
18 Senate and of the House of Representatives and the Joint
19 Committee on Atomic Energy: *Provided further*, That the
20 two foregoing provisos shall have no application with re-
21 spect to technical and production facilities (1) if the Com-
22 mission certifies to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget
23 that immediate construction or immediate continuation of
24 construction is necessary to the national defense and security,
25 and (2) if the Director agrees that such certification is justi-

1 fied: ~~Provided further,~~ That no part of the foregoing appro-
 2 priation or contract authorization shall be used in connection
 3 with the payment of any contractor or firm of contractors
 4 engaged under a ~~cost plus a fixed fee~~ contract or contracts
 5 at any installation of the Commission, where the fee for
 6 community management is at a rate in excess of \$90,000
 7 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system
 8 where the fee is at a rate in excess of \$45,000 per annum.

9 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

10 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including
 11 personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed
 12 \$28,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the
 13 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not to exceed
 14 \$10,000 for medical examinations performed for veterans by
 15 private physicians on a fee basis; travel expenses of examiners
 16 acting under the direction of the Commission, and expenses
 17 of examinations and investigations held in Washington and
 18 elsewhere; payment in advance for library membership in
 19 societies whose publications are available to members only or to
 20 members at a price lower than to the general public; print-
 21 ing and binding; not to exceed ~~\$50,000~~ \$80,000 for perform-
 22 ing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of
 23 July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767); reimbursement of the General
 24 Services Administration for security guard services for pro-
 25 tection of confidential files; a health service program as

1 authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ; payment of tort claims
2 pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) ; and not to exceed
3 \$5,000 for actuarial services by contract, without regard to
4 section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended; ~~\$15,261,913~~
5 ~~\$15,761,913~~: *Provided*, That no details from any executive
6 department or independent establishment in the District of
7 Columbia or elsewhere to the Commission's central office
8 in Washington or to any of its regional offices shall be made
9 during the current fiscal year, but this shall not affect the
10 making of details for service as members of the boards of
11 examiners outside the immediate offices of the Commission
12 in Washington or of the regional directors, nor shall it affect
13 the making of details of persons qualified to serve as expert
14 examiners on special subjects: *Provided further*, That the
15 Civil Service Commission shall have power in case of
16 emergency to transfer or detail any of its employees to or
17 from its office or field force: *Provided further*, That mem-
18 bers of the Loyalty Review Board in Washington and of
19 the regional loyalty boards in the field may be paid actual
20 transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of sub-
21 sistence authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949
22 while traveling on official business away from their homes
23 or regular places of business, and while en route to
24 and from and at the place where their services are to be
25 performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in section 281

1 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of
2 the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99) shall be deemed to
3 apply to any person because of his appointment for part-time
4 or intermittent service as a member of the Loyalty Review
5 Board or a regional loyalty board in the Civil Service Com-
6 mission.

7 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
8 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and
9 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining
10 and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission,
11 established pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 9358
12 of July 1, 1943, or for the compensation or expenses of
13 any member of a board of examiners (1) who has not
14 made affidavit that he has not appeared in any agency
15 proceeding within the preceding two years, and will not
16 thereafter while a board member appear in any agency
17 proceeding, as a party, or in behalf of a party to the pro-
18 ceeding, before an agency in which an applicant is em-
19 ployed who has been rated or will be rated by such member;
20 or (2) who, after making such affidavit, has rated an
21 applicant who at the time of the rating is employed by an
22 agency before which the board member has appeared as
23 a party, or in behalf of a party, within the preceding two
24 years: *Provided*, That the definitions of "agency", "agency

1 proceeding” and “party” in section 2 of the Administrative
2 Procedure Act shall apply to these terms as used herein.

3 No part of appropriations herein shall be used to pay
4 the compensation of officers and employees of the Civil
5 Service Commission who allocate or reallocate supervisory
6 positions in the classified civil service solely on the size
7 of the group, section, bureau, or other organization unit,
8 or on the number of subordinates supervised. References
9 to size of the group, section, bureau, or other organization
10 unit or the number of subordinates supervised may be given
11 effect only to the extent warranted by the work load of
12 such organization unit and then only in combination with
13 other factors, such as the kind, difficulty, and complexity
14 of work supervised, the degree and scope of responsibility
15 delegated to the supervisor, and the kind, degree, and value
16 of the supervision actually exercised.

17 Panama Canal construction annuity fund: For pay-
18 ment of annuities authorized by the Act of May 29, 1944, as
19 amended (48 U. S. C. 1373a), \$2,803,177.

20 Civil-service retirement and disability fund: For financ-
21 ing the liability of the United States, created by the Act
22 approved May 22, 1920, and Acts amendatory thereof (5
23 U. S. C. chap. 14), \$305,000,000, which amount shall be
24 placed to the credit of the “civil-service retirement and dis-
25 ability fund”.

COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE

EXECUTIVE MANSION

For all expenses of the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion as authorized by Public Law 40, Eighty-first Congress, \$20,000 \$50,000, together with not exceeding \$30,000 of the unobligated balances of funds appropriated for such purpose in the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, and the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950.

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (Public Law 774, approved June 25, 1948), including personal services and rents in the District of Columbia; travel expenses, including travel expenses outside continental United States without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to

1 law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as author-
2 ized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; and
3 payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; \$455,100:
4 *Provided*, That allocations may be made from this appropri-
5 ation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the
6 Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independ-
7 ent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for
8 the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures
9 may be made under the specific authority herein contained
10 or under the authority governing the activities of the de-
11 partment, agency, corporation, or independent establishment
12 to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further*, That the
13 Commission may enter into agreements with governmental
14 and private agencies and may make payment in advance or
15 by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in
16 rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the
17 purposes of this Act.

18 *Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary*
19 *to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of*
20 *1948, as amended by the Act of June 16, 1950 (Public*
21 *Law 555), including personal services and rents in the*
22 *District of Columbia; travel expenses without regard to the*
23 *Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended,*
24 *and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence*
25 *Expense Act of 1926, as amended; purchase (not to exceed*

1 three), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and
2 binding, including printing and binding outside the conti-
3 nental limits of the United States without regard to section 11
4 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); expenses
5 incident to the primary and secondary education of Ameri-
6 can children who are dependents of Government personnel
7 paid from this appropriation and stationed overseas; serv-
8 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
9 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant
10 to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as au-
11 thorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens;
12 and payment of rent in foreign countries in advance;
13 \$9,000,000: Provided, That allocations may be made from
14 this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the
15 Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corpora-
16 tion, or independent establishment of the Government for
17 direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation,
18 and any such expenditures may be made under the specific
19 authority herein contained or under the authority governing
20 the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or inde-
21 pendent establishment to which amounts are allocated: Pro-
22 vided further, That the Commission may enter into agree-
23 ments with international, governmental, and private agencies
24 and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for

1 *expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance*
2 *to the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this Act.*

3 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

4 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in per-
5 forming the duties imposed by the Communications Act
6 of 1934, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1064), the
7 Ship Act of 1910, approved June 24, 1910, as amended
8 (46 U. S. C. 484-487), the International Radiotelegraphic
9 Convention (45 Stat., pt. 2, p. 2760), Executive Order
10 3513, dated July 9, 1921, as amended under date of June
11 30, 1934, relating to applications for submarine cable
12 licenses, and the radiotelegraphy provisions of the Conven-
13 tion for Promoting Safety of Life at Sea, ratified by the
14 President July 7, 1936, including personal services in the
15 District of Columbia, contract stenographic reporting serv-
16 ices, special counsel fees, health service program as authorized
17 by law (5 U. S. C. 150), payment of tort claims pursuant to
18 law (28 U. S. C. 2672), improvement and care of grounds
19 and repairs to buildings (not to exceed \$17,500), purchase of
20 not to exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles for replace-
21 ment only, travel expenses (not to exceed \$93,000), and
22 printing and binding, \$6,625,000, of which \$25,000 shall be
23 available only for services as authorized by section 15 of the
24 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), for a survey as to
25 ways and means of expediting business: *Provided, That*

1 funds appropriated under this paragraph may be used for
2 application processing and hearings in connection with broad-
3 cast activities and for application processing in connection
4 with safety and special services without regard to the
5 apportionment of funds required by the Act of February 27,
6 1906 (31 U. S. C. 665).

7 FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

8 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
9 work of the Commission, not otherwise provided for, as
10 authorized by law, including personal services in the District
11 of Columbia; not to exceed ~~\$247,500~~ \$256,500 for travel;
12 health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C.
13 150) ; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C.
14 2672) ; printing and binding; and purchase (not to exceed
15 two, for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor
16 vehicles; and not to exceed \$500 for newspapers; ~~\$3,938,-~~
17 ~~300~~ \$4,013,300, of which amount not to exceed \$10,000
18 shall be available for special counsel and services as author-
19 ized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
20 55a), but at rates not exceeding \$50 per diem for
21 individuals.

22 Flood-control surveys: For expenses necessary for the
23 work of the Commission as authorized by section 4 of the
24 Act of June 28, 1938 (33 U. S. C. 701j), and similar
25 provisions in subsequent Acts, including personal services

1 in the District of Columbia; contract stenographic reporting
2 services, and printing and binding, \$351,700.

3 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

4 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
5 ing personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase
6 of one passenger motor vehicle; health service program as
7 authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ; payment of tort claims
8 pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) ; contract stenographic
9 reporting services; and printing and binding; and not to
10 exceed \$700 for newspapers; ~~\$3,866,695~~ \$3,916,695, of
11 which not less than \$223,473 shall be available to the Bureau
12 of Trade Practice Conferences for trade practice agreement
13 work: *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated
14 herein for the Federal Trade Commission shall be expended
15 upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent
16 resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated sub-
17 sequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the
18 cost of such investigation.

19 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

20 Salaries: For personal services in the District of Colum-
21 bia and elsewhere, ~~\$34,500,000~~ \$32,689,500.

22 Miscellaneous expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
23 ing printing and binding and the purchase of one passenger
24 motor vehicle for replacement only, \$1,750,000.

25 Appropriations for the General Accounting Office shall

1 be available for a health service program as authorized by
2 law (5 U. S. C. 150), for payment of tort claims pursuant
3 to law (28 U. S. C. 2672), *for newspapers and periodicals*
4 *(not exceeding \$600)*, and services as authorized by section
5 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

6 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

7 Sites and planning, public buildings outside the District
8 of Columbia: For expenses necessary for continuing the
9 program for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of
10 drawings and specifications for Federal public building proj-
11 ects outside the District of Columbia, as authorized and
12 provided for by title I of the Act of June 16, 1949 (Public
13 Law 105), and by the Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630),
14 as amended, including personal services in the District of
15 Columbia, ~~\$28,000,000~~ \$22,000,000, to remain available
16 until expended.

17 Renovation and improvement of federally owned build-
18 ings outside of the District of Columbia: For expenses neces-
19 sary for continuing the program for the renovation and
20 improvement of federally owned buildings outside the District
21 of Columbia, for which funds are not otherwise available,
22 including appurtenances and approaches thereto, that are
23 under the control of the General Services Administration
24 for repair and preservation, as authorized by title III of the
25 Act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105), including personal

1 services in the District of Columbia, \$10,000,000, to remain
2 available until expended.

3 Repair, preservation, and equipment, outside the Dis-
4 trict of Columbia: For the repair, alteration, improvement,
5 preservation, and equipment, not otherwise provided for,
6 including personal services in the District of Columbia,
7 of completed Federal buildings, the grounds and approaches
8 thereof, wharves, and piers, together with the necessary
9 dredging adjacent thereto, and care and safeguarding of
10 sites acquired for Federal buildings and of surplus real
11 property, the custody of which is the responsibility of the
12 General Services Administration under the Act of August 27,
13 1935 (40 U. S. C. 304), and Public Law 152, Eighty-first
14 Congress, pending sale or disposition; the demolition of build-
15 ings thereon; the purchase and repair of equipment and
16 fixtures in buildings under the administration of the Gen-
17 eral Services Administration; and for changes in, main-
18 tenance of, and repairs to the pneumatic-tube system
19 in New York City installed under franchise of the city of
20 New York, approved June 29, 1909, and June 11, 1928,
21 and the payment of any obligations arising thereunder in
22 accordance with the provisions of the Acts approved August
23 5, 1909 (36 Stat. 120), and May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 533);
24 \$10,000,000.

25 Federal office building, Nashville, Tennessee: For com-

1 pletion of construction of a Federal office building in
2 Nashville, Tennessee, to remain available until expended,
3 \$1,200,000, which shall be for payment of obligations
4 incurred under authority granted under this head in the
5 Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949.

6 Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio: For comple-
7 tion of construction of buildings and facilities at Cincinnati,
8 Ohio, for the use of the Public Health Service, as authorized
9 by section 8 (b) of the Act of June 30, 1948 (Public Law
10 845), \$1,400,000, to remain available until expended, and
11 in addition thereto the General Services Administration is
12 authorized to enter into contracts for such purposes in an
13 amount not exceeding \$2,400,000.

14 Federal Courts Building, District of Columbia: For
15 completion of construction of a building for the use of the
16 United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia
17 and the District Court of the United States for the District of
18 Columbia, as authorized by the Act of May 14, 1948 (Public
19 Law 527), to remain available until expended, \$6,000,000,
20 which shall be for payment of obligations incurred under
21 authority granted under this head in the Second Deficiency
22 Appropriation Act, 1948.

23 General Accounting Office Building, District of Columbia:
24 For completion of construction of a building for the use of the
25 General Accounting Office on square 518, in the District of

1 Columbia, under the provisions of the Act of May 18, 1948
 2 [(Public Law 533)], to remain available until expended,
 3 \$15,358,194, which shall be for payment of obligations in-
 4 curred under authority granted under this head in the Second
 5 Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948.

6 Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion: For
 7 completing the renovation, repair, and modernization of the
 8 Executive Mansion, to remain available until expended,
 9 \$3,400,000, which shall be for payment of obligations
 10 incurred under authority granted under this head in the
 11 Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949.

12 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions
 13 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of
 14 July 23, 1946, including personal services in the District
 15 of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
 16 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of five
 17 passenger motor vehicles; and printing and binding; ~~\$633,-~~
 18 ~~608,240~~ \$605,000,000, to remain available until expended,
 19 of which not to exceed \$25,000,000 may be expended in
 20 accordance with the purposes of said Act of July 23, 1946,
 21 through purchase contracts negotiated with operators within
 22 the United States, its Territories and possessions, and in
 23 making advance payments on such contracts to the extent
 24 determined to be necessary to the performance thereof, and
 25 of which \$240,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations in-

1 curred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this
2 head; and in addition to the amount herein appropriated,
3 contracts may be entered into for the purposes of the
4 said Act of July 23, 1946, in an amount not in
5 excess of ~~\$100,000,000~~ \$125,000,000: *Provided*, That any
6 funds received as proceeds from sale or other disposition of
7 materials on account of the rotation of stocks under said
8 Act shall be deposited to the credit, and be available for
9 expenditure for the purposes, of this appropriation: *Pro-*
10 *vided further*, That during the current fiscal year, there
11 shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and
12 critical materials which, in accordance with subsection 6 (a)
13 of the Act of July 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 598), may be trans-
14 ferred to stock piles established in accordance with said Act.

15 For refunds under section 403 (a) (4) (D) (relating
16 to the recomputation of the amortization deduction) and by
17 the last sentence of section 403 (i) (3) (relating to excess
18 inventories) of the Renegotiation Act; and to refund any
19 amount finally adjudged or determined to have been erro-
20 neously collected by the United States pursuant to a uni-
21 lateral determination of excessive profits, with interest there-
22 on (at a rate not to exceed 4 per centum per annum) as
23 may be determined by the War Contracts Price Adjustment
24 Board, computed to the date of certification to the Treasury

1 Department for payment; \$7,400,000: *Provided*, That
2 to the extent refunds are made from this appropriation
3 of excessive profits collected under the Renegotiation Act
4 and retained by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation
5 or any of its subsidiaries, the Reconstruction Finance Corpo-
6 ration or the appropriate subsidiary shall reimburse this
7 appropriation: *Provided further*, That refunds made here-
8 under shall be based solely on the certificate of the War
9 Contracts Price Adjustment Board or its duly authorized
10 representatives.

11 To increase the General Supply Fund established by
12 section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative
13 Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, approved June 30,
14 1949), \$4,000,000.

15 Alaska public works: For an additional amount for
16 expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the
17 Act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 264), relating to the
18 development of the Territory of Alaska, to remain available
19 until June 30, 1955, \$9,000,000, of which \$4,000,000
20 shall be for the liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant
21 to authority heretofore granted under this head and of which
22 not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available for administrative
23 expenses, including the purchase of not to exceed two
24 passenger motor vehicles; *and, in addition, the General*

1 *Services Administration is authorized to enter into contracts*
2 *in an amount not to exceed \$4,000,000 for the purposes*
3 *of this appropriation:—Provided, That no part of this appro-*
4 *priation shall be available for expenditure on any project*
5 *until a certificate has been received from the Secretary of*
6 *Defense that the installation of such facility will be of value*
7 *in connection with national defense.*

8 Advance planning of non-Federal public works: For
9 an additional amount for expenses necessary for carrying out
10 the provisions of the Act of October 13, 1949 (Public Law
11 352), relating to the advance planning of public works, to
12 remain available until expended, ~~\$28,000,000~~ \$20,000,000,
13 of which \$14,100,000 is for liquidation of obligations in-
14 curred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this
15 head and of which not to exceed \$1,704,000 shall be avail-
16 able for administrative expenses, including personal services
17 in the District of Columbia; and, in addition, the General
18 Services Administration is authorized to enter into contracts,
19 in an amount not to exceed ~~\$32,000,000~~ \$27,000,000, for
20 the purposes of this appropriation.

21 Grants for plan preparation, water pollution control:
22 For an additional amount for grants to States, municipalities,
23 or interstate agencies to aid in financing the cost of action
24 preliminary to the construction of projects for water pollution

1 control as authorized by section 8 (c) of the Water Pollution
2 Control Act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1155), ~~\$900,000~~
3 ~~\$750,000~~.

4 Administrative expenses, water pollution control: For
5 expenses necessary to carry out the administrative functions
6 of the General Services Administration under the provisions
7 of the Water Pollution Control Act of June 30, 1948 (62
8 Stat. 1155), as authorized by section 8 (e) of said Act,
9 including personal services in the District of Columbia;
10 travel; hire of passenger motor vehicles; health service pro-
11 grams as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ; and exchange
12 of books; ~~\$60,000~~ \$52,285.

13 Virgin Islands public works: For an additional amount
14 to carry out the provisions of the Act of December 20, 1944
15 (58 Stat. 827) , ~~\$1,300,000~~ \$1,000,000, and in addition, the
16 General Services Administration is authorized to enter into
17 contracts, for an amount not to exceed \$1,467,000, for the
18 purposes of this appropriation.

19 Public works advance planning: The unexpended bal-
20 ances on June 30, 1950, of funds made available for
21 public works advance planning under title V of the War
22 Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 791),
23 are hereby continued available for expenditure until June 30,
24 1951.

25 Liquidation of public works advance planning: Not to

1 exceed \$125,000 of the unobligated balance on June 30,
2 1950, of the funds made available for public works advance
3 planning under title V of the War Mobilization and Recon-
4 version Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 791) shall be available
5 during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses
6 incident to the liquidation of the activity for which said
7 funds were appropriated, including the objects specified under
8 this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act,
9 1946.

10 War public works (community facilities) liquidation:
11 For administrative expenses necessary during the current
12 fiscal year for the liquidation of all activities under titles II,
13 III, and IV of the Act of October 14, 1940, as amended
14 (42 U. S. C. 1531-1534, 1541, and 1562), except expenses
15 related to the maintenance, operation and disposal of Fed-
16 eral project properties, and those in connection with the
17 management and disposal of project securities, including
18 personal services and rents in the District of Columbia;
19 printing and binding; and a health service program as
20 authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); not to exceed
21 \$40,000 of the unobligated balances of the funds here-
22 tofore appropriated for carrying out the provisions of titles
23 II, III, and IV of the Act of October 14, 1940, as amended
24 (42 U. S. C. 1531-1534, 1541, and 1562)'.
25

Operating expenses: For necessary expenses of the Gen-

1 eral Services Administration not otherwise provided for, in-
2 cluding: Operation, maintenance, protection, repair, and
3 improvement of public buildings and grounds to the extent
4 that such buildings and grounds are under the control of
5 the General Services Administration for any of such pur-
6 poses (including the operation, maintenance, and protection
7 of the District Court Building in the District of Columbia) ;
8 rental of buildings or parts thereof in the District of Columbia
9 and elsewhere; the restoration of leased premises; moving
10 Government agencies in connection with the assignment,
11 allocation, and transfer of building space; ground rent, which
12 may be paid in advance where required; demolition of build-
13 ings; furnishings and equipment; acquisition by purchase or
14 otherwise and disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and
15 interests therein; payment of sums in lieu of taxes accruing
16 against real property declared surplus by Government cor-
17 porations under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, where
18 legal title to such property remains in the Government cor-
19 poration; compliance with the provisions of the National
20 Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 451ff) ; pay-
21 ment of per diem employees employed in connection with
22 any of the foregoing functions at rates approved by the
23 Administrator of General Services or his designee not exceed-
24 ing current rates for similar services in the place where such
25 services are employed; arms and ammunition for the guard

1 force; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards
2 and elevator operators; purchase of not to exceed twenty-
3 three passenger motor vehicles; processing and determining
4 net renegotiation rebates; liquidation of activities under the
5 Act to promote the defense of the United States (55 Stat.
6 31) ; scientific, technical and other apparatus and materials
7 for the arrangement, titling, scoring, repair, editing, process-
8 ing, duplication, and reproduction of photographic and other
9 records (including motion-picture and other films and sound
10 recordings) in the custody of the Archivist of the United
11 States and preparation of guides and other finding aids to
12 records of the Second World War; ~~\$76,500,000~~ \$82,725,000.

13 Section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended
14 (40 U. S. C. 278a) shall not apply to any lease entered into
15 by, or transferred to, the General Services Administration,
16 for the housing of agencies specifically exempted from the
17 requirements of said section.

18 The foregoing appropriation shall be credited with (1)
19 advances or reimbursements for salaries and administrative
20 expenses chargeable against other appropriations of the Gen-
21 eral Services Administration, and such salaries and expenses
22 may be paid from this appropriation; (2) advances or reim-
23 bursements for services, quarters, maintenance, or other facili-
24 ties furnished other agencies on a reimbursable basis; (3)
25 cost of maintenance, upkeep, and repair included as part of

1 rentals received from Government corporations pursuant to
2 law (40 U. S. C. 129) ; (4) reimbursements for services
3 performed in respect to bonds and other obligations under the
4 jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, issued
5 by public authorities, States, or other public bodies, and such
6 services in respect to such bonds or obligations as the Admin-
7 istrator deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon
8 the request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be pro-
9 vided from this appropriation; and (5) as respects property
10 transferred to the General Services Administration pursuant
11 to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U. S. C. 451ff), (a)
12 advances or reimbursements for necessary utilities and serv-
13 ices furnished private occupants of industrial plants, and
14 such utilities and services may be provided at cost from this
15 appropriation; (b) proceeds received from insurance against
16 damage to such property, and such proceeds may, at the direc-
17 tion of the Secretary of Defense, be used to repair or restore
18 the damaged property; and (c) appropriations or funds
19 available to other agencies, and transferred to the General
20 Services Administration, in connection with such property,
21 and such appropriations or funds may, with the approval of
22 the Bureau of the Budget, be so transferred.

23 Appropriations or other funds available to the Gen-
24 eral Services Administration shall be available during the
25 current fiscal year for personal services in the District of

1 Columbia; health service programs as authorized by law
2 (5 U. S. C. 150) ; printing and binding; purchase of news-
3 papers and periodicals (not to exceed \$400) ; preparation,
4 shipment, and installation of photographic displays, exhibits,
5 and other descriptive materials; and payment of tort claims
6 pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

7 During the current fiscal year, no part of any money
8 appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used during
9 any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase typewriting
10 machines (except bookkeeping and billing machines) at a
11 price which exceeds 90 per centum of the lowest net cash
12 price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the
13 most-favored customer (other than the Government, the
14 American National Red Cross, and the purchasers of type-
15 writing machines for educational purposes only) of the
16 manufacturer of such machines during the six-month period
17 immediately preceding such quarter.

18 No part of any money appropriated by this or any other
19 Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Govern-
20 ment (which shall include all departments, independent
21 establishments, and wholly owned Government corporations)
22 shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase
23 within the continental limits of the United States of any
24 typewriting machines (except typewriting machines for

1 veterans under public laws administered by the Veterans'
2 Administration) unless the Administrator of General Serv-
3 ices certifies that he is unable to furnish such agency with
4 suitable typewriting machines out of stock on hand. The
5 Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed
6 at such times as he may determine to be necessary to survey
7 and determine the numbers and kinds of typewriting ma-
8 chines located in the continental limits of the United States
9 which are at any time surplus to the requirements of any
10 agency in the executive branch of the Government (which
11 shall include all departments, independent establishments,
12 and wholly owned Government corporations). Upon such
13 determination, the Administrator of General Services is au-
14 thorized to direct, upon such notice and in such manner as
15 he may prescribe, the head of any such agency to surrender
16 to the General Services Administration any and all type-
17 writing machines surplus to its requirements, the costs of
18 packing, shipping, and handling thereof to be charged to
19 the general supply fund. Each such agency shall furnish
20 the Administrator of General Services such information re-
21 garding typewriting machines, wherever located, as he may
22 from time to time request. The General Services Adminis-
23 tration is authorized and directed to receive, hold, sell,
24 exchange, or supply to any branch of the Government,
25 including the District of Columbia, typewriting machines

1 surrendered to it hereunder. The Administrator of General
 2 Services is authorized to charge each agency to which type-
 3 writing machines are supplied hereunder amounts equal to
 4 the fair value thereof, as determined by him, and such
 5 amounts shall be credited to the general supply fund.

6 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

7 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

8 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the
 9 Office of the Administrator, including personal services and
 10 rent in the District of Columbia; purchase of one passenger
 11 motor vehicle, for replacement only; printing and binding;
 12 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
 13 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); expenses of attendance at meet-
 14 ings of organizations concerned with the work of the Agency;
 15 payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672);
 16 a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C.
 17 150); and transportation expenses and not to exceed \$25
 18 per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5
 19 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b-2), for
 20 persons serving without compensation as members of any
 21 advisory committee established pursuant to Title VI of the
 22 Housing Act of 1949; ~~\$4,200,000~~ \$4,900,000: *Provided,*
 23 That the Administrator may, with the approval of the Di-
 24 rector of the Bureau of the Budget, transfer to this account
 25 from funds of the constituent agencies such sums as relate pri-

1 marily to functions which are consolidated in the Office of
 2 the Administrator as authorized by Title III of the Housing
 3 Act of 1948, as amended: *Provided further, That necessary*
 4 *expenses of inspections of projects financed through loans to*
 5 *educational institutions authorized by Title IV of the Housing*
 6 *Act of 1950 shall be compensated by such institutions by the*
 7 *payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to*
 8 *the development costs of such projects will cover the costs*
 9 *of rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose*
 10 *shall be considered nonadministrative, and for the purpose*
 11 *of providing such inspections, the Administrator may utilize*
 12 *any agency and such agency may accept reimbursement or*
 13 *payment for such services from such institutions or the Ad-*
 14 *ministrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropria-*
 15 *tions or funds against which such charges have been made.*

16 PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

17 Annual contributions: For the payment of annual con-
 18 tributions to public housing agencies in accordance with sec-
 19 tion 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as
 20 amended (42 U. S. C. 1410), ~~\$7,500,000~~ \$9,250,000:
 21 *Provided, That except for payments required on contracts*
 22 *entered into prior to April 18, 1940, no part of this appro-*
 23 *priation shall be available for payment to any public housing*
 24 *agency for expenditure in connection with any low-rent hous-*
 25 *ing project, unless the public housing agency shall have*

1 adopted regulations prohibiting as a tenant of any such proj-
2 ect by rental or occupancy any person other than a citizen
3 of the United States, but such prohibition shall not be appli-
4 cable in the case of a family of any serviceman or the family
5 of any veteran who has been discharged (other than dishon-
6 orably) from, or the family and any serviceman who died
7 in, the armed forces of the United States within four years
8 prior to the date of application for admission to such housing:
9 *Provided further,* That all expenditures of this appro-
10 priation shall be subject to audit and final settlement by
11 the Comptroller General of the United States under the pro-
12 visions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as
13 amended.

14 Administrative expenses: For administrative expenses
15 of the Public Housing Administration, ~~\$8,750,000~~ \$11,-
16 500,000, to be merged with and expended under the author-
17 ization for such expenses contained in title II of this chapter.

18 INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

19 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry
20 out the purposes of the Act of August 13, 1946 (25 U. S. C.
21 70), creating an Indian Claims Commission, including per-
22 sonal services in the District of Columbia and printing and
23 binding, \$91,700, together with not exceeding \$7,300 of
24 the unobligated balance available for such purpose contained
25 in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950.

1 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

2 General expenses: For expenses necessary in perform-
3 ing the functions vested by law in the Commission (49 U.
4 S. C. 1-24, 301-327, 901-923, 1001-1022), except those
5 otherwise specifically provided for in this Act, and for
6 general administration, including not to exceed \$5,000
7 for the employment of special counsel; contract stenographic
8 reporting services; personal services in the District of Colum-
9 bia; newspapers (not to exceed \$200); health service
10 program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment
11 of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); purchase
12 of twenty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only;
13 and printing and binding; ~~\$9,889,600~~ \$10,002,600, of which
14 \$100,000 shall be available for valuations of pipe lines, and
15 \$3,831,920 shall be available for the work of the Bureau of
16 Motor Carriers: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and co-
17 operating State commissioners may use Government trans-
18 portation requests when traveling in connection with their
19 duties as such.

20 Railroad safety: For expenses necessary in performing
21 functions authorized by law (45 U. S. C. 1-15, 17-21,
22 35-46, 61-64; 49 U. S. C. 26) to insure a maximum of
23 safety in the operation of railroads, including authority to
24 investigate, test experimentally, and report on the use and
25 need of any appliances or systems intended to promote the

1 safety of railway operation, including those pertaining to
 2 block-signal and train-control systems, as authorized by the
 3 joint resolution approved June 30, 1906, and the Sundry
 4 Civil Act of May 27, 1908 (45 U. S. C. 35-37), and to
 5 require carriers by railroad subject to the Act to install
 6 automatic train-stop or train-control devices as prescribed
 7 by the Commission (49 U. S. C. 26), including the em-
 8 ployment of inspectors, engineers, and personal services in
 9 the District of Columbia, and payment of tort claims pur-
 10 suant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672), ~~\$1,000,000~~ \$1,016,000.

11 Locomotive inspection: For expenses necessary in the
 12 enforcement of the Act of February 17, 1911, entitled "An
 13 Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon
 14 railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in inter-
 15 state commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and
 16 suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto", as amended (45
 17 U. S. C. 22-34), including personal services in the District
 18 of Columbia, and payment of tort claims pursuant to law
 19 (28 U. S. C. 2672), ~~\$700,000~~ \$718,600.

20 INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC
 21 RIVER BASIN

22 Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac
 23 River Basin: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury
 24 to pay in advance to the Interstate Commission on the
 25 Potomac River Basin the Federal contribution toward

1 the expenses of the Commission during the current fiscal
2 year in the administration of its business in the conserv-
3 ancy district established pursuant to the Act of July 11,
4 1940 (54 Stat. 748), \$5,000.

5 MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For expenses necessary for the Motor Carrier Claims
8 Commission established by the Act of July 2, 1948 (Public
9 Law 880), including personal services in the District of
10 Columbia, travel, printing and binding, and services as
11 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
12 U. S. C. 55a), ~~\$175,000~~ \$227,800.

13 NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR

14 AERONAUTICS

15 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the
16 Committee, including contracts for the making of spe-
17 cial investigations and reports and for engineering, draft-
18 ing and computing services; equipment, maintenance, and
19 operation of the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, the Ames
20 Aeronautical Laboratory, and the Lewis Flight Propulsion
21 Laboratory; purchase and maintenance of cafeteria equip-
22 ment; maintenance and operation of aircraft; purchase of
23 eight passenger motor vehicles of which seven shall be
24 for replacement; printing and binding; personal services
25 in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section

1 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
2 payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C.
3 2672) ; and a health service program for employees as au-
4 thorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ; in all, ~~\$40,890,630~~
5 ~~\$44,225,630~~: *Provided*, That statutory provisions prohibit-
6 ing the payment of compensation to aliens shall not apply to
7 any person whose employment by the Committee shall be de-
8 termined by the Chairman thereof to be necessary: *Pro-*
9 *vided further*, That aircraft and parts, equipment, and sup-
10 plies may be transferred to the Committee by the Air Force,
11 Army, and Navy without reimbursement: ~~*Provided fur-*~~
12 ~~*ther*~~, That no part of this appropriation shall be available
13 for the operation of a field office outside the continental
14 or territorial limits of the United States.

15 Construction and equipment: For construction and
16 equipment at laboratories and research stations of the Com-
17 mittee, to be available until June 30 of the next succeeding
18 year, \$15,500,000, of which \$10,000,000 and \$5,000,000
19 shall be available for payments under contracts entered into
20 pursuant to the contract authority under this head in the
21 Independent Offices Appropriation Acts, 1949 and 1950
22 respectively: *Provided*, That in addition, the Committee
23 may enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropria-
24 tion in an amount not in excess of ~~\$10,000,000~~ \$12,500,000.

1 NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

2 Maintenance and operation of properties: For the
3 maintenance and operation of properties under title I of
4 the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Authority Act,
5 ~~\$35,000~~ \$39,600: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from
6 sales, leases, or other sources shall be covered into the
7 Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further*,
8 *That so long as funds are available from appropriations*
9 *for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of*
10 *the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first*
11 *Congress) shall not be effective.*

12 NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING
13 COMMISSION

14 Land acquisition, National Capital and metropolitan
15 area: For necessary expenses for the National Capital Park
16 and Planning Commission in connection with the acquisition
17 of land for the park, parkway, and playground system of
18 the National Capital, as authorized by the Act of May 29,
19 1930 (46 Stat. 482), and amendment of August 8, 1946
20 (60 Stat. 960), including services as authorized by sec-
21 tion 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),
22 and real estate appraisers, by contract or otherwise without
23 regard to the civil service and classification laws, at rates
24 of pay or fees not to exceed those usual for similar services;
25 and purchase of options and other costs incident to the

1 acquisition of land; \$724,500, to remain available until
2 expended, \$480,500 of said sum to be used for carrying
3 out the provisions of section 1 (b) of said Act and \$244,000
4 for carrying out the provisions of section 4 of said Act:
5 *Provided*, That not exceeding \$29,000 of the funds available
6 under the above appropriation during the current fiscal year
7 may be used for regular and part-time personal services of
8 the Commission, excepting services by contract.

9 OFFICE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE RECORDS

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
11 operation and maintenance of the Office of Selective Service
12 Records, as authorized by the Act of March 31, 1947 (61
13 Stat. 31), and by section 10 (a) (4) of the Selective Service
14 Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), including personal services in
15 the District of Columbia; printing and binding; services as
16 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
17 U. S. C. 55a) ; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28
18 U. S. C. 2672) ; and a health service program as authorized
19 by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ; \$4,954,000.

20 PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

21 Philippine War Damage Commission: For carrying out
22 the provisions of title I of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act
23 of 1946, \$40,200,000, to remain available until April 30,
24 1951, of which not to exceed \$1,620,000 shall be for
25 necessary expenses of the Philippine War Damage Com-

1 mission for the current fiscal year, including personal
2 services in the District of Columbia; purchase of news-
3 papers and periodicals not to exceed \$200; housing of
4 American employees by rental or lease and necessary repairs
5 and alterations to and maintenance of quarters, without re-
6 gard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended
7 (40 U. S. C. 278a) ; printing and binding without regard to
8 section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111) ;
9 and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
10 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) : *Provided*, That the
11 provisions of the Act of June 29, 1936 (46 U. S. C. 1241),
12 shall not apply to any travel or transportation of effects pay-
13 able from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That no
14 payment shall be made under the provisions of such title of
15 such Act to any person who, by a civil or military court
16 having jurisdiction, has been found guilty of collaborating
17 with the enemy or of any act involving disloyalty to the
18 United States or the Republic of the Philippines *or, in the*
19 *absence of such finding by such court, the Commission after*
20 *hearing finds upon evidence that such person was guilty of*
21 *such collaboration or act of disloyalty: Provided further*,
22 That no part of this appropriation shall be available for
23 engaging in any phase of activity or for undertaking any
24 phase of activity authorized by the Philippine Rehabilitation
25 Act of 1946 which would result in obligating the Govern-

1 ment of the United States in any sense or respect to the
 2 future payment of amounts in excess of the amounts author-
 3 ized to be appropriated in such Act.

4 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

5 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
 6 ing personal services in the District of Columbia; health
 7 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150);
 8 payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672);
 9 not to exceed \$1,150 for the purchase of newspapers; printing
 10 and binding; and services as authorized by section 15 of the
 11 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); ~~\$6,130,000~~
 12 \$6,330,000.

13 SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

14 Salaries and expenses, Smithsonian Institution: For
 15 all necessary expenses for the preservation, exhibition, and
 16 increase of collections from the surveying and exploring
 17 expeditions of the Government and from other sources; for
 18 the system of international exchanges between the United
 19 States and foreign countries; for anthropological researches
 20 among the American Indians and the natives of
 21 lands under the jurisdiction or protection of the United
 22 States, independently or in cooperation with State, educa-
 23 tional, and scientific organizations in the United States,
 24 and the excavation and preservation of archeological re-
 25 mains; for maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory and

1 making necessary observations in high altitudes; for the
 2 administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts; for
 3 the administration, and for the construction and maintenance,
 4 of laboratory and other facilities on Barro Colorado Island,
 5 Canal Zone, under the provisions of the Act of July 2, 1940,
 6 as amended by the provisions of Reorganization Plan Num-
 7 bered 3 of 1946; for the maintenance and administration
 8 of a national air museum as authorized by the Act of August
 9 12, 1946 (20 U. S. C. 77) ; including personal services in
 10 the District of Columbia and not to exceed \$35,000 for
 11 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
 12 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; traveling expenses; payment
 13 of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) ; a health
 14 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ;
 15 printing and binding, including printing the report of the
 16 American Historical Association; purchase, repair, and clean-
 17 ing of uniforms for guards and elevator conductors; repairs
 18 and alterations of buildings and approaches; and preparation
 19 of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications;
 20 ~~\$2,666,490~~ \$2,770,000.

21 *Paleontological investigations: For payments to non-*
 22 *Federal agencies for cooperative paleontological investiga-*
 23 *tions in accordance with the Act of August 15, 1949 (Public*
 24 *Law 228), to remain available until expended, \$20,000.*

25 Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art: For the

1 upkeep and operation of the National Gallery of Art, the
2 protection and care of the works of art therein, and admin-
3 istrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the
4 Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the
5 public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9,
6 Seventy-sixth Congress), including personal services in the
7 District of Columbia; health service program as authorized
8 by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of tort claims pursuant
9 to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); services as authorized by sec-
10 tion 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
11 traveling expenses; payment in advance when author-
12 ized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in
13 library, museum, and art associations or societies whose
14 publications or services are available to members only, or
15 to members at a price lower than to the general public;
16 purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and
17 elevator operators; printing and binding; purchase or rental
18 of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents
19 thereof, and maintenance and repair of buildings, approaches,
20 and grounds; and not to exceed \$15,000 for restoration and
21 repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by
22 contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms,
23 or organizations at such rates or prices and under such
24 terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper;
25 ~~\$1,158,000~~ \$1,200,000.

TARIFF COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Tariff Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, subscriptions to newspapers (not to exceed \$250), health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), and contract stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), ~~\$1,290,700~~ \$1,340,700: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of any member of the Tariff Commission who shall hereafter participate in any proceedings under sections 336, 337, and 338 of the Tariff Act of 1930, wherein he or any member of his family has any special, direct, and pecuniary interest, or in which he has acted as attorney or special representative.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 12A), including purchase (not to exceed two) and hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft; the purchase (not to exceed two hundred and twenty-five for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$102,714,000 to remain available until expended, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against prior appropriations.

1 THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

2 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
3 ing printing and binding and contract stenographic reporting
4 services, ~~\$820,000~~ \$826,900: *Provided*, That travel expenses
5 of the judges shall be paid upon the written certificate of the
6 judge.

7 UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

8 Ship construction: For new ship construction, including
9 reconditioning and betterment, as authorized by title V of
10 the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (except for construction of
11 one prototype vessel under title VII of said Act), \$35,-
12 000,000, of which \$30,000,000 is for payment of obliga-
13 tions for new ship construction incurred under authority
14 granted in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948;
15 and, in addition, the Commission is authorized to enter into
16 contracts for new ship construction in an amount not to
17 exceed \$63,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appro-
18 priation or contract authorization shall be used to start any
19 new ship construction for which an estimate was not included
20 in the budget for the current fiscal year, nor to start any
21 new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which
22 exceeds by 10 per centum the estimated cost included there-
23 for in such budget unless the Director of the Bureau of the
24 Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construc-
25 tion and the Director shall submit forthwith a detailed

1 explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of
 2 the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, as
 3 used herein, the term "budget" includes the detailed justifi-
 4 cation supporting the budget estimates: *Provided, That no*
 5 *part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be*
 6 *used (1) to start any new ship construction for which an*
 7 *estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal*
 8 *year or (2) to start any new ship construction the currently*
 9 *estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 per centum the estimated*
 10 *cost included therefor in such budget unless, in either case,*
 11 *the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves*
 12 *the start of such ship construction and the Director shall*
 13 *submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Com-*
 14 *mittees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House*
 15 *of Representatives; and, as used herein, the term "budget"*
 16 *includes the detailed justification supporting the budget*
 17 *estimates: Provided further, That not to exceed \$64,875,000*
 18 *of the funds and contract authority made available for new*
 19 *ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment,*
 20 *in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, shall*
 21 *continue to be available until December 31, 1950.*

22 Operating-differential subsidies: For operating-differen-
 23 tial subsidies, as authorized by the Merchant Marine Act,
 24 1936, as amended, ~~\$26,450,000~~ \$30,108,000, together with
 25 funds appropriated under this head in the Supplemental Inde-

1 pendent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, the Independent
2 Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, not to exceed \$16,770,000
3 from the special deposit account established with receipts from
4 sales under Public Laws 44 and 305 of the Seventy-eighth
5 Congress, and not to exceed \$3,529,000 from the special
6 deposit account established from the refund of unobligated
7 amounts out of the working fund established with the Corps
8 of Engineers, Department of the Army, for development
9 of reserve fleet sites, all to be available until expended for
10 payment of operating-differential subsidies for the fiscal years
11 1949, 1950, and 1951, to grant operating-differential sub-
12 sidies on a long-term basis and to obligate the United States
13 to make future payments in accordance with the terms of
14 such contracts: *Provided*, That to the extent that the
15 operating-differential subsidy accrual (computed on the basis
16 of parity) is represented on the operator's books by a
17 contingent accounts receivable item against the Commis-
18 sion as a partial or complete offset to the recapture accrual,
19 the operator (1) shall be excused from making deposits in
20 the special reserve fund, and (2) as to the amount of such
21 earnings the deposit of which is so excused shall be entitled
22 to the same tax treatment as though it had been deposited
23 in said special reserve fund. To the extent that any amount
24 paid to the operator by the Commission reduces the balance
25 in the operator's contingent receivable account against the

1 Commission, such amount, unless it is forthwith deposited
2 in the fund, shall be considered as withdrawn under section
3 607 (h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended:
4 *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this Act, or
5 in any prior appropriation Act, shall be construed to affect
6 the authority of the Commission pursuant to the provisions
7 of section 603 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as
8 amended, (1) to grant operating-differential subsidies on
9 a long-term basis, and (2) to obligate the United States
10 to make future payments in accordance with the terms of
11 such operating-differential subsidy contracts: ~~*Provided fur-*~~
12 ~~*ther*~~, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be
13 available for obligation, nor any obligation made, for the
14 payment of an operating-differential subsidy for any number
15 of ships in excess of the number of ships which are entitled
16 to receive an operating-differential subsidy pursuant to pro-
17 visions of any contract, authorization, commitment or obli-
18 gation by the Commission in existence on January 1, 1950,
19 including within said limitation as to number any ships
20 being constructed or contracted for on said date under a
21 construction-differential subsidy contract and including also
22 any ships the operation of which may be authorized by the
23 Commission under any contracts which may result from
24 any formal applications filed with the Commission prior to
25 January 1, 1950: *Provided further*, That the balance in

1 excess of \$16,770,000 as of June 30, 1950, in the special
2 deposit account established with receipts from sales under
3 Public Laws 44 and 305 of the Seventy-eighth Congress,
4 together with any receipts after that date from such sales,
5 shall be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

6 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for car-
7 rying into effect the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and other
8 laws administered by the United States Maritime Commis-
9 sion, \$19,903,300, within limitations as follows:

10 Administrative expenses, including personal services in
11 the District of Columbia; printing and binding; not to ex-
12 ceed \$2,000 for newspapers and periodicals; purchase of
13 five passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; not
14 to exceed \$17,700 for services as authorized by section 15
15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not
16 to exceed \$1,125 for entertainment of officials of other coun-
17 tries when specifically authorized by the Chairman; payment
18 of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); and
19 \$50,000 to be available exclusively for ship structure re-
20 search, testing and models; \$9,271,700: *Provided*, That the
21 Maritime Commission is authorized to dispense with the
22 administrative audit of agents' accounts covering voyages
23 beginning prior to April 1, 1949;

24 Maintenance of shipyard facilities, \$452,000;

25 Operation of warehouses, \$436,000;

1 Reserve fleet expense, \$8,978,600;

2 Maintenance and operation of terminals, \$765,000.

3 Maritime training: For training personnel for the man-
 4 ning of the merchant marine (including operation of training
 5 stations at Kings Point, New York; Sheepshead Bay, New
 6 York; Alameda, California, and the United States Mari-
 7 time Service Institute), including not to exceed \$2,229,300
 8 for administrative personal services in the District of Colum-
 9 bia and elsewhere; purchase of three passenger motor ve-
 10 hicles, for replacement only; printing and binding; health
 11 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); not
 12 to exceed \$2,500 for contingencies for the Superintendent,
 13 United States Merchant Marine Academy, to be expended
 14 in his discretion; not to exceed \$77,000 for transfer to
 15 applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for
 16 services rendered the Commission; \$3,342,660, including
 17 uniforms and textbooks for cadet midshipmen, to be provided
 18 in kind at an average yearly cost of not to exceed \$200 per
 19 cadet: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be
 20 used for compensation or allowances for trainees or cadets.

21 *Maritime training: For training personnel for the man-*
 22 *ning of the merchant marine (including operation of training*
 23 *stations at Kings Point, New York; Sheepshead Bay, New*
 24 *York; Alameda, California, and the United States Maritime*
 25 *Service Institute), including not to exceed \$2,477,000 for*

1 administrative personal services (exclusive of pay of cadet
 2 midshipmen and other trainees) in the District of Columbia
 3 and elsewhere; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles,
 4 for replacement only; printing and binding; health service
 5 program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); not to
 6 exceed \$2,500 for contingencies for the Superintendent,
 7 United States Merchant Marine Academy, to be expended
 8 in his discretion; not to exceed \$77,000 for transfer to appli-
 9 cable appropriations of the Public Health Service for serv-
 10 ices rendered the Commission; \$3,930,520, including the
 11 pay of cadet midshipmen and other trainees.

12 State marine schools: To reimburse the State of Cali-
 13 fornia, \$50,000; the State of Maine, \$50,000; the State of
 14 Massachusetts, \$50,000; and the State of New York, \$50,-
 15 000; for expenses incurred in the maintenance and support
 16 of marine schools in such States as provided in the Act
 17 authorizing the establishment of marine schools, and so forth,
 18 approved March 4, 1911, as amended (34 U. S. C. 1121-
 19 1123); \$153,000 for the maintenance and repair of vessels
 20 loaned by the United States to the said States for use in
 21 connection with such State marine schools, and \$340,000
 22 for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence of cadets at an
 23 average yearly cost of not to exceed \$475 per cadet; \$668,-
 24 000, together with not to exceed \$25,000 of the unobligated

1 balance for this purpose contained in the Independent
2 ~~Offices Appropriation Act, 1950.~~

3 *State marine schools: To reimburse the State of Cali-*
4 *fornia, \$50,000; the State of Maine, \$50,000; the State of*
5 *Massachusetts, \$50,000; and the State of New York, \$50,-*
6 *000; for expenses incurred in the maintenance and support*
7 *of marine schools in such States as provided in the Act*
8 *authorizing the establishment of marine schools, and so forth,*
9 *approved March 4, 1911, as amended (34 U. S. C. 1121-*
10 *1123); \$153,000 for the maintenance and repair of vessels*
11 *loaned by the United States to the said States for use in*
12 *connection with such State marine schools, and \$749,050*
13 *for the pay of seven hundred and ten cadet midshipmen at*
14 *\$65 per month and \$275 per annum for the subsistence of*
15 *each cadet midshipman; \$1,102,050.*

16 Vessel operating functions: For expenses (other than
17 administrative expenses) necessary for liquidating the oper-
18 ating functions transferred to the United States Maritime
19 Commission by section 202 of the Naval Appropriation
20 Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 501), \$764,760, together with not
21 to exceed \$150,000 of the unobligated balance for this
22 purpose contained in the Independent ~~Offices Appropria-~~
23 ~~tion Act, 1950~~ *Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949,*
24 which latter sum, together with not to exceed \$150,000

1 of the amount herein appropriated, shall be available for
2 liquidation of liens or claims which may take prece-
3 dence over the Government's preferred mortgage on
4 vessels, and other expenses necessary to protect the Gov-
5 ernment's interest in vessels sold or chartered: *Pro-*
6 *vided*, That receipts from such functions during the current
7 fiscal year shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous
8 receipts.

9 No additional vessels shall be allocated under charter,
10 nor shall any vessel be continued under charter by reason
11 of any extension of chartering authority beyond June 30,
12 1949, unless the charterer shall agree that the Commission
13 shall have no obligation upon redelivery to accept or pay
14 for consumable stores, bunkers, and slop-chest items, except
15 with respect to such minimum amounts of bunkers as the
16 Commission considers advisable to be retained on the vessel
17 and that prior to such redelivery all consumable stores,
18 slop-chest items, and bunkers over and above such mini-
19 mums shall be removed from the vessel by the charterer
20 at his own expense.

21 War Shipping Administration liquidation: The unex-
22 pended balance of the appropriation to the Secretary of the
23 Treasury in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act,
24 1948, for liquidation of obligations approved by the General

1 Accounting Office as properly incurred against funds of the
2 War Shipping Administration prior to January 1, 1947, is
3 hereby continued available during the current fiscal year.

4 Construction fund: For an additional amount for pay-
5 ment of obligations (exclusive of obligations for ship con-
6 struction, reconditioning, and betterments incurred pursuant
7 to authority contained in the Independent Offices Appropria-
8 tion Act, 1948) incurred prior to July 1, 1948, against
9 the Construction fund established pursuant to the Merchant
10 Marine Act, 1936, as amended, \$10,000,000, to be avail-
11 able until June 30, 1951, for expenditure only.

12 Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the
13 Commission is authorized to furnish utilities and services and
14 make necessary repairs in connection with any lease, con-
15 tract, or occupancy involving Government property under
16 control of the Commission, and payments received by the
17 Commission for utilities, services, and repairs so furnished or
18 made shall be credited to the appropriation charged with the
19 cost thereof: *Provided*, That rental payments under any such
20 lease, contract, or occupancy on account of items other than
21 such utilities, services, or repairs shall be covered into the
22 Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

23 The United States Maritime Commission shall not incur
24 any obligations during the current fiscal year from the con-
25 struction fund established by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936,

1 or otherwise, in excess of the appropriations and limitations
2 contained in this chapter, or in any prior appropriation Act,
3 and all receipts which otherwise would be deposited to the
4 credit of said fund shall be covered into the Treasury as
5 miscellaneous receipts.

6 VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

7 Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary serv-
8 ices: For necessary expenses of the Veterans' Administra-
9 tion, including maintenance and operation of medical, hos-
10 pital, and domiciliary services, in carrying out the functions
11 pursuant to all laws for which the Administration is charged
12 with administering, including personal services in the Dis-
13 trict of Columbia; health service program as authorized by
14 law (5 U. S. C. 150) ; purchase of ninety-three passenger
15 motor vehicles for replacement only, and one without refer-
16 ence to the provisions of this or any other Act; services as
17 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
18 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; maintenance and operation of farms;
19 recreational articles and facilities at institutions maintained
20 by the Veterans' Administration; expenses incidental to
21 securing employment for war veterans; funeral, burial,
22 and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries of
23 the Veterans' Administration except burial awards author-
24 ized by Veterans' Administration Regulation Numbered 9
25 (a), as amended; aid to State or Territorial homes in con-

1 formity with the Act approved August 27, 1888, as amended
2 (24 U. S. C. 134), for the support of veterans eligible for
3 admission to Veterans' Administration facilities for hospital
4 or domiciliary care; not to exceed \$5,600 for newspapers
5 and periodicals; payment of tort claims pursuant to law
6 (28 U. S. C. 2672); not to exceed \$44,000 for the prep-
7 aration, shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photo-
8 graphic displays, moving pictures, and other visual educa-
9 tional information and descriptive material, including the
10 purchase or rental of equipment; and not to exceed \$800,000
11 for research work in connection with prosthetic appliances;
12 ~~\$875,847,795~~ \$887,621,000, together with not to exceed
13 \$179,000 of the unobligated balance of funds appropriated
14 for this purpose in the Independent Offices Appropriation
15 Act, 1950, from which allotments and transfers may be made
16 to the Federal Security Agency (Public Health Service),
17 the Army, Navy, and Interior Departments, for disburse-
18 ments by them under the various headings of their applicable
19 appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care
20 and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administra-
21 tion: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be
22 used to pay in excess of seventy persons engaged in public
23 relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appro-
24 priation shall be expended for the purchase of any site for or
25 toward the construction of any new hospital or home, or for

1 the purchase of any hospital or home; and not more than
2 \$4,708,000 of this appropriation may be used to repair, alter,
3 improve, or provide facilities in the several hospitals and
4 homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration
5 either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and
6 the purchase of materials: *Provided further*, That hereafter
7 the Administrator shall assign as his representatives, as pro-
8 vided for in the last sentence of section 1100 (a) of the Serv-
9 icemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C. 696f),
10 only such numbers of regional or sectional representatives
11 as he finds necessary to provide for the processing of read-
12 justment allowances in an efficient and economical manner.

13 Compensation and pensions: For the payment of com-
14 pensation, pensions, gratuities, and allowances (including
15 subsistence allowances authorized by part VII of Veterans
16 Regulation 1a, as amended), authorized under any Act of
17 Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon, in-
18 cluding emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities,
19 the administration of which is now or may hereafter be
20 placed in the Veterans' Administration, and for the payment
21 of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and
22 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended (38 U. S. C.
23 631 and 661), \$2,147,520,000, to be immediately available
24 and to remain available until expended.

25 Readjustment benefits: For the payment of benefits to

1 or on behalf of veterans as authorized by titles II, III, and
2 V, of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944,
3 \$2,505,600,000, to be immediately available and to remain
4 available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this
5 appropriation for education and training under title II of
6 the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, shall be
7 expended for tuition, fees, or other charges, or for sub-
8 sistence allowance, for any course elected or commenced
9 by a veteran on or subsequent to July 1, 1948, and which
10 is determined by the Administrator to be avocational or
11 recreational in character. For the purposes of this proviso,
12 education or training for the purpose of teaching a veteran
13 to fly or related aviation courses in connection with his
14 present or contemplated business or occupation shall not,
15 in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, be
16 considered avocational or recreational when a certificate in
17 the form of an affidavit supported by corroborating affidavits
18 by two competent disinterested persons, has been furnished
19 by a physically qualified veteran stating that such education
20 or training will be useful to him in connection with earning
21 a livelihood: *Provided further*, That no part of this appro-
22 priation for education and training under title II of the
23 Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, shall be ex-
24 pended subsequent to the effective date of this chapter for

1 subsistence allowance or for tuition, fees, or other charges in
2 any of the following situations:

3 (1) For any veteran for a course in an institution
4 which has been in operation for a period of less than one
5 year immediately prior to the date of enrollment in such
6 course unless such enrollment was prior to August 24, 1949;

7 (2) For any course of education or training for
8 which the educational or training institution involved has
9 no customary cost of tuition, until a fair and reasonable
10 rate of payment for tuition, fees, or other charges for
11 such course has been determined. In any case in which
12 one or more contracts providing a rate or rates of tuition
13 have been executed for two successive years, the rate
14 established by the most recent contract shall be considered
15 to be the customary cost of tuition notwithstanding the
16 definition of "customary cost of tuition" as hereinafter
17 set forth. If the Administrator finds that any institution
18 has no customary cost of tuition he shall forthwith
19 fix and pay or cause to be paid a fair and reason-
20 able rate of payment for tuition, fees, and other charges
21 for the courses offered by such institution. Any educa-
22 tional or training institution which is dissatisfied with a
23 determination of a rate of payment for tuition, fees, or other
24 charges under the foregoing provisions of this paragraph

1 shall be entitled, upon application ~~therefore~~ *therefor*, to a re-
2 view of such determination (including the determination with
3 respect to whether there is a customary cost of tuition)
4 by a board to be known as the "Veterans' Tuition Appeals
5 Board" consisting of three members, appointed by the
6 Administrator for such purpose. Such board shall be sub-
7 ject, in respect to appointment, hearings, appeals, and
8 all other actions and qualifications, to the provisions of sec-
9 tions 5 to 11, inclusive, of the Administrative Procedure Act,
10 approved June 11, 1946, as amended. The decision of such
11 board with respect to all matters shall constitute the final ad-
12 ministrative determination. In no event shall the board fix
13 a rate of payment in excess of the maximum amount allow-
14 able under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended.
15 The term "customary cost of tuition" as employed herein
16 and in paragraph 5, part VIII, Veterans Regulation
17 Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is regarded as that charge
18 which an educational or training institution requires a non-
19 veteran enrollee similarly circumstanced to pay as and for
20 tuition for a course, except that the institution (other than
21 a nonprofit institution of higher learning) is not regarded
22 as having a "customary cost of tuition" for the course or
23 courses in question in the following circumstances:

24 (a) Where the majority of the enrollment of the edu-
25 cational and training institution in the course in question con-

1 sists of veterans in training under Public Laws 16 and 346,
2 Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended; and

3 (b) One of the following conditions prevails:

4 1. The institution has been established subsequent
5 to June 22, 1944.

6 2. The institution, although established prior to June
7 22, 1944, has not been in continuous operation since
8 that date.

9 3. The institution, although established prior to
10 June 22, 1944, has subsequently increased its total
11 tuition charges for the course to all students more than
12 25 per centum.

13 4. The course (or a course of substantially the same
14 length and character) was not provided for nonveteran
15 students by the institution prior to June 22, 1944,
16 although the institution itself was established before June
17 22, 1944: *Provided further*, That nothing in the fore-
18 going proviso shall be construed to affect adversely any
19 legal rights which have accrued prior to the date of
20 enactment of this chapter, or to affect payments to
21 educational or training institutions under contracts in
22 effect on such date.

23 Military and naval insurance: For military and naval
24 insurance, \$6,830,000 to remain available until expended.

25 Hospital and domiciliary facilities: For hospital and

1 domiciliary facilities, \$160,000,000, to remain available
2 until expended for the payment of obligations hereto-
3 fore or herein authorized to be incurred under this head,
4 for extending, with the approval of the President, any
5 of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans'
6 Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sec-
7 tions 1 and 2 of the Act approved March 4, 1931 (38
8 U. S. C. 438 j-k) or in section 101 of the Servicemen's
9 Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C. 693a): *Provided*,
10 That the authority contained in the Third Urgent Deficiency
11 Appropriation Act, 1946, the Independent Offices Approp-
12 riation Act, 1948, the Supplemental Independent Offices
13 Appropriation Act, 1949, and the Independent Offices
14 Appropriation Act, 1950, to incur obligations for the pur-
15 poses specified in those Acts, is hereby extended to
16 July 1, 1952: *Provided further*, That not to exceed ~~4~~ 6.7
17 per centum of the foregoing appropriation and contract au-
18 thorizations shall be available for the employment in the
19 District of Columbia and in the field of all necessary tech-
20 nical and clerical personnel for the preparation of plans and
21 specifications for the projects as approved hereunder and in
22 the supervision of the execution thereof, and for all travel
23 expenses, field office equipment, and supplies in connection
24 therewith, except that whenever the Veterans' Administra-

tion finds it necessary in the construction of any project to employ other Government agencies or persons outside the Federal service to perform such services not to exceed 7 10 per centum of the cost of such projects may be expended for such services: *Provided further*, That the amount of the foregoing contract authorizations available for obligation for portable initial equipment, is increased from \$10,000,000 to \$25,000,000, including the purchase of one hundred and seventy-six passenger motor vehicles.

National service life insurance: For the payment of benefits and for transfer to the national service life insurance fund, in accordance with the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, \$31,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That certain premiums shall be credited to this appropriation as provided by the Act.

Veterans' miscellaneous benefits: For the payment of burial awards authorized by Veterans' Administration Regulation Numbered 9 (a), as amended, and for supplies, equipment, and tuition authorized by part VII and payments authorized by part IX of Veterans' Administration Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, \$71,100,000, to remain available until expended.

Grants to the Republic of the Philippines: For payments to the Republic of the Philippines of grants in accordance

1 with the Act of July 1, 1948 (Public Law 865), for
2 expenses incident to medical care and treatment of veterans,
3 \$3,285,000.

4 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-
5 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons except
6 beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits
7 to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the
8 appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Admin-
9 istrator of Veterans' Affairs.

10 WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

11 PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

12 For payment of claims, as authorized by the War Claims
13 Act of 1948, from funds deposited in the Treasury to the
14 credit of the war claims fund created by section 13 (a)
15 of said Act, such sums as may be necessary, to be available
16 to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment of claims under
17 sections 4 (a), 4 (b) (2), 5 (e), 6 (b), and 7 of said
18 Act to the payees named and in the amounts stated in certi-
19 fications by the War Claims Commission and the Federal
20 Security Administrator or their duly authorized represent-
21 atives, which certifications shall be in lieu of any vouchers
22 which might otherwise be required: *Provided*, That this
23 appropriation shall not be available for administrative ex-
24 penses: *Provided further*, That no claims shall be allowed or
25 paid under the provisions of said War Claims Act of 1948

1 from any funds other than those covered into the Treasury
2 pursuant to the provisions of section 39 of the Trading With
3 the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, as provided
4 by section 13 (a) of said War Claims Act of 1948.

5 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

6 For expenses necessary for the War Claims Commission,
7 including personal services in the District of Columbia;
8 travel; printing and binding; purchase of one passenger
9 motor vehicle; services as authorized by section 15 of the
10 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; expenses of attend-
11 ance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appro-
12 priation; and advances or reimbursements to other Govern-
13 ment agencies for use of their facilities and services in carry-
14 ing out the functions of the Commission; ~~\$600,000~~
15 \$700,000, to be derived from the war claims fund
16 created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948
17 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948).

18 INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

19 SEC. 102. No part of any appropriation contained
20 in this title for the Atomic Energy Commission shall be
21 used to confer a fellowship on any person who advo-
22 cates or who is a member of an organization or party that
23 advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United
24 States by force or violence or with respect to whom the
25 Commission finds, upon investigation and report by the

1 Federal Bureau of Investigation on the character, asso-
2 ciations, and loyalty of whom, that reasonable grounds
3 exist for belief that such person is disloyal to the Gov-
4 ernment of the United States: *Provided further*, That
5 any person who advocates or who is a member of an
6 organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the
7 Government of the United States by force or violence and
8 accepts employment or a fellowship the salary, wages,
9 stipend, grant, or expenses for which are paid from any
10 appropriation contained in this title shall be guilty of a
11 felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than
12 \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both:
13 *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in
14 addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions
15 of existing law.

16 SEC. 103. Where appropriations in this title are ex-
17 pendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific
18 limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such
19 travel expenses may not exceed the amount set forth therefor
20 in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations.

21 SEC. 104. Where appropriations in this title are ex-
22 pendable for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and
23 no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expendi-
24 tures therefor under each such appropriation may not exceed
25 the amount of \$50: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not

1 apply to the purchase of scientific, technical, trade, or traffic
2 periodicals necessary in connection with the performance of
3 the authorized functions of the agencies for which funds are
4 herein provided.

5 SEC. 105. No part of any appropriation contained
6 in this title shall be available to pay the salary of any
7 person filling a position, other than a temporary position,
8 formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the
9 armed forces of the United States and has satisfactorily com-
10 pleted his period of active military or naval service and has
11 within ninety days after his release from such service or from
12 hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not
13 more than one year made application for restoration to his
14 former position and has been certified by the Civil Service
15 Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his
16 former position and has not been restored thereto.

17 SEC. 106. Appropriations contained in this title,
18 available for expenses of travel shall be available, when
19 specifically authorized by the head of the activity or estab-
20 lishment concerned, for expenses of attendance at meetings
21 of organizations concerned with the function or activity for
22 which the appropriation concerned is made; and shall be
23 available for the examination of estimates of appropriations
24 and activities in the field.

25 SEC. 107. No part of any appropriation or fund

1 contained in this title shall be available for installing or
2 maintaining systems for administrative appropriation, fund,
3 or inventory accounting except such systems as are pre-
4 scribed or approved by the Comptroller General: *Provided*,
5 That all agencies, for whose activities provision is made in
6 this title, shall hereafter maintain fiscal-accounting control
7 of all inventories of supplies, materials, or equipment which
8 may be owned by or be in the custody of such agencies.

9 SEC. 108. No part of any appropriations made
10 available by the provisions of this title shall be used for
11 the purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of
12 establishing new offices outside the District of Columbia:
13 *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to programs
14 which have been approved by the Congress and appropria-
15 tions made therefor.

16 SEC. 109. No part of any appropriation contained in
17 this title shall be used to pay the compensation of any
18 employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the num-
19 ber that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee
20 to one hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-
21 time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned:
22 *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall
23 be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend
24 half time or more in personnel administration consisting of
25 direction and administration of the personnel program;

1 employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and
 2 classification; employee relations and services; training;
 3 committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service
 4 examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording,
 5 and reporting.

6 *SEC. 110. None of the sections under the head "Inde-*
 7 *pendent offices, General provisions" in this title shall apply*
 8 *to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Inland*
 9 *Waterways Corporation, or the Tennessee Valley Authority.*

10 TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

11 The following corporations and agencies, respectively,
 12 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within
 13 the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to
 14 each such corporation or agency and in accord with law,
 15 and to make such contracts and commitments without
 16 regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104
 17 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended,
 18 as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth
 19 in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for each such corpo-
 20 ration or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

21 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

22 Home Loan Bank Board: Not to exceed a total of
 23 \$455,000 to be derived from the special deposit
 24 account established under the provisions under the head
 25 "Federal Home Loan Bank Administration" in the Inde-

1 pendent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, and from receipts
2 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, the Federal
3 Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home Loan Bank Board
4 for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, shall be
5 available during the current fiscal year for administrative
6 expenses of the Home Loan Bank Board, including health
7 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150),
8 and the Board may utilize and may make payment for
9 services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the
10 Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan
11 Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corpora-
12 tion, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That
13 all necessary expenses in connection with the conservator-
14 ship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan
15 Insurance Corporation and all necessary expenses (including
16 services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not in-
17 cluding other personal services) in connection with the
18 handling, including the purchase, sale, and exchange, of
19 securities on behalf of Federal home-loan banks, and the
20 sale, issuance, and retirement of, or payment of interest on,
21 debentures or bonds, under the Federal Home Loan Bank
22 Act, as amended, shall be considered as nonadministrative
23 expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That not-
24 withstanding any other provisions of this chapter, except for
25 the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the admin-

1 istrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall be
2 incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions
3 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22, 1932, as
4 amended (12 U. S. C. 1421-1449).

5 Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation:

6 Not to exceed \$635,000 shall be available for admin-
7 istrative expenses, including health service program as
8 authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), which shall be on
9 an accrual basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid,
10 depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in
11 connection with liquidation of insured institutions, liquida-
12 tion or handling of assets of or derived from insured insti-
13 tutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward
14 the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the
15 case of specific insured institutions, and legal fees and
16 expenses, and said Corporation may utilize and may make
17 payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan
18 banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Home Loan Bank
19 Board, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and other agen-
20 cies of the Government: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any
21 other provisions of this chapter, except for the limitation
22 in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses
23 and other obligations of said Corporation shall be incurred,
24 allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the Act
25 of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1724-1730).

1 Home Owners' Loan Corporation: Not to exceed
2 \$1,400,000 shall be available for administrative ex-
3 penses, including health service program as authorized
4 by law (5 U. S. C. 150), which shall be on an accrual
5 basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation,
6 properly capitalized expenditures, expenses (including per-
7 sonal services) in connection with the termination or liquida-
8 tion of accounts carried on the books of the Corporation
9 not to exceed \$500,000, expenses (including services
10 performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but
11 not including other personal services) in connection with the
12 acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement,
13 or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said
14 Corporation or in which it has an interest, and legal fees
15 and expenses, and said Corporation may utilize and may
16 make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-
17 loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Home Loan Bank
18 Board, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corpora-
19 tion, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That,
20 notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter, except
21 for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the ad-
22 ministrative expenses and other obligations of said Corpora-
23 tion shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with
24 the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12
25 U. S. C. 1461-1468).

1 Federal Housing Administration: In addition to the
2 amounts available by or pursuant to law (which shall be
3 transferred to this authorization) for the administrative
4 expenses of the Federal Housing Administration in carrying
5 out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed
6 \$5,425,000 of the various funds of the Federal Housing
7 Administration shall be available for expenditure, in ac-
8 cordance with the National Housing Act, as amended (12
9 U. S. C. 1701): *Provided*, That, except as herein other-
10 wise provided, all expenses and obligations of said Admin-
11 istration shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance
12 with the provisions of said Act: *Provided further*, That
13 funds available for expenditure shall be available for contract
14 actuarial services (not to exceed \$1,500); purchase of
15 periodicals and newspapers (not to exceed \$1,500); health
16 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and
17 the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles, of which one
18 shall be for replacement only.

19 Public Housing Administration: Of the amounts
20 available by or pursuant to law for the administrative
21 expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carry-
22 ing out duties imposed by or pursuant to law including
23 funds appropriated by title I of this chapter, not to exceed
24 ~~\$17,724,000~~ \$17,524,000 shall be available for such ex-
25 penses, including purchase of not to exceed nine passenger

1 motor vehicles, of which eight shall be for replacement only;
2 expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned
3 with the work of the Administration; and a health service
4 program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) : *Provided*,
5 That necessary expenses of providing representatives of the
6 Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects in connec-
7 tion with the construction of such non-Federal projects by
8 public housing agencies with the aid of the Administration,
9 shall be compensated by such agencies by the payment of
10 fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the develop-
11 ment costs of such projects will cover the costs of render-
12 ing such services, and expenditures by the Administration
13 for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative
14 expenses, and funds received from such payments may be
15 used only for the payment of necessary expenses of provid-
16 ing representatives of the Administration at the sites of
17 non-Federal projects or for administrative expenses of the
18 Administration not in excess of the amount authorized by
19 the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Administrator
20 of the Housing and Home Finance Agency may relinquish
21 and transfer, pursuant to the same general terms and condi-
22 tions specified in subsections 505 (a) and (b) of the
23 Act of October 14, 1940, as added by the Act of June 28,
24 1948 (Public Law 796), title to temporary housing pro-
25 vided for certain veterans and their families under title

1 V of said Act of October 14, 1940, as amended, to any
2 State, county, city, other public body, educational institution,
3 or nonprofit organization: *Provided further*, That any appli-
4 cation for such relinquishment and transfer shall be filed with
5 the Administrator by December 31, 1950: *Provided further*,
6 That funds made available by the Act of June 29, 1936 (49
7 Stat. 2035) shall be available for necessary expenses, in-
8 cluding administrative expenses, of the Public Housing
9 Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Act of
10 May 19, 1949 (Public Law 65).

11 INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

12 Inland Waterways Corporation (administered under
13 the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Commerce) :
14 Not to exceed \$542,000 shall be available for admin-
15 istrative expenses, to be determined in the manner set
16 forth under the title "General expenses" in the Uniform
17 System of Accounts for Carriers by Water of the Interstate
18 Commerce Commission (effective January 1, 1947) : *Pro-*
19 *vided*, That no funds shall be used to pay compensation of
20 employees normally subject to the Classification Act of
21 1949 at rates in excess of rates fixed for similar services
22 under the provisions of said Act, nor to pay the compensa-
23 tion of vessel employees and such terminal and other em-
24 ployees as are not covered by said Act, at rates in excess
25 of rates prevailing in the river transportation industry in

1 the area (including prevailing leave allowances for vessel
2 employees, but the granting of such allowances shall not be
3 construed as establishing a different leave system within the
4 meaning of that term as used in section 3 of the Act of
5 December 21, 1944 (5. U. S. C. 61d)).

6 TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

7 Not to exceed \$4,026,000 of the funds available
8 to the Tennessee Valley Authority, shall be available
9 during the current fiscal year for all administrative and
10 general expenses of the Corporation, which expenses shall
11 be inclusive of costs of all administrative offices and other
12 activities representing management and other functions serv-
13 ing the programs and projects of the Corporation in general.

14 CORPORATIONS—GENERAL PROVISION

15 SEC. 202. No part of the funds of, or available for ex-
16 penditure by, any corporation or agency included in this
17 title shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee
18 engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that
19 would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one
20 hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time,
21 and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Pro-*
22 *vided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be

1 considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-
2 time or more in personnel administration consisting of di-
3 rection and administration of the personnel program;
4 employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and
5 classification; employee relations and services; training;
6 committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service
7 examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording,
8 and reporting.

9 This chapter may be cited as the "Independent Offices
10 Appropriation Act, 1951".

1 CHAPTER IX—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT
2 OF THE ARMY

3 QUARTERMASTER CORPS

4 CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

5 Cemetery expenses: For maintaining and improving
6 national cemeteries, including personal services and fuel for
7 superintendents; purchase of grave sites; maintenance of the
8 Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, chapel, and grounds in
9 the Arlington National Cemetery, and that portion of Con-
10 gressional Cemetery to which the United States has title and
11 the graves of those buried therein, including Confederate
12 graves, and the burial site of Pushmataha, a Choctaw Indian
13 chief; repair to roadways but not to more than a single
14 approach road to any national cemetery; for headstones or
15 markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces
16 under the Act of July 1, 1948 (24 U. S. C. 279a, b),
17 and civilians interred in post cemeteries; for maintenance
18 of monuments, tablets, roads, fences, and so forth, made and
19 constructed by the United States in Cuba and China to mark
20 the places where American soldiers fell; maintenance of the

1 year 1950 and the current fiscal year, upon certification by
2 the appropriate agency of the department concerned.

3 SEC. 629. Not more than \$15,000,000 of the
4 amounts received during the current fiscal year by each of the
5 Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as proceeds
6 from the sale of scrap or salvage material, shall be available
7 during the current fiscal year for expenses of transportation,
8 demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage of
9 military supplies, equipment, and matériel: *Provided*, That a
10 report of receipts and disbursements under this limitation
11 shall be made quarterly to the Appropriation Committees of
12 the Congress.

13 TITLE VII—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

14 SEC. 701. The contract authorization granted under the
15 head "Ordnance for New Construction," in title IV of the
16 "National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950,"
17 is reduced by the sum of \$31,460,000 and the amount of the
18 limitation imposed by the proviso under said head on the
19 total obligations to be incurred for armor, armament, and
20 ammunition, for construction, conversion, or replacement ap-
21 proved during the fiscal year 1950, is also reduced by the
22 sum of \$31,460,000.

23 This chapter may be cited as the "Defense Appropria-
24 tion Act, 1951".

1 CHAPTER ~~X A~~—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN AP-
2 PROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORI-
3 ZATIONS

4 Reductions in appropriations and contract authoriza-
5 tions contained in this Act are hereby made in the sum
6 of \$600,000,000.

7 Not more than the following sums may be obligated by
8 any agency or department provided for in this Act, viz:

9 ~~(1)~~ For civilian personnel, not more than an amount 10
10 per centum below the amount proposed in the President's
11 budget estimates for fiscal year 1951, except that in the De-
12 partment of Defense where no more than the amount of the
13 President's budget estimate minus 2 per centum shall be
14 obligated. This paragraph shall not apply to nurses, doc-
15 tors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the
16 Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration.

17 ~~(2)~~ For travel, not more than a total for all depart-
18 ments and agencies of \$319,000,000, and not more than 5
19 per centum less than the estimates provided for military
20 personnel travel and not more than 20 per centum less than
21 the amount provided for civilian personnel travel, than the
22 estimates therefor contained in the President's budget mes-
23 sage for the fiscal year 1951.

1 ~~(3)~~ For transportation of things, for all departments
2 and agencies, not more than \$720,000,000: *Provided fur-*
3 *ther,* That in no case shall the amount obligated exceed a
4 figure 10 per centum below the estimates submitted by the
5 President in his budget message for 1951 for each item
6 for all agencies except the Department of Defense, and for
7 the Department of Defense not more than 5 per centum less
8 than the estimates of the President, transmitted in said
9 budget message.

10 ~~(4)~~ For communications services, not more than \$59,-
11 000,000, and not more for any department other than the
12 Department of Defense than the amount of the President's
13 budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum, and for
14 the Department of Defense not more than a figure 5 per
15 centum below the President's budget estimates for 1951.

16 ~~(5)~~ For rents and utilities, not more than \$205,-
17 000,000, and for all establishments other than the Depart-
18 ment of Defense not more than the President's budget
19 estimates for fiscal year 1951 minus 10 per centum.

20 ~~(6)~~ For printing and reproduction, not more than
21 \$52,000,000, and not more in any case than the President's
22 budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

23 ~~(7)~~ For other contractual services, not more than
24 \$1,301,000,000, and for all departments other than the

1 Department of Defense not more than the President's budget
2 estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

3 ~~(8)~~ For supplies and materials, not more than \$3,888,-
4 000,000, and for all departments of the Government except
5 the Department of Defense and the Veterans' hospitals not
6 more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus
7 10 per centum.

8 ~~(9)~~ For equipment, not more than \$3,577,000,000,
9 and for all departments other than the Department of De-
10 fense, not more than the President's budget estimates for
11 1951 minus 10 per centum.

12 ~~(10)~~ For lands and structures, for all departments of
13 the Government, except the Department of Defense not
14 more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 5
15 per centum.

CHAPTER X-B—FOREIGN AID

TITLE I—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE

PRESIDENT

ECONOMIC COOPERATION

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended by the Act of April 19, 1949 (Public Law 47), and as further amended by the Act of June 5, 1950 (Public Law 535), including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation (not to exceed \$30,000); hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation and hire of aircraft; payment of damage claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); rents in the District of Columbia; transportation of privately owned automobiles; entertainment (not to exceed \$20,000); exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes; and loss by exchange; \$2,391,930,000, of which not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for expenditures of a confidential character (other than entertainment) under the direction of the Administrator or the Deputy Administrator, who shall make a certificate of the amount of each such expenditure which he may think it advisable not

1 to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a suffi-
2 cient voucher for the amount therein specified: Provided,
3 That this appropriation shall be consolidated and merged
4 with funds heretofore made available for the purposes of
5 the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and
6 such consolidated appropriation may be used during the
7 fiscal year 1951 within the limitations herein specified: Pro-
8 vided further, That not to exceed \$15,255,000 of such con-
9 solidated appropriation shall be available for administrative
10 expenses during the fiscal year 1951, of which not more than
11 \$25,000 shall be available to the Administrator for any
12 further action he may consider advisable to carry out the
13 provisions of section 115 (f) of the Economic Cooperation
14 Act of 1948, as amended: Provided further, That not to
15 exceed \$600,000,000 shall be available for transfers under
16 section 111 (d) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948,
17 as amended: Provided further, That no part of the funds
18 herein appropriated shall be expended in a manner that will
19 permit any of the local currency equivalents, derived there-
20 from in compliance with section 115 (b) (6) of the Eco-
21 nomic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, to be placed
22 at the disposal of any recipient country so long as any depend-
23 ent area of such country fails to comply with any treaty to
24 which such dependent area and the United States are parties.

25 ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

26 For expenses necessary to provide assistance to the

1 *Republic of Korea, as authorized by law, including expenses*
 2 *of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of*
 3 *this appropriation; payment of tort claims pursuant to law*
 4 *(28 U. S. C. 2672); health service programs as author-*
 5 *ized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); transportation of privately*
 6 *owned automobiles; hire of passenger motor vehicles and*
 7 *aircraft; exchange of funds without regard to section 3651*
 8 *of the Revised Statutes; and loss by exchange; \$90,000,000:*
 9 *Provided, That not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be available*
 10 *for administrative expenses.*

11 *INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S WELFARE WORK*

12 *To enable the President to carry out the provisions of*
 13 *title V of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950*
 14 *(Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950), \$12,500,000:*
 15 *Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used*
 16 *for contributions to any agency or to any subordinate body*
 17 *of the United Nations other than to the United Nations*
 18 *International Children's Emergency Fund.*

19 *INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT*

20 *For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry*
 21 *out the provisions of the Act for International Development*
 22 *(title IV of Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950), in-*
 23 *cluding personal services in the District of Columbia; expenses*
 24 *of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this*
 25 *appropriation; purchase (not to exceed twelve), and hire of*

1 *passenger motor vehicles for use outside the continental limits*
2 *of the United States; printing and binding; payment of tort*
3 *claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service*
4 *programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); insurance*
5 *of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by*
6 *law of such countries; acquisition of temporary quarters out-*
7 *side the continental limits of the United States to house em-*
8 *ployees of the United States Government by rental (with-*
9 *out regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as*
10 *amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), lease, or construction, and*
11 *necessary repairs and alterations to such temporary quarters;*
12 *exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the*
13 *Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543); entertainment (not*
14 *to exceed \$2,000); health and accident insurance for foreign*
15 *trainees and technicians while absent from their own*
16 *countries participating in activities authorized under this*
17 *appropriation, and actual expenses of preparing and trans-*
18 *porting to their former homes the remains of such persons*
19 *who may die away from their homes while participating in*
20 *such activities; services of commissioned officers of the Public*
21 *Health Service and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and*
22 *for purposes of providing such services the Public Health*
23 *Service may appoint not to exceed twenty officers in the Regu-*
24 *lar Corps to grades above that of senior assistant, but not*
25 *above that of director, as otherwise authorized in accordance*

1 with section 711 of the Act of July 1, 1944, as amended
2 (42 U. S. C. 211a), and the Coast and Geodetic Survey
3 may appoint for such purposes not to exceed twenty com-
4 missioned officers in addition to those otherwise authorized;
5 \$10,000,000; and, in addition, there may be transferred
6 to this appropriation for the purposes hereof not to exceed
7 \$2,600,000 from the appropriation to the Department of State
8 for "International information and educational activities,"
9 fiscal year 1951: Provided, That this appropriation shall be
10 available for contracts or agreements entered into during the
11 fiscal year 1951 pursuant to section 405 (e) of the Act for
12 International Development which entail commitments for the
13 expenditure of funds for not to exceed three years: Provided,
14 however, That no part of this appropriation may be expended
15 for the duplication of any program being carried on by any
16 other agency of the United States Government or any inter-
17 national agency to which the United States is a major con-
18 tributor, nor for the construction of any project, nor for any
19 purpose except administrative expenses (not to exceed 10
20 per centum), and preliminary surveys and technical coop-
21 eration programs upon which reports shall be made to the
22 Congress of the United States quarterly: Provided further,
23 That the making of any survey or the advancement of any
24 technical cooperation program or the preparation of plans
25 for projects does not constitute any obligation whatsoever on

1 the part of the Government of the United States to make any
2 loan or grant for the execution or construction of any project
3 or for the completion of any program devised under title IV
4 of Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950: Provided
5 further, That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of
6 State to give written notice to each recipient of funds or
7 beneficiary under said title that such assistance shall not be
8 construed as an obligation on the part of the United States
9 to make funds available for the construction or execution of
10 any project and to report such action to Congress.

11 *MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE*

12 For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry
13 out the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of
14 1949, as amended, for the period through June 30, 1951,
15 \$1,678,023,729, of which (a) \$1,000,000,000 shall be
16 available, in accordance with section 102 (b), for carrying
17 out the provisions of title I, including expenses, as authorized
18 by section 408 (b), of administering the provisions of said
19 Act and the Act of May 22, 1947 (61 Stat. 103), as
20 amended; (b) \$131,500,000 shall be available for carrying
21 out the provisions of title II; (c) \$91,000,000 shall be
22 available for carrying out the provisions of title III, includ-
23 ing \$16,000,000 as authorized by section 302 (b) and
24 \$75,000,000 as authorized by section 303 (b); and (d)
25 \$455,523,729 shall be available for payment of obligations

1 *incurred under the authority to enter into contracts granted*
2 *under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation*
3 *Act, 1950: Provided, That the unexpended balances of ap-*
4 *propriations and contract authorizations granted under this*
5 *head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950,*
6 *shall continue available until June 30, 1951.*

7 *TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE*

8 *DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CIVIL FUNCTIONS*

9 *GOVERNMENT AND RELIEF IN OCCUPIED AREAS*

10 *For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to*
11 *meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States*
12 *in connection with the government or occupation of certain*
13 *foreign areas (except Germany), including personal services*
14 *in the District of Columbia and elsewhere and, subject to*
15 *such authorizations and limitations as may be prescribed by*
16 *the head of the department or agency concerned, tuition,*
17 *personal allowances (not to exceed \$10 per day), travel*
18 *expenses (not to exceed those authorized for like United*
19 *States military or civilian personnel), and fees incident to*
20 *instruction in the United States or elsewhere of such persons*
21 *as may be required to carry out the provisions of this appro-*
22 *priation; travel expenses and transportation; services as*
23 *authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946*
24 *(5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem*
25 *for individuals; health service program as authorized by*

1 law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of claims pursuant to law
2 (28 U. S. C. 2672); translation rights, photographic work,
3 educational exhibits, and dissemination of information, in-
4 cluding preview and review expenses incident thereto; expenses
5 incident to the operation of schools in Japan for American
6 children who are dependents of Government personnel; print-
7 ing and binding; purchase and hire of passenger motor
8 vehicles and aircraft; repair and maintenance of buildings,
9 utilities, facilities, and appurtenances; contingencies for the
10 United States commanders, commissioners, or other adminis-
11 trators of foreign areas, to be expended in their respective
12 discretions (not exceeding amounts authorized or approved
13 by the head of the department or agency concerned); such
14 minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such areas
15 as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest,
16 prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished; and
17 such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be essential
18 to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; \$288,000,000,
19 of which not to exceed \$18,200,000 shall be available for
20 administrative expenses: Provided, That the general pro-
21 visions of the appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1951
22 for the military functions of the Department of the Army
23 shall apply to expenditures made by that Department
24 from this appropriation: Provided further, That ex-
25 penditures from this appropriation may be made out-

1 side continental United States, when necessary to carry
2 out its purposes, without regard to sections 355, 1136,
3 3648, and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, civil
4 service or classification laws, or provisions of law prohibiting
5 payment of any person not a citizen of the United States:
6 Provided further, That expenditures from this appro-
7 priation may be made, when necessary to carry out its
8 purposes, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes,
9 as amended, and the Armed Services Procurement Act of
10 1947 (41 U. S. C. 151-161): Provided further, That ex-
11 penditures may be made hereunder for the purposes of eco-
12 nomic rehabilitation in such occupied areas in such manner
13 as to be consistent with the general objectives of the Economic
14 Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended: Provided further,
15 That funds appropriated hereunder and unexpended at the
16 time of the termination of occupation by the United States, of
17 any area for which such funds are made available, may be
18 expended by the President for the procurement of such com-
19 modities and technical services, and commodities procured
20 from funds herein or heretofore appropriated for government
21 and relief in occupied areas and not delivered to such an area
22 prior to the time of the termination of occupation, may be
23 utilized by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the
24 maintenance of the political and economic stability of such
25 areas: Provided further, That before any such assistance is

1 made available, an agreement shall be entered into between
2 the United States and the recognized government or authority
3 with respect to such area containing such undertakings by
4 such government or authority as the President may deter-
5 mine to be necessary in order to assure the efficient use of
6 such assistance in furtherance of such purposes: Provided
7 further, That such agreement shall, when applicable, include
8 requirements and undertakings corresponding to the require-
9 ments and undertakings specified in sections 5, 6, and 7
10 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, approved
11 December 17, 1947): Provided further, That funds appro-
12 priated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable, and
13 under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by
14 the head of the department or agency concerned to pay
15 ocean transportation charges from United States ports, in-
16 cluding territorial ports, to ports in Japan and the Ryukyus
17 for the movement of supplies donated to, or purchased
18 by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies regis-
19 tered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee
20 on Voluntary Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned
21 to individuals residing in such countries: Provided further,
22 That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the
23 head of the department or agency concerned shall fix and
24 pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation
25 of all relief packages of food or other general classification

1 of commodities shipped to Japan or the Ryukyus regardless
2 of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by par-
3 ticular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not
4 apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals: Pro-
5 vided further, That the President may transfer to any other
6 department or agency any function or functions provided for
7 under this appropriation, and there shall be transferred to any
8 such department or agency such unobligated balances of this
9 appropriation and, without reimbursement and without regard
10 to the appropriation from which procured, such property
11 as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine
12 to relate primarily to any function or functions so transferred;
13 and any funds so transferred may be expended either under
14 the authority contained herein or under the authority govern-
15 ing the activities of the department or agency concerned.

16 TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

17 GOVERNMENT IN OCCUPIED AREAS OF GERMANY

18 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
19 meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States
20 in connection with the government, occupation, and control
21 of occupied areas of Germany, under such regulations as
22 the Secretary of State may prescribe, including personal
23 services in the District of Columbia; one deputy to the United
24 States High Commissioner for Germany at a salary of
25 \$17,500; tuition, personal allowances (not to exceed \$10

1 *per day), travel expenses (not to exceed those authorized for*
2 *United States civilian personnel), health and accident insur-*
3 *ance, and fees incident to instruction in the United States or*
4 *elsewhere, of such persons as may be required to carry out*
5 *the provisions of this appropriation; actual expenses of pre-*
6 *paring and transporting to their former homes the remains*
7 *of persons who may die away from their homes while partici-*
8 *pating in activities authorized under this appropriation;*
9 *services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,*
10 *1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per*
11 *diem for individuals; health service program as authorized*
12 *by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of tort claims pursuant*
13 *to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) and payment of tort claims in*
14 *the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672,*
15 *as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such*
16 *claims arise in foreign countries; expenses for translation*
17 *and reproduction rights; acquisition, maintenance, operation,*
18 *and distribution of educational, informational, reorientation,*
19 *and rehabilitation materials and equipment for Germany,*
20 *including grants; medical and health assistance for the*
21 *civilian population of Germany; expenses incident to the*
22 *operation of schools for American children who are depend-*
23 *ents of Government personnel; expenses incident to main-*
24 *taining discipline and order in occupied areas (including*
25 *trial and punishment by courts established by or under*

1 authority of the President); printing and binding, includ-
2 ing printing and binding outside continental United States
3 without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919
4 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase, rental, operation, and mainte-
5 nance of printing and binding machines, equipment, and
6 devices abroad; purchase and hire of passenger motor ve-
7 hicles; transportation to occupied Germany of property
8 donated for the purposes of this appropriation; unforeseen
9 contingencies (not to exceed \$100,000) for the United States
10 High Commissioner for Germany, to be accounted for pur-
11 suant to the provisions of section 291 of the Revised Statutes
12 (31 U. S. C. 107); and representation allowances (not to
13 exceed \$20,000) similar to those authorized by section 901
14 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C.
15 1131); \$27,000,000: Provided, That provisions of law,
16 including current appropriation Acts, applicable to the De-
17 partment of State shall be available for application to
18 expenditures made from this appropriation: Provided fur-
19 ther, That when section 601 of the Economy Act of 1932,
20 as amended (31 U. S. C. 686), is employed to carry out
21 the purposes of this appropriation the requisitioned agency
22 may utilize the authority contained in this appropriation:
23 Provided further, That expenditures from this appropriation
24 may be made outside the continental United States, when
25 necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sec-

1 *tions 355 and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended: Provided*
2 *further, That the Department of State is authorized to utilize*
3 *for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, includ-*
4 *ing unforeseen contingencies, without dollar reimbursement*
5 *from this or any other appropriation (1) currencies de-*
6 *posited in Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany*
7 *in accordance with section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic*
8 *Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and which may be*
9 *made available by the Economic Cooperation Administration,*
10 *(2) currencies otherwise deposited in Germany by the*
11 *Federal Republic of Germany and which become available*
12 *for use of the Government of the United States, its repre-*
13 *sentatives or agencies in Germany, in such quantities and*
14 *under such terms and conditions as may be determined by*
15 *the Secretary of State after consultation with the Adminis-*
16 *trator for Economic Cooperation, and (3) other currencies*
17 *derived from activities carried on under this appropriation:*
18 *Provided further, That civilian employees of the United*
19 *States serving in Germany who received appointments in*
20 *October 1949 to the Foreign Service of the United States*
21 *for service in Germany shall, for the purposes of section*
22 *625 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, be considered to*
23 *have been in class on September 30, 1949: Provided fur-*
24 *ther, That for the purposes of this appropriation appoint-*
25 *ments may be made to the Foreign Service Reserve without*

1 regard to the four-year limitation contained in section 522
2 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946: Provided further, That
3 in the event the President assigns to the Department of State
4 responsibilities and obligations of the United States in con-
5 nection with the government, occupation, or control of foreign
6 areas in addition to Germany, the authorities contained in
7 this appropriation may be utilized by the Department of
8 State in connection with such government, occupation, or
9 control of such foreign areas: Provided further, That when
10 the Department of the Army, under the authority of the Act
11 of March 3, 1911, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1253), fur-
12 nishes subsistence supplies to personnel of civilian agencies
13 of the United States Government serving in Germany, pay-
14 ment therefor by such personnel shall be made at the same
15 rate as is paid by civilian personnel of the Department of
16 the Army serving in Germany.

17 AID TO PALESTINE REFUGEES

18 For contributions by the United States to the United
19 Nations for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency
20 for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, as authorized by
21 title III of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950
22 (Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950), \$24,705,000.

23 This chapter may be cited as the "Foreign Aid Appro-
24 priation Act, 1951".

1 CHAPTER XI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

2 DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

3 SEC. 1101. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the
4 maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal
5 year, in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2,
6 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger
7 motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station
8 wagons), is hereby fixed at \$1,400.

9 SEC. 1102. Unless otherwise specified and during the
10 current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained
11 in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensa-
12 tion of any officer or employee of the Government of the
13 United States (including any agency the majority of the
14 stock of which is owned by the Government of the United
15 States) whose post of duty is in continental United States
16 unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States,
17 (2) is a person in the service of the United States on
18 the date of enactment of this Act who, being eligible for
19 citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become
20 a citizen of the United States prior to such date, or (3)
21 is a person who owes allegiance to the United States:
22 *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit
23 signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie

1 evidence that the requirements of this section with respect
2 to his status have been complied with: *Provided further*,
3 That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty
4 of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more
5 than \$4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year,
6 or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause
7 shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any
8 other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That
9 any payment made to any officer or employee contrary
10 to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in
11 action by the Federal Government. This section shall not
12 apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to
13 nationals of those countries allied with the United States
14 in the prosecution of the war.

15 SEC. 1103. Appropriations of the executive departments
16 and independent establishments for the current fiscal year,
17 available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the
18 activity concerned, are hereby made available for living
19 quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26,
20 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), and regulations prescribed there-
21 under, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed
22 under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946,
23 in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regula-
24 tions of the President, for all civilian officers and employees
25 of the Government permanently stationed in foreign coun-

1 tries: *Provided*, That the availability of appropriations made
2 to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions of
3 the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected hereby.

4 SEC. 1104. No part of any appropriation for the current
5 fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid
6 to any person for the filling of any position for which he or
7 she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to
8 approve of the nomination of said person.

9 SEC. 1105. No part of any appropriation contained in
10 this or any other Act shall be used to pay in excess of \$4
11 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United
12 States Code Annotated and such volumes shall be purchased
13 on condition and with the understanding that latest pub-
14 lished cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the
15 date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in
16 excess of \$4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes
17 of the Lifetime Federal Digest.

18 SEC. 1106. Funds made available by this or any other
19 Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year
20 of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government
21 Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 841),
22 shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds
23 are otherwise available, for personal services and rent in
24 the District of Columbia; printing and binding; examination
25 of budgets and estimates of appropriations in the field;

1 services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of
2 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and the objects
3 specified in the sections of this title under the head
4 "Departments and agencies", all the provisions of
5 which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such
6 funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which
7 they are made available: *Provided*, That in the event any
8 functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subse-
9 quently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limita-
10 tions on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly
11 reduced.

12 SEC. 1107. No part of any funds of or available to any
13 wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for
14 the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the
15 purchase or construction of any office building at the seat
16 of government primarily for occupancy by any department
17 or agency of the United States Government or by any cor-
18 poration owned by the United States Government.

19 SEC. 1108. Funds of corporations and agencies, subject
20 to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended,
21 covered by the provisions of this or any other Act shall
22 be available during the current fiscal year for payment of
23 tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

24 SEC. 1109. No part of any appropriation contained in this

1 or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure
2 by any corporation included in this or any other Act, shall
3 be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages
4 in a strike against the Government of the United States or
5 who is a member of an organization of Government employees
6 that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
7 United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an or-
8 ganization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government
9 of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for
10 the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima
11 facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not
12 contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike
13 against the Government of the United States, is not a member
14 of an organization of Government employees that asserts the
15 right to strike against the Government of the United States,
16 or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
17 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Gov-
18 ernment of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*
19 *further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the
20 Government of the United States or who is a member of an
21 organization of Government employees that asserts the right
22 to strike against the Government of the United States, or
23 who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that
24 advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
25 States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary

1 or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund
2 contained in this or any other Act shall be guilty of a felony
3 and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or
4 imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided*
5 *further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to,
6 and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing
7 law: *Provided further*, That, as applicable to the Depart-
8 ments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section
9 shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person
10 employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency
11 work involving the loss of human life or destruction of
12 property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made
13 to such persons from applicable appropriations for services
14 rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit
15 contemplated by this section.

16 SEC. 1110. No funds made available by this or any other
17 Act shall be withdrawn from one appropriation account for
18 credit to another, or to a working fund, except as authorized
19 by law: *Provided*, That, except as otherwise specifically
20 provided by law, any funds so withdrawn and credited shall
21 be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same
22 limitations, conditions, and restrictions, as provided by the
23 Act appropriating such funds: *Provided further*, That any
24 such withdrawal and credit shall be made, without warrant
25 action, by check: *Provided further*, That no funds withdrawn

1 and credited pursuant to section 601 of the Act of June
2 80, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686),
3 shall be available for any period beyond that provided by the
4 Act appropriating such funds.

5 SEC. 1111. Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as
6 amended (31 U. S. C. 665), is hereby further amended to
7 read as follows:

8 “SEC. 3679. (a) No officer or employee of the United
9 States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create
10 or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund
11 in excess of the amount available therein; nor shall any
12 such officer or employee involve the Government in any
13 contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for
14 any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such
15 purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized
16 by law.

17 “(b) No officer or employee of the United States shall
18 accept voluntary service for the United States or employ
19 personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except
20 in cases of emergency involving the safety of human life or
21 the protection of property.

22 “(c) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section,
23 all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a
24 definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent
25 obligation *or expenditure* thereof in a manner which would

1 indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropria-
2 tions for such period; and all appropriations or funds not
3 limited to a definite period of time, and all authorizations to
4 create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations,
5 shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and
6 economical use thereof. As used hereafter in this section, the
7 term 'appropriation' means appropriations, funds, and au-
8 thorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of
9 appropriations.

10 “(2) In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may
11 be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect sav-
12 ings whenever savings are made possible by or through
13 changes in ~~requirements~~, *requirements* or greater efficiency of
14 operations, ~~or other developments~~ subsequent to the date on
15 which such appropriation was made available. Whenever it
16 is determined by an officer designated in subsection (d) of
17 this section to make apportionments and reapportionments
18 that any amount so reserved will not be required to carry out
19 the purposes of the appropriation concerned, he shall
20 recommend the rescission of such amount in the manner
21 provided in the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for
22 estimates of appropriations.

23 “(3) Any appropriation subject to apportionment shall
24 be distributed by months, calendar quarters, operating sea-
25 sons, or other time periods, or by activities, functions, proj-

1 ects, or objects, or by a combination thereof, as may be
2 deemed appropriate by the officers designated in subsection
3 (d) of this section to make apportionments and reappor-
4 tionments. Except as otherwise specified by the officer
5 making the apportionment, amounts so apportioned shall
6 remain available for obligation, in accordance with the
7 terms of the appropriation, on a cumulative basis unless
8 reapportioned.

9 “(4) Apportionments shall be reviewed at least four
10 times each year by the officers designated in subsection (d)
11 of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments,
12 and such reapportionments made or such reserves established,
13 modified, or released as may be necessary to further the
14 effective use of the appropriation concerned, in accordance
15 with the purposes stated in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

16 “(d) (1) Any appropriation available to the legisla-
17 tive branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, which
18 is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this
19 section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by
20 the officer having administrative control of such appropria-
21 tion. Each such appropriation shall be apportioned not later
22 than thirty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for
23 which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty
24 days after approval of the Act by which the appropriation
25 is made available, whichever is later.

1 “(2) Any appropriation available to an agency, which
2 is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this
3 section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by
4 the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The head of
5 each agency to which any such appropriation is available
6 shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in
7 such form and manner and at such time or times as the
8 Director may prescribe, as may be required for the appor-
9 tionment of such appropriation. Such information shall be
10 submitted not later than forty days before the beginning
11 of any fiscal year for which the appropriation is available,
12 or not more than fifteen days after approval of the Act by
13 which such appropriation is made available, whichever is
14 later. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall
15 apportion each such appropriation and shall notify the agency
16 concerned of his action not later than twenty days before
17 the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation
18 is available, or not more than thirty days after the approval
19 of the Act by which such appropriation is made available,
20 whichever is later. When used in this section, the term
21 ‘agency’ means any executive department, agency, commis-
22 sion, authority, administration, board, or other independent
23 establishment in the executive branch of the Government,
24 including any corporation wholly or partly owned by the
25 United States which is an instrumentality of the United

1 States. Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed
2 as to interfere with the initiation, operation, and adminis-
3 tration of agricultural price support programs. The pro-
4 visions of this section shall not apply to any corporation
5 which obtains funds for making loans, other than paid in
6 capital funds, without legal liability on the part of the
7 United States.

8 “(e) (1) No apportionment or reapportionment which,
9 in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment
10 or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a de-
11 ficiency or supplemental estimate shall be made except upon
12 a determination by such officer that such action is required
13 because of (A) any laws enacted subsequent to the trans-
14 mission to the Congress of the estimates for an appropria-
15 tion which require expenditures beyond administrative con-
16 trol; or (B) emergencies involving the safety of human
17 life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare
18 of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been
19 made to enable the United States to make payment of, or
20 contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to
21 individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in
22 accordance with formulae prescribed by law.

23 “(2) In each case of an apportionment or a reappor-
24 tionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such
25 apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a neces-

1 sity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate, such officer
 2 shall immediately submit a detailed report of the facts of
 3 the case to the Congress. In transmitting any deficiency
 4 or supplemental estimates required on account of any such
 5 apportionment or reapportionment, reference shall be made
 6 to such report.

7 “(f) (1) The officers designated in subsection (d) of
 8 this section to make apportionments and reapportionments
 9 may exempt from apportionments *trust funds and working*
 10 *funds expenditures from which have no significant effect on*
 11 *the financial operations of the Government, working capital*
 12 *and revolving funds established for intra-governmental*
 13 *operations, receipts from industrial and power operations*
 14 *available under law and any appropriation made specifically*
 15 *for—*

16 “(1) interest on, or retirement of, the public debt;

17 “(2) payment of claims, judgments, refunds, and
 18 draw-backs;

19 “(3) any item determined by the President to be
 20 of a confidential nature;

21 “(4) payment under private relief Acts or other
 22 laws requiring payments to designated payees in the
 23 total amount of such appropriation;

24 ~~“(5) contingent expenses of the Senate or of the~~
 25 ~~House of Representatives.~~

1 “(2) *The provisions of subsection (c) of this section*
2 *shall not apply to appropriations to the Senate or House of*
3 *Representatives or to any Member, committee, Office (includ-*
4 *ing the office of the Architect of the Capitol), officer, or*
5 *employee thereof.*

6 “(g) Any appropriation which is apportioned or reap-
7 portioned pursuant to this section may be divided and
8 subdivided administratively within the limits of such appor-
9 tionments or reapportionments. The officer having admin-
10 istrative control of any such appropriation available to the
11 legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia,
12 and the head of each agency, subject to the approval of the
13 Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall prescribe, by
14 regulation, a system of administrative control (not incon-
15 sistent with any ~~other~~ accounting procedures prescribed by
16 or pursuant to law) which shall be designed to (A) restrict
17 obligations *or expenditures* against each appropriation to the
18 amount of apportionments or reapportionments made for each
19 such appropriation, and (B) enable such officer or agency
20 head to fix responsibility for the creation of any obligation
21 *or the making of any expenditure* in excess of an apporportion-
22 ment or reapportionment.

23 “(h) No officer or employee of the United States shall
24 authorize or create any obligation *or make any expenditure*
25 (A) in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment, or

1 (B) in excess of the amount permitted by regulations pre-
2 scribed pursuant to subsection (g) of this section.

3 “(i) (1) In addition to any penalty or liability under
4 other law, any officer or employee of the United States who
5 shall violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall
6 be subjected to appropriate administrative discipline, includ-
7 ing, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty with-
8 out pay or removal from office; and any officer or employee
9 of the United States who shall knowingly and willfully violate
10 subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall, upon con-
11 viction, be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned for not
12 more than two years, or both.

13 “(2) In the case of a violation of subsection (a), (b),
14 or (h) of this section by an officer or employee of an agency,
15 or of the District of Columbia, the head of the agency con-
16 cerned or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia,
17 shall immediately report to the President, through the Di-
18 rector of the Bureau of the Budget, and to the Congress all
19 pertinent facts together with a statement of the action taken
20 thereon.”

21 SEC. 1112. No part of the funds of, or available for
22 expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this
23 Act, *including the government of the District of Columbia*,
24 shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by
25 any officer or employee during the calendar year 1950 and

1 unused at the close of business on ~~December 31, 1950~~ *June*
2 *30, 1951: Provided, That* this section shall not apply to
3 officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the
4 continental United States.

5 SEC. 1113. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6
6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the
7 provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may,
8 in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year,
9 terminate the employment of any officer or employee of
10 the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the
11 United States whenever he shall deem such termination
12 necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

13 Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act
14 of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of
15 any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his
16 absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate
17 the employment of any officer or employee of the Depart-
18 ment of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination
19 necessary or advisable in the best interests of the United
20 States.

21 SEC. 1114. No part of any appropriation contained in
22 this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any
23 incumbent appointed to any civil office or position under
24 the United States Government which may become vacant
25 during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1950: *Provided,*
26 *That this inhibition shall not apply—*

1 ~~(a)~~ to not to exceed 10 per centum of all such
2 vacancies in any agency caused by separation from
3 such agency;

4 ~~(b)~~ to positions filled from within the agency;

5 ~~(c)~~ to offices or positions required by law to be
6 filled by appointment of the President by and with the
7 advice and consent of the Senate;

8 ~~(d)~~ to scientific and technical positions in the
9 Atomic Energy Commission and the Armed Services;

10 ~~(e)~~ to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel,
11 including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and
12 the Veterans' Administration;

13 ~~(f)~~ to law enforcement officers;

14 ~~(g)~~ to temporary, emergency, seasonal, or coopera-
15 tive positions;

16 ~~(h)~~ to commissioned, commissioned warrant, war-
17 rant, and enlisted personnel, and cadets of the Coast
18 Guard, and the undergraduates of the United States
19 Military and Naval Academies, or

20 ~~(i)~~ to any agency in the legislative or judicial
21 branches of the Government, or the municipal govern-
22 ment of the District of Columbia.

23 *SEC. 1114. During the current fiscal year, no part of*
24 *any money appropriated in this or any other Act shall be*
25 *used during any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase*
26 *typewriting machines (except bookkeeping and billing ma-*

1 *chines) at a price which exceeds 90 per centum of the lowest*
2 *net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded*
3 *the most-favored customer (other than the Government, the*
4 *American National Red Cross, and the purchasers of type-*
5 *writing machines for educational purpose only) of the*
6 *manufacturer of such machines during the six-month period*
7 *immediately preceding such quarter.*

8 *SEC. 1115. No payment shall be made from appro-*
9 *priations in this Act to any officer on the retired lists of*
10 *the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps,*
11 *Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard, Coast and Geo-*
12 *detic Survey, and Public Health Service for a period of*
13 *two years after retirement who for himself or for others*
14 *is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of*
15 *or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Depart-*
16 *ment of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic*
17 *Survey, and the Public Health Service any supplies or war*
18 *materials.*

19 This Act may be cited as the "General Appropriation
20 Act, 1951".

Passed the House of Representatives May 10, 1950.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

Calendar No. 1944

81ST CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 7786

[Report No. 1941]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

MAY 11 (legislative day, MARCH 29), 1950

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

JULY 8, 1950

Reported with amendments

Senate

TUESDAY, JULY 11, 1950

(Legislative day of Saturday, July 1, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. In all the perplexities of these confused times may we not lose our perspective. In these fateful days, lead us to right decisions and to that wisdom which is from above. As we remember here those of our own fellow countrymen who, in far places, are laying down their lives for the preservation of our heritage of freedom, save us from lowering the shield of national solidarity, just as the air is filled with the poisoned arrows of determined foes. In these days of crisis and alarm, help us to play the man and so help others to face with good cheer and courage whatever tomorrow may bring. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 10, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. TOBEY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and the remainder of this week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chavez	Frear
Anderson	Connally	Fulbright
Benton	Cordon	George
Brewster	Donnell	Gillette
Bricker	Douglas	Graham
Bridges	Dworschak	Green
Butler	Eastland	Gurney
Byrd	Eaton	Hayden
Cain	Ellender	Hendrickson
Capehart	Ferguson	Hickenlooper
Chapman	Flinders	Hill

Hoey	McCarran	Saltonstall
Holland	McCarthy	Schoeppel
Humphrey	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Hunt	McFarland	Smith, N. J.
Ives	McKellar	Sparkman
Johnson, Colo.	McMahon	Stennis
Johnson, Tex.	Magnuson	Taft
Kefauver	Malone	Thomas, Okla.
Kem	Martin	Thomas, Utah
Kerr	Millikin	Thye
Kilgore	Morse	Tydings
Knowland	Mundt	Watkins
Langer	Murray	Wherry
Leahy	Myers	Wiley
Lehman	Neely	Williams
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Young
Lucas	Russell	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, attending the sessions of the International Labor Organization at Geneva, Switzerland, as a delegate representing the United States.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent because of the death of Judge Curtis Waller, a close personal friend.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on Government business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNERT] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to consider Senate bill 1728, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that the unanimous-consent request was made immediately after a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The RECORD will show it.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in favor of the request made by the Senator from Tennessee. I believe the appropriation bill should be made the temporary business of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 180) to suspend until December 31, 1950, the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in connection with the study and investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 140, Eighty-first Congress.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1049. An act for the relief of Amy Alexandrovna Taylor and Myrna Taylor;

S. 1792. An act for the relief of Thomas Nicholas Epiphaniades and Wanda Julia Epiphaniades; and

S. 2243. An act for the relief of Tevfik Kamil Kutay.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 441. An act to redefine the units and establish the standards of electrical and photometric measurements;

S. 2046. An act to provide authority for certain functions and activities of the National Bureau of Standards, and for other purposes;

S. 2160. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize annual and sick leave with pay for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, to authorize the payment of accumulated and accrued annual leave in excess of 60 days, and for other purposes;

S. 2201. An act amending section 2 of the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the National Bureau of Standards, and for other purposes;

S. 2507. An act to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of an interceptor sewer pipe line in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the Maritime Alameda Shipyard, Alameda, Calif.;

S. 2591. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in arthritis and rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and blindness, and other diseases, and for other purposes; and

S. 2864. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Department of Justice, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 91) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 649. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice N. Kozma;

H. R. 661. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster, and Nolen J. Salyards, assistant postmaster, at Inglewood, Calif.;

H. R. 1130. An act for the relief of Hanna Mussbach;

H. R. 1500. An act for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Guanapoulos;

H. R. 1503. An act for the relief of George Washington;

H. R. 1585. An act for the relief of Lellah begum Alaoui Mullin;

H. R. 1586. An act for the relief of Harold E. Trantwein;

H. R. 1611. An act for the relief of Walter E. Miller;

H. R. 1616. An act for the relief of S. L. Ayres & Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1618. An act for the relief of Kenneth J. MacKenzie;

H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Warren P. Hoover;

H. R. 1988. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Fry;

H. R. 2350. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion M. Martin Jones;

H. R. 2805. An act for the relief of John F. Oettl;

H. R. 3132. An act for the relief of Sergio and Mara Lamberti;

H. R. 3304. An act for the relief of Jose Cotto Santiago;

H. R. 3412. An act for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar;

H. R. 3611. An act to provide for the preparation, printing, and distribution of a list of all persons who died at any time after May 26, 1941, and before December 31, 1946, while serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States;

H. R. 3664. An act for the relief of Bruce M. Stern;

H. R. 3906. An act to amend the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act, as amended;

H. R. 3919. An act for the relief of John S. Steber;

H. P. 3921. An act for the relief of Nicholas C. Hadjipateras, Pipitsa N. Hadjipateras, and Costas N. Hadjipateras;

H. R. 4014. An act for the relief of Maria Hoffman;

H. R. 4045. An act for the relief of Katherine L. Anderson, a civil-service employee, permanently injured through negligent treatment at the Army Advisory Group Station Hospital in Nanking, China;

H. R. 4136. An act for the relief of Helen M. Booth;

H. R. 4142. An act for the relief of Ralph D. McKinney;

H. R. 4221. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Patricia Joyce Dunn, a minor;

H. R. 4542. An act to provide for the classification of the public lands in Alaska;

H. R. 4601. An act for the relief of Jeanette Passayanni-Capodistria;

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of J. R. Fleming & Co.;

H. R. 4709. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims arising out of certain blasting operations on the Merrimack River;

H. R. 4775. An act for the relief of Harold L. Corzett, commander, United States Naval Reserve;

H. R. 4832. An act for the relief of Graphic Arts Corp., of Ohio;

H. R. 4954. An act for the relief of Jacob F. Hutt and Anderson E. Humphrey;

H. R. 4989. An act to provide for the payment of just compensation to John II Estate, Ltd., a Hawaiian corporation, for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, T. H.;

H. R. 5008. An act to provide for the exchange between the United States and the State of New York of certain lands and interests in lands at Manhattan Beach, Kings County, N. Y.;

H. R. 5507. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the protection of the Bald Eagle," approved June 1, 1940;

H. R. 5981. An act for the relief of Claiborne V. Wagley;

H. R. 6020. An act for the relief of Richard H. Sears;

H. R. 6038. An act to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,419, for certain land in California;

H. R. 6062. An act for the relief of John M. Vick;

H. R. 6095. An act for the relief of Universal Corp., James Stewart Corp., and James Stewart & Co., Inc.;

H. R. 6312. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Joseph Lundborg and others against the United States;

H. R. 6417. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frieda Gray (formerly Frieda Putman);

H. R. 6442. An act for the relief of Mrs. Martha Reid;

H. R. 6463. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shikaju Nakashima;

H. R. 6533. An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6578. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gunnbord Janzon Hamilton;

H. R. 6586. An act for the relief of Stamatie Amersonis;

H. R. 6606. An act to provide that the district judge of the eastern, middle, and western districts of Pennsylvania shall become a district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania alone when the first vacancy occurs in that district;

H. R. 6657. An act for the relief of Georges Jules Louis Sauvage;

H. R. 6707. An act for the relief of Sirius Proestopoulos;

H. R. 6750. An act for the relief of Achilles Maroulis;

H. R. 6804. An act for the relief of certain Italian aliens;

H. R. 6861. An act to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain;

H. R. 6885. An act for the relief of E. Elmer Mynatt;

H. R. 7012. An act for the relief of Anna Ellero and Clara Ellero;

H. R. 7043. An act to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road or public toll road through the wildlife refuge located in Princess Anne County, Va.;

H. R. 7146. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States," so as to provide that moneys received from the disposal of material from reserved school section lands in Alaska shall be credited to the Territory;

H. R. 7192. An act to provide benefits for the widows of certain persons who were retired or are eligible for retirement under section 6 of the act entitled "An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1918, as amended;

H. R. 7202. An act for the relief of Alexander Newman;

H. R. 7209. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing studies of Atlantic coast fish species for the purpose of developing and protecting fish resources;

H. R. 7268. An act to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide a more effective distribution of mortgage loans insured under title I, to give holders of such mortgage loans preference in the refinancing of loans on a noninsured basis, to adjust the loan limitations governing title II loans so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7282. An act for the relief of Cornelius Ver Sluis;

H. R. 7297. An act for the relief of Ignas Malcius;

H. R. 7364. An act for the relief of Jenny Irene Benson;

H. R. 7613. An act for the relief of Mrs. Miyako Horikoshi Spaulding and Mabel Miya Spaulding;

H. R. 7675. An act to authorize the addition of certain land to Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the State of Tennessee;

H. R. 7689. An act to amend certain acts relating to the retired status of the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

H. R. 7709. An act to provide for the acquisition, investigation, and preservation of lands to commemorate the historic Fort Caroline settlement, St. Johns Bluff, Fla.;

H. R. 7810. An act for the relief of M. S. Davis;

H. R. 814. An act for the relief of Stella Matutina Kazuko Yamazaki;

H. R. 7887. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an amendment to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Compact, and repealing the limitation on the life of such compact;

H. R. 7921. An act for the relief of Eva T. Ross;

H. R. 7954. An act to authorize the commercial operation of certain vessels on the Great Lakes;

H. R. 7977. An act to authorize the city of Buffalo, Wyo., to make additional uses of certain lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8009. An act for the relief of Enrica Gianoli;

H. R. 8028. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the remaining Government lots in the town site of St. Marks, Fla.;

H. R. 8061. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yuki Sugimoto Murphy and David Murphy;

H. R. 8069. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiki Kohga Brooks;

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3893) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas, Nev., and vicinity, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas and vicinity, Nevada, to be made under direction of the Chief of Engineers, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on such drainage area, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the intention of the junior Senator from Nevada is to urge a favorable report from the Senate Public Works Committee to the end that the Army engineers may proceed with preliminary examination and report on this important Las Vegas, Nev., area.

REDUCTION OF EXCISE TAXES— AMENDMENTS

Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. HILL, and Mr. FREAR) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 8920) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 8920, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS— AMENDMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes. The amendment would restore the cut in the point 4 program. I ask unanimous consent that a statement in explanation of the amendment prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from New York will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN IN CONNECTION WITH AMENDMENT TO RESTORE CUT IN THE POINT 4 APPROPRIATION

Mr. President, I am submitting the amendment to H. R. 7786, the appropriation act, for the purpose of restoring to the full \$26,900,000 requested by the budget, the amount to be expended under the point 4 program, which is title 4 of Public Law 535, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1950.

It is inconceivable to me, Mr. President, at this time when we stand in the greatest need of the friendship and support of all the peoples of the world, that we should attempt to save \$15,000,000 at the expense of one of the most vital programs in our whole plan of action to assist the freedom-loving peoples of the earth.

The action of the Appropriations Committee in cutting \$15,000,000 off the proposed expenditure has echoed around the world and has been magnified by Radio Moscow and its subsidiary organs of propaganda into a deed of cynical contempt for the interests of all the nations whom we have pledged to assist in raising their standard of living.

While we willingly and even anxiously spend millions in arms and guns and planes and bombs, we strain at the spending of \$15,000,000 which can save us, I hope, hundreds of millions in military expenditures.

This is not an extravagant statement. I shall support it in the course of the debate on this item. I understand that other members of the Senate have indicated their intention of introducing similar amendments. I shall support any of these which is called up for a vote.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 649. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice N. Kozma;

H. R. 661. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster, and Nolan J. Sal-yards, assistant postmaster, at Inglewood, Calif.;

H. R. 1130. An act for the relief of Hanna Mussbach;

H. R. 1500. An act for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Guanapoulos;

H. R. 1503. An act for the relief of George Washington;

H. R. 1585. An act for the relief of Leilah begun Alaoui Mullin;

H. R. 1586. An act for the relief of Harold E. Trautwein;

H. R. 1611. An act for the relief of Walter E. Miller;

H. R. 1616. An act for the relief of S. L. Ayres & Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1618. An act for the relief of Kenneth J. MacKenzie;

H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Warren P. Hoover;

H. R. 1988. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Fry;

H. R. 2350. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion M. Martin Jones;

H. R. 2805. An act for the relief of John F. Oetti;

H. R. 3132. An act for the relief of Sergio and Mara Lamberti;

H. R. 3304. An act for the relief of Jose Cotto Santiago;

H. R. 3412. An act for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar;

H. R. 3664. An act for the relief of Bruce M. Stern;

H. R. 3919. An act for the relief of John S. Steber;

H. R. 3921. An act for the relief of Nicholas C. Hadjipateras, Pipitsa N. Hadjipateras, and Costas N. Hadjipateras;

H. R. 4014. An act for the relief of Maria Hoffman;

H. R. 4045. An act for the relief of Katherine L. Anderson, a civil-service employee, permanently injured through negligent treatment at the Army Advisory Group Station Hospital in Nanking, China;

H. R. 4136. An act for the relief of Helen M. Booth;

H. R. 4142. An act for the relief of Ralph D. Kinney;

H. R. 4221. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Patricia Joyce Dunn, a minor;

H. R. 4601. An act for the relief of Jeanette Passayan-Capodistria;

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of J. R. Fleming & Co.;

H. R. 4709. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims arising out of certain blasting operations on the Merrimack River;

H. R. 4775. An act for the relief of Harold L. Corzett, commander, United States Naval Reserve;

H. R. 4832. An act for the relief of Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio;

H. R. 4954. An act for the relief of Jacob F. Hutt and Anderson E. Humphrey;

H. R. 4989. An act to provide for the payment of just compensation to John H. Estate, Ltd., a Hawaiian corporation, for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 5981. An act for the relief of Claiborne V. Wagley;

H. R. 6020. An act for the relief of Richard H. Sears;

H. R. 6052. An act for the relief of John M. Vick;

H. R. 6095. An act for the relief of Universal Corp., James Stewart Corp., and James Stewart & Co., Inc.;

H. R. 6312. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Joseph Lundborg and others against the United States;

H. R. 6417. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frieda Gray (formerly Frieda Putman);

H. R. 6442. An act for the relief of Mrs. Martha Reid;

H. R. 6463. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shikaju Nakashima;

H. R. 6578. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gunnborg Janson Hamilton;

H. R. 6586. An act for the relief of Stamatie Amersonis;

H. R. 6696. An act to provide that the district judge of the eastern, middle, and western districts of Pennsylvania shall become a district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania alone when the first vacancy occurs in that district;

H. R. 6657. An act for the relief of Georges Jules Louis Sauvage;

H. R. 6707. An act for the relief of Sirius Proestopoulos;

H. R. 6750. An act for the relief of Achilleus Maroullis;

H. R. 6804. An act for the relief of certain Italian aliens;

H. R. 6885. An act for the relief of E. Elmer Mynatt;

H. R. 7012. An act for the relief of Anna Ellero and Clara Ellero;

H. R. 7202. An act for the relief of Alexander Newman;

H. R. 7282. An act for the relief of Cornelius VerSluis;

H. R. 7297. An act for the relief of Ignas Malolius;

H. R. 7364. An act for the relief of Jenny Irene Benson;

H. R. 7613. An act for the relief of Mrs. Miyako Horikoshi Spaulding and Mabel Miya Spaulding;

H. R. 7810. An act for the relief of M. S. Davis;

H. R. 7814. An act for the relief of Stella Matutina Kazuko Yamazaki;

H. R. 7921. An act for the relief of Eva T. Ross;

H. R. 8009. An act for the relief of Enrica Gianoli;

H. R. 8061. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yuki Sugimoto Murphy and David Murphy;

H. R. 8069. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiki Kohga Brooks;

H. R. 8073. An act for the relief of Kimiko Iso and her minor daughter, Midori;

H. R. 8134. An act for the relief of Elona Schwietza and her son;

H. R. 8153. An act for the relief of Oniyoko Akashi;

H. R. 8219. An act for the relief of Tadeusz Herka;

H. R. 8423. An act for the relief of Yuriko Mizumoto;

H. R. 8450. An act for the relief of Raief Neahem, Ifief Neahem, and Ihnen Neahem;

H. R. 8477. An act for the relief of Marcel Rene de Romanett;

H. R. 8584. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tokio Sato Keating, Terry Yoichi Keating, and Betty Jean Keating;

H. R. 8741. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nobuko Yonashiro Martin and Gerald Philip Martin;

H. R. 8751. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yoshiko Ogiso Peterson;

H. R. 8759. An act for the relief of Rev. Andrew Chai Kyung Whang;

H. R. 8772. An act for the relief of Ah-Kim Wong;

H. R. 8792. An act to amend the statute relating to certificates of trade-mark registrations;

H. R. 8794. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eiko Yoshizawa Lendrum and Charles Robert Lendrum, Jr.;

H. R. 8795. An act for the relief of Benjamin Paglinaman;

H. R. 8824. An act for the relief of Tokuko Murayama;

H. R. 8929. An act for the relief of Vincent F. Leslie;

H. R. 8935. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jaye Kurusu Maddox;

H. R. 8956. An act for the relief of Mrs. Claude Morita and Rodney Morita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3611. An act to provide for the preparation, printing, and distribution of a list of all persons who died at any time after May 26, 1941, and before December 31, 1946, while serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States; and

H. R. 8816. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain hospital supplies and equipment of the United States to the city of Gulfport and to Harrison County, Miss.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3906. An act to amend the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act, as amended;

H. R. 5507. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the protection of the Bald Eagle," approved June 8, 1940;

H. R. 6533. An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7043. An act to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road or public toll road through the wildlife refuge located in Princess Anne County, Va.;

H. R. 7192. An act to provide benefits for the widows of certain persons who were retired or are eligible for retirement under section 6 of the act entitled "An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other

works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1918, as amended;

H. R. 7209. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing studies of Atlantic coast fish species for the purpose of developing and protecting fish resources;

H. R. 7689. An act to amend certain acts relating to the retired status of the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

H. R. 7887. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an amendment to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Compact, and repealing the limitation on the life of such compact;

H. R. 7954. An act to authorize the commercial operation of certain vessels on the Great Lakes;

H. R. 8417. An act to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the regulation of motor carriers engaged in commerce to and from the Territories and possessions of the United States; and

H. R. 8617. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4542. An act to provide for the classification of the public lands in Alaska;

H. R. 6038. An act to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,419, for certain land in California;

H. R. 6861. An act to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain;

H. R. 7146. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States," so as to provide that moneys received from the disposal of material from reserved school section lands in Alaska shall be credited to the Territory;

H. R. 7675. An act to authorize the addition of certain land to Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the State of Tennessee;

H. R. 7709. An act to provide for the acquisition, investigation, and preservation of lands to commemorate the historic Fort Caroline settlement, St. Johns Bluff, Fla.;

H. R. 7977. An act to authorize the city of Buffalo, Wyo., to make additional uses of certain lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8028. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the remaining Government lots in the town site of St. Marks, Fla.; and

H. R. 8366. An act to supplement the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2029), relating to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5003. An act to provide for the exchange between the United States and the State of New York of certain lands and interests in lands at Manhattan Beach, Kings County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 7268. An act to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide a more effective distribution of mortgage loans insured under title I, to give holders of such mortgage loans preference in the refinancing of loans on a noninsured basis, to adjust the loan limitations governing title II loans so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 8767. An act to authorize the exclusion from the mails of all obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile articles, matters, things, devices, or substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 8845. An act to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Kennebec County, Maine, to the town of Chelsea; to the Committee on Finance.

H. J. Res. 434. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the California World Progress Exposition; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session.

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Charles M. Spofford, of New York, to be the United States deputy representative on the North Atlantic Council, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive J, Eighty-first Congress, second session, the texts of the Telegraph Regulations (Paris Revision, 1949) and final protocol annexed to the International Telecommunication Convention, which were signed in the French language at Paris on August 5, 1949; with reservations (Ex. Rept. No. 9).

ORIGIN OF FEPC LEGISLATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN AND PROGRAM OF ACTION ADOPTED BY THE NAACP

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the ideological origin of FEPC legislation, prepared by him, and also a copy of a program of action adopted by the NAACP in 1919, which appear in the Appendix.]

AN EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Excellent Appointment," published today in the New York Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOUTH KOREAN MANPOWER RESOURCES—ARTICLE BY HENRY G. MAZLEN

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a paper entitled "South Korean Manpower Resources," written by Henry G. Mazlen, social scientist-demographer, which appears in the Appendix.]

ON THE HOME FRONT—EDITORIAL FROM THE OIL CITY COURIER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "On the Home Front," published recently in the Oil City (Pa.) Courier, which appears in the Appendix.]

VETERANS' PREFERENCE—ARTICLE FROM VFW MAGAZINE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Tricking the Veterans Out of His Job," written by Omar B. Ketchum, director, national legislative service, VFW, and published in the VFW magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the practice, it is not necessary to make such a request.

The Secretary will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter I—District of Columbia," on page 2, line 3, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "\$9,800,000" and insert "\$11,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter II—Legislative Branch," on page 3, after line 1, to insert:

SENATE

SALARIES AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF SENATORS, MILEAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND OF SENATORS, AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

For compensation of Senators, \$1,200,000.

For mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, \$51,000.

For expense allowance of the Vice President, \$10,000.

For expense allowance of Senators, \$240,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 11, to insert:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation of officers, employees, clerks to Senators, and others, as authorized by law, including increased and additional compensation provided by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

For compensation of the Vice President of the United States, \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 4, to insert:

For clerical assistance to the Vice President, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in multiples of \$5 per month, \$50,370.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 3, to insert:

CHAPLAIN

Chaplain of the Senate, \$2,646.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 5, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For office of the Secretary, \$355,230.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 7, to insert:

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

For professional and clerical assistance to standing committees, \$1,441,040.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 10, to insert:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

For professional and clerical assistance to the Select Committee on Small Business, \$88,645, authorized by Senate Resolution 272, agreed to May 26, 1950, at rates of compen-

sation to be fixed hereafter in accordance with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, with respect to standing committees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 17, to insert:

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$30,280.

For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Minority at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$30,280.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

For administrative and clerical assistants and messenger service for Senators, \$5,036,185.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 4, to insert:

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, including three in lieu of two assistant chief telephone operators at \$2,400 each and thirty-three in lieu of twenty-six telephone operators at \$1,800 each, \$1,025,789.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 9, to insert:

OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND THE MINORITY

For the offices of the secretary for the majority and the secretary for the minority, \$57,060.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, beginning on page 5, after line 13, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Legislative reorganization: For salaries and expenses, legislative reorganization, including the objects specified in Public Law 663, Seventy-ninth Congress, \$100,000.

Senate policy committees: For salaries and expenses of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, \$45,715 for each such committee; in all, \$91,430.

Joint Committee on the Economic Report: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, \$125,585.

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, including the objects specified in Public Law 20, Eightieth Congress, \$160,135.

Joint Committee on Printing: For salaries for the Joint Committee on Printing, \$22,080, for expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory, \$1,600, and for travel and subsistence expenses at rates provided by law for Senate committees, \$4,500; in all, \$28,180.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: To enable the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to engage by contract the services of private firms or corporations for making a survey of certificated interstate and overseas air carrier operations, with a view to drafting legislation requiring the separation of mail compensation from any Federal subsidy payments, \$200,000.

Vice President's automobile: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Vice President, \$5,480.

Automobile for the President pro tempore: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the President pro tempore of the Senate, \$5,480.

Automobiles for majority and minority leaders: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of two automobiles, one for the majority leader of the Senate, and one for the minority leader of the Senate, \$10,960.

Reporting Senate proceedings: For reporting the debates and proceedings of the Senate, payable in equal monthly installments, \$122,785.

Furniture: For services in cleaning, repairing, and varnishing furniture, \$2,900.

Furniture: For materials for furniture and repairs of same, and for the purchase of furniture, \$18,000.

Inquiries and investigations: For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate or conducted pursuant to section 134 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, including compensation for stenographic assistance of committees at such rates and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, but not exceeding the rate of 25 cents per hundred words for the original transcript of reported matter; and including \$50,000 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution No. 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, and Public Law 20, Eightieth Congress, \$832,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses (as defined in the Travel Expense Act of 1949) at rates in excess of \$9 per day except that higher rates may be established by the Committee on Rules and Administration in the case of travel beyond the limits of the continental United States: *And provided further*, That hereafter the provisions of section 134 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, shall be applicable to the Select Committee on Small Business.

Folding documents: For folding speeches and pamphlets at a basic rate not exceeding \$1 per thousand \$28,875.

Materials for folding: For materials for folding, \$1,500.

Fuel, and so forth: For fuel, oil, cotton waste, and advertising, exclusive of labor, \$2,000.

Senate restaurants: For repairs, improvements, equipment, and supplies for Senate kitchens and restaurants, Capitol Building and Senate Office Building, including personal and other services, to be expended under the supervision of the Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, \$42,500.

Motor vehicles: For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, \$9,560.

Miscellaneous items: For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, \$786,895.

Packing boxes: For packing boxes, \$3,000.

Postage stamps: For office of Secretary, \$500; office of Sergeant at Arms, \$225; offices of the secretaries for the majority and the minority, \$100; in all, \$825.

Air-mail and special-delivery stamps: For air-mail and special-delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate as authorized by law, \$10,250.

Stationery: For stationery for Senators and for the President of the Senate, including \$10,000 for stationery for committees and offices of the Senate, \$58,500.

The Sergeant at Arms is authorized and directed to secure suitable office space in post office or other Federal buildings in the State of each Senator for the use of such Senator and in the city to be designated by him:

Provided, That in the event suitable space is not available in such buildings and a Senator leases or rents office space elsewhere, the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to approve for payment, from the contingent fund of the Senate, vouchers covering bona fide statements of rentals due in an amount not exceeding \$900 per annum for each Senator.

Commencing with the fiscal year 1949 the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to protect the funds of his office by purchasing insurance in an amount necessary to protect said funds against loss. Premiums on such insurance shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Salaries or wages paid out of the foregoing items under "Contingent expenses of the Senate" shall be computed at basic rates as authorized by law, plus increased and additional compensation as provided by the "Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945," as amended, and the "Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 7, to insert:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

For an amount to enable the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures to carry out the duties imposed upon it by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726), to remain available during the existence of the committee, \$20,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] with reference to an item appearing on page 4. I realize we have passed beyond that point, but I should like to ask a question relating to the provision making appropriations for the Select Committee on Small Business. The question I desire to ask is this: Under the language of the provision will the employees of the Small Business Committee be on the same basis as employees of a regular standing committee so far as retirement benefits are concerned?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding. They are in the same category.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was the intention of the committee to make them so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The reason I asked the question is that it is my understanding that this committee's employees, who are paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate, are paid as employees of a separate committee, such, for instance, as the employees of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report; that the latter employees are not eligible for retirement because they are regarded, I assume, as being more or less temporary employees, whereas the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate, when it was established by the Senate, was set up as a permanent committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. And it was to have the same status as a permanent committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was the intention of the Senate that that be true.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment on page 19, after line 7, is agreed to. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Capitol buildings and grounds," on page 22, after line 6, to insert:

Subway transportation, Capitol and Senate Office Buildings: For maintenance, repairs, and rebuilding of the subway transportation system connecting the Senate Office Building with the Capitol, including personal and other services, \$2,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 11, to insert:

Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel and for personal and other services, including four female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms at \$1,500 each and one at \$1,560, for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building; to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, \$643,900.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this amendment deals with the proposal to erect a new Senate Office Building. I should like to have the attention of Senators on that subject. The subcommittee made a study of the proposed plan and recommended to the full committee by a vote of 4 to 3 that the building be erected. Then the full committee voted, 11 to 7, as I remember, to report the item favorably to the Senate.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I opposed the appropriation for the erection of this new Senate Office Building. I should like at this time to read the sum and substance of remarks made by me last year when the same item was rejected by the Senate.

In May of 1949 I made a survey of the space presently assigned and occupied by Senators and committees. The results of my study indicated rather forcefully to me that if the proper committees of the Senate should carefully investigate the matter they would find that the Senate's space needs could be solved by a more equitable distribution of space already available—and all without the necessity for expensive new construction.

The following are the results of my study, and prompted me to oppose the appropriation of funds last year to construct an elaborate new Senate Office Building.

At the time of my survey there were 390 rooms assigned to Senators, 328 in regular suites in the Senate Office Building, 31 detached rooms in the Senate Office Building, and 31 rooms in the Senate wing of the Capitol. I should like to emphasize that these rooms are assigned to Senators, and not to committees or any other type of activity.

If these rooms were equally divided among the 96 Senators, each Senator would have 4 rooms, with 6 rooms remaining. Under the present assignment, however, about one-third of the Senators have 3 rooms, one-third have

4 rooms, and one-third have 5 and 6 rooms, as indicated below:

Number of Senators with 6 rooms-----	5
Number of Senators with 5 rooms-----	26
Number of Senators with 4 rooms-----	35
Number of Senators with 3 rooms-----	30
Total-----	96

It seems that space is assigned to Senators on the basis of seniority. This is wrong. In general, space should be assigned on the basis of need and in accordance with the size of the Senator's State in terms of population. To a certain extent the Senate has previously recognized this formula as being fair and logical by providing proportionately more money for clerical assistance to Senators from large States as compared to Senators from smaller States. We have, as a result of this, several Senators with many staff members in a few rooms, and at the same time, Senators with a few staff members in more rooms than may be needed. It is certainly reasonable to assume that 6,000,000 residents of a State will write more letters and demand more from their Senators than will 500,000 inhabitants of another State.

I find that the present system of assignment brings about several gross inequities, such as these:

A Senator from New York with a population of 13,500,000, has 4 rooms. His staff numbers 15. Allowing one room for himself, the number of persons per room is five.

A Senator from a New England State, however, with a population of about 800,000, has 5 rooms. His staff numbers only seven, and the number of persons per room, excluding the Senator's room, is 1.75. This is merely one instance among many of this sort.

I feel that the principle of the formula, by which Senators are provided clerical assistance is correct and logical, in that it recognizes that Senators from large States are likely to have more office work to do. Certainly the same formula should be applied in assigning space where their assistants work.

My survey showed, as of May 15, 1949, that the 96 Senators employed 801 people in their offices. That total was obtained from information furnished me by each office. As previously indicated, there are 390 rooms assigned to Senators. Allowing 1 room for each Senator's own use, 294 are available for the staffs. That would reflect an average of 2.7 persons per room, if rooms were more equitably assigned and all rooms properly and wisely utilized.

Three persons per room is not an unduly crowded situation. I have yet to see a room either in the Senate Office Building or in the Capitol that will not adequately and comfortably accommodate three persons.

As a matter of fact, even under the present allocation of space, most offices are not overcrowded. My survey shows that in the offices of 67 Senators—more than two-thirds—the average number of persons per room, excluding the Senator and his room, is three or fewer. In the offices of another 18 Senators the average is between three and four persons. In only 11 offices does the average run

higher than four persons per room, and only one of those runs higher than five.

In addition, I am convinced that there is considerable space, in both the Capitol and the Senate Office Building, presently occupied by activities having little relative importance. This space could be used by Senators. I refer specifically to space occupied by liaison activities of Government agencies and overage in space occupied by committees whose work has considerably declined.

One of the reasons advanced for the new building is to provide a suite of five rooms for each standing committee chairman. This is regardless of the amount of business the Senator or the committee may have, and is, therefore, basically and fundamentally inequitable. My survey shows that most of the committee chairmen already have five rooms or more. Of the 15 committee chairmen, 3 have 6 rooms, 8 have 5 rooms, 3 have 4 rooms, and 1 has 3 rooms. Their offices do not appear crowded. The average number of persons per room in offices of committee chairmen is 2.14, ranging from the lowest average of 1.60 to the highest of 3, except for the one chairman with only three rooms, where the average is 3.50.

As to the committees proper, there are 52 rooms assigned to the 15 committees, which employ 124 persons. Thus, the average number of persons per room is 2.4. In this connection, it should be borne in mind that of 11 of the committees, each has a very large committee room. The same wide variation that was noted among Senators' offices is apparent in committees, and very clearly a reassignment of committee space is desirable. For instance, the Finance Committee has five rooms and four employees, an average of 0.8 per room. The average per room ranges up to five in the case of Expenditures in Executive Departments.

To my mind, the above data proves that adequate space is available for Senators' offices and for committees. Our real problem is not the acquisition of more space, but better utilization and distribution of the space we already have.

Mr. President, that, in substance, was the statement made by me last year in opposition to the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for a start toward the erection of the new Senate Office Building.

This year our subcommittee went into detail in order to try to determine how the required space could best be provided.

I realize that some Senators are cramped for space; but I think it is on the verge of folly for us to erect the elaborate building now in contemplation, just to take care of the few Senators who require extra office rooms.

In our investigation we requested the architects to devise some way by which the present plans could be modified in such a manner that the building could be reduced in size and in cost. Pursuant to our request, they submitted a modified plan, which is called plan 4-B, under which the large number of office and hearing rooms originally contemplated were reduced in number, and the

two extra large hearing rooms, the auditorium, the swimming pool, and the physical-therapy department were eliminated. Even with these modifications, however, the cost of erecting the building would be only \$4,600,000 under the cost of the originally planned structure.

We also had the architects submit an estimate on what we classified as a utility building, comprising one wing facing on First Street, in order to provide additional office space for the Senators. We tried to get the architects to use the same plans, if that were possible. However, we were told that it would be impossible for the same plans to be used if only the building facing First Street were erected, and if the wings facing on B and C Streets were eliminated.

So, Mr. President, the architects took the position that it would be necessary for them to scrap the present plans and specifications if we were to build a simple structure of the kind which, in my opinion, would suffice to give to all Senators adequate space, and leave some extra space remaining for future needs.

At this time I should like to review the specifications of the three plans we now have before us, namely, the ones which were studied by the subcommittee of which I am chairman.

The first plan is for the complete new building which was authorized, as will be recalled, in an appropriation bill in 1948. Under that plan, 329 office rooms would be provided.

Next, plan B, a revision of the first plan, would provide for 220 office rooms.

And lastly, plan C, which was suggested by myself and other members of the subcommittee, would provide for 206 rooms.

With respect to hearing rooms, instead of 18, as called for by the original plan, plan 4-B would reduce the number to 9. The third plan or plan C, calls for from six to nine hearing rooms. We could even further reduce the number if we deem it advisable.

A consideration which disturbs me is that the fine building we now have, with all its magnificent hearing rooms, would more or less become obsolete. It was the idea of the planners of the new building—and it is still their idea, if we should go through with the plan as originally drafted—to provide hearing rooms for each of the major committees within the New Senate Office Building. This would mean that the chairman of each committee and his entire office force, together with the staff of the committee, would have to move into the new building. I repeat, the new building was planned originally to accommodate all committees with their staffs, and the committee rooms which would be left vacant in the present building would be turned over to subcommittees.

In addition to the large hearing rooms with which the committees would be provided in the proposed new building, it is contemplated that there will be also two rooms of the same size as the caucus room in the present Senate Office Building, which would be used to accommodate any committees that may be

conducting hearings on bills in which a large number of people might be interested.

And further, it is also contemplated in the proposed new building that there will be a large auditorium with a capacity of 500 persons, equipped for radio, television, and motion pictures. Provision is also made for a swimming pool and physical therapy department.

As I expressed myself on the floor of the Senate last year, the building originally contemplated would represent the last word in accommodations.

Under all three plans—that is, in the plan which is now in contemplation, as well as the 4-B plan and the new plan 4-C which we propose—a cafeteria, and a school for pages would be provided. In all the plans there is provision for storage facilities, facilities to accommodate the building guard and maintenance force; receiving and shipping facilities; extension of subways to the new building; a telephone exchange and other communication facilities; a folding room; storage space, and additional quarters for the Sergeant at Arms.

With respect to the garage, as I pointed out last year, the new building would provide space for 200 cars. The garage would be built on the first story. It would be a covered garage, whereas under Plan 4-B, although the garage would be constructed in the same place as that provided under the original plan, it would not be under cover. In the case of the third plan which we considered, an open parking space would be provided instead of a garage. Accommodations for the post office substation would be provided both under the original plan and under plan 4-B. There would be no special hearing rooms, either in plan 4-B or under the new plan which several of us in the subcommittee propose. The auditorium would be eliminated, as would also the swimming pool, provided under the original plans.

The overall cost of the originally contemplated building, including the accommodations I have just enumerated, would be \$18,600,000. Under plan 4-B, which, as I indicated, would reduce the number of office rooms from 329 to 220 and would eliminate half the hearing rooms, as well as the large auditorium, the cost would be \$14,000,000. The building contemplated under plan 4-C, that is, the new plan, which as I indicated at the beginning of my remarks would require the architects to start from scratch, would be erected of the same materials as those specified in either the original plan or plan 4-B. The essential difference would be that the new building would be a utility office building, providing 206 office rooms and from 6 to 9 hearing rooms, together with all the other facilities for shipping and receiving, telephone exchange, cafeteria, page school, and so forth, but eliminating the swimming pool, auditorium, and two extra large hearing rooms. The number of office rooms could be increased by further reducing the number of hearing rooms. As I just mentioned the new plans considered by the subcommittee contemplate from 6 to 9 hearing rooms.

The number could be reduced to three or four or five, and the additional space converted to office use. The cost of that building, which as I said would be a building that will meet all of our needs, but without the frills, would be in the neighborhood of \$11,700,000.

As I indicated a moment ago, I desire to assist, if I can, in the erection of a new office building—if one is actually needed. I am frank to confess that some Senators are today cramped for space. Additional space should be provided for them. However, I believe it would be folly for us, as a means of fulfilling that need, to erect the grand new structure which is now in contemplation.

The alternative which I wish to propose is simply that the provision now under consideration be stricken from the bill, and that in lieu thereof there be inserted an amendment which I intend to send to the desk. The purpose of my amendment is to appropriate the remainder of the sum authorized in 1948 for the drafting of plans for the proposed Senate Office Building. It will be recalled that the Congress in 1948 authorized an appropriation of \$25,000 for the purpose of drafting preliminary plans for a new building. Under this authorization, \$15,000 was appropriated, which finally led to the drafting of the present plans for an \$18,600,000 building. There is remaining of that authorization the sum of \$10,000, which could be used by the Commission for the purpose of preparing additional preliminary plans.

I believe that in the light of present world conditions it might be well for the Commission to look further into the building situation. When and if my amendment is adopted in lieu of the committee amendment, it is my purpose to introduce at once a bill which will be referred to the Committee on Public Works with a view of reappraising the situation and endeavoring to find ways and means whereby, if it be found that a building is necessary, one can be constructed more in line with our needs, rather than the elaborate structure now proposed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is there any doubt in the Senator's mind that the Senators of the United States need more space?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that I realized that some Senators are in need of more space; and the Senator knows that last year I made a suggestion which I believe to be a good one and which the committee should look into when it studies the new plans. The Senator knows that the suggestion was discussed before the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And the Senator from Louisiana knows the action which the committee took.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know that. But the point I want to make is this: There has been under consideration for many years, as the Senator knows, a proposal to complete the Capitol Building by extending the east wing. The plans for this extension are already drafted, and would require an expenditure in the

neighborhood of \$6,000,000. If the east wing of the Capitol is completed 42 new rooms will be made available.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If we want to use the Capitol of the United States for that purpose; yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not see why we should not. Many, if not most, of the Senators who preceded us at the time they voted for the present office building had their offices in the Capitol.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will permit me to continue, I should like to suggest that the Senators consider the advisability of making the addition to the east wing of the Capitol, which would provide 42 large rooms, and also two large hearing rooms. It would provide for a large dining room or cafeteria which could be used by both the House Members and the Senate Members. It is true that in the division of the space contained in the new addition, 21 office rooms and 1 hearing room would have to go to the House. But the space on the street floor now occupied by the dining room, and the space where the cooking is done, could be utilized for office space, if need be, either to house a special committee, or for other purposes.

If we erect the addition to the Capitol we shall be doing something which is already in contemplation, something which is beyond the preliminary-planning stage. Last, but not least, Mr. President, it will provide a cafeteria or a dining room where all Senators and all Representatives can be served, along with a greater number of other customers, and thereby the deficit which the Senate has sustained each year in having to pay for the maintenance of the Senate dining room can be obviated. As I recall last year, \$42,000 of the taxpayers' money was used to pay off the deficit incurred in operation of the Senate dining room.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course every Senator is interested in saving the money of the taxpayers. It happens that this body has acted on chapter I of the appropriation bill which we are now considering. We were not worried one bit by providing the people of the District of Columbia with \$12,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money. Sixty-eight Senators have informed the Committee on Public Works that they need space. The Committee on Appropriations decided, practically unanimously, that there is need of more space for the work of the Senators. I might remind the Senator from Louisiana that the Senator from New York, representing the most populous State in the Union, has three rooms in which to carry on his duties and responsibilities.

We do not have to spend \$18,000,000, Mr. President. We could spend a million dollars and provide all the space necessary. But was that the dream of Washington? Was that the dream of Jefferson? Was that the dream of Huey Long, when the capitol in Baton Rouge was constructed?

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to state to my distinguished friend that the proposal which I am now making to the Senate, if the Committee on Public Works is convinced, as I am sure it will probably be, that more space is necessary, would mean that instead of constructing the elaborate building which is in contemplation—we can save millions of dollars and provide adequate space to house or to take care of all Senators. One great difficulty is that the building, as I pointed out a while ago, would be an edifice constructed to the memory of someone.

It would not be a utilitarian building by any means; it would be a building which would provide facilities which may never be used. I have been in the Senate for 14 years, and on only three occasions has it been necessary for us to assemble in a room larger than the caucus room. On those occasions we walked over to the Library of Congress and utilized its auditorium. What is the necessity in these times of deficit spending to build an auditorium for Senators, an auditorium which would cost a huge sum of money, and provide a great many plush seats, and a place for the showing of moving pictures? I say we ought to examine our consciences, and having examined them, eliminate all that unnecessary expense.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to reemphasize one further point. I contend that the hearing rooms are now far enough removed from the Capitol Building. Why place them almost a block farther away than they are now by locating them in the proposed new office building? As I said a moment ago, the purpose of the planners of this new building was to do what—to relegate to subcommittees all the fine hearing rooms that we now have in the present Senate Office Building, and to build 18 brand-new large ones for the standing committees, and bear in mind, that would be done irrespective of the needs of Congress. While it is true that some committees need larger space than other committees, under the present plan all of them would be put in the same category. All of them would be provided with large desks and nice seats and each room would accommodate anywhere from 150 to 200 people.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. Some of the rooms may be necessary, but I say if we must erect a structure to suit our needs we could provide for a building which would be just as substantial as the one which is now proposed, and we could just as well honor Jefferson, Huey Long, Washington, Monroe, and other men who have in times past served their country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. What I have in mind, and what I think other Senators should consider, is the erection of a building which would be utilitarian, and in which every single cubic inch of space would be used. Some of the rooms which

would be provided under the present plan would never be used, or at best would be used only occasionally. On the other hand, the upkeep of the building, such as providing heat in the winter and air conditioning in the summer, would be a constant expense to the taxpayers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to ask the Senator a question, because evidently the Senator from Louisiana has not read the committee report, or is not familiar with the committee's action.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I made a misstatement I shall be glad to have the Senator from New Mexico correct me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator has been discussing elaborate and detailed plans. He has not been discussing what the committee did. On page 11 of the committee's report I find the following language, to which I should like to have the Senator from Louisiana listen as I read it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am listening.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I read the following language:

After full discussion—

Not after listening to the Senator from Louisiana or the Senator from New Mexico, but after full discussion—

the committee voted to request the Senate Office Building Commission to review forthwith the detailed plans of the proposed Senate Office Building—

For what purpose?—
with a view—

Not with a view to carrying out the elaborate plans which the Senator from Louisiana has been discussing for half an hour—

with a view of simplifying the building—

To bring about what?—

to bring about savings, and with the expressed desire of the committee to make the new office building more of a working and utilitarian unit than the present plans contemplate.

That is what the committee decided to do. The committee did not decide to carry out the elaborate plans. It did not decide to build an auditorium, or this or that. The committee instructed the Building Commission to do what it wanted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend from New Mexico that since the language he had read was incorporated in the report I had occasion to discuss the matter with the legislative counsel of the Senate. I was informed that it may not be possible for the present plans to be materially altered because—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am looking at the law. Under the original plan—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this is getting to be a little personal.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator wish to make it personal?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Apparently the Senator from Louisiana would not be trusting the

chairman of the Senate Office Building Commission and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who constitute the Commission, with intending to carry out the instructions of the committee, irrespective of what counsel had in mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from New Mexico may be met by the General Accounting Office on that proposition. I say to the Senator from New Mexico that the law provides for an appropriation not to exceed \$20,000,000 and in substantial accord with the preliminary plans prepared under the authority of the act of June 11, 1947. Those preliminary plans have already been adopted. They cannot be altered, as the Senator knows, except perhaps to make a few changes such as is contemplated under plan 4-B.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And to carry out the instructions of the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from New Mexico. Is it the understanding of the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Louisiana, and was it the understanding of the committee, that the words in the committee report would permit the Building Commission to scrap the present plans, or revise them, and then go ahead?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not. That was the understanding, but that is not written in the law. I wish to say to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts that I am hopeful that the Senate will stand by me in the amendment which I shall propose. The amendment I shall propose will strike from the bill the authorization to go on with the present plans, and places in the bill in lieu thereof a provision to authorize an appropriation of \$10,000 for the purpose of studying new plans.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to be perfectly frank with the Senator as to what I have in mind.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I should fail in my attempt to have the amendment substituted for the present language in the bill, I intend to offer another amendment which would permit to be done legally what is contemplated in the pending bill. Under the provisions of my second amendment, any necessary changes could be made in the present plans, or new plans could be drafted. I am sincere in saying to my good friend from New Mexico—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why does the Senator doubt the sincerity of the majority of the committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not a question of what the committee wishes to do. It is whether it can be done. I say a question arises as to whether it is possible to do what is contemplated by the report.

As I have indicated, the language of the present law authorizes the appropriation. It does not call for the making of plans. The plans have already been executed. The appropriation act states that the money is being appropriated for the express purpose of—doing what? For the purpose of erecting a building substantially in accordance with those plans.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Except that the committee said—

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not care what the committee said. I am reciting what the law states.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Or what the Senator thinks the law is.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Louisiana can yield only for a question, and he can yield only to one Senator at a time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I first yield to the Senator from New Mexico, if he has further questions to ask.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that after full deliberation by the Committee on Appropriations, the hearings before which the Senator from Louisiana attended personally, and in which he was very active in discussing the law, as he understood it, it was decided there that within the law that was passed several years ago, not by the present Congress, but a previous Congress, directing the construction of the Senate Office Building, the committee itself gave the Senate Office Building Commission definite plans and definite instructions as to what they should do under the law? Why does the Senator from Louisiana think the Commission is going to do something different?

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me tell the Senator that, as I pointed out a moment ago, the first action taken by the Senate with respect to this matter was to pass a bill authorizing an appropriation of \$25,000 for the preparation of plans—not for the making of specifications as we now have them—but for the preparation of plans. Of that amount only \$15,000 was actually appropriated, and there remains the sum of \$10,000 to make further plans if the Congress desires to appropriate it. It is to that provision I am now proposing this amendment.

The point is that the plans which have been accepted by the Building Commission contemplate the erection of 18 new hearing rooms. They contemplate moving all committee chairmen, with all of their forces, into the new office building. I say that if we destroy all that, we destroy the plans, and I am backed in that opinion by very capable lawyers of the legislative counsel's office.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have just indicated, if I should fail in the proposal I am now making to the Senate, namely,

to start anew, then I expect to offer another amendment which would give what I believe to be necessary power to the Commission to do what is contemplated by the report. Unless we do that, I doubt very seriously that any new plans can be used in the construction of the office building.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. When Senators address the Chair and the Chair asks the Senator having the floor if he yields, the Chair would like to have the Senator indicate whether he will yield or not.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe that when a Senator is engaged in speaking, a Senator desiring to ask a question ought to realize that the Senator having the floor cannot proceed with his remarks and answer questions at the same time. Senators ought to wait at least until I could get through with a sentence, or until I state that I will yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the Senator has concluded for the moment, will he yield for a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I first yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana if the cost of the proposed Senate Office Building, under existing plans, would not be approximately \$21,000,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct, if we include cost of the ground, the borings, and everything else.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And even if the plans were to be simplified, as has been suggested by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, would not such a building cost at least from fifteen to eighteen million dollars?

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean the modified building?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I gave the exact figures. Exclusive of site, it would cost \$14,000,000 if it were possible to eliminate 9 out of the 18 contemplated hearing rooms, and the auditorium and other facilities.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that even if the plans were simplified, there would be required the appropriation of a very large sum of money, approximately \$15,000,000?

Mr. ELLENDER. For this year it would probably be half of that, but ultimately it would be that; that is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I voted with the Senator from Louisiana in the committee against this appropriation, I will say, but I believe it would be only fair to the Senator from Illinois to point out to him that the contemplated building would include space for telephone facilities, for the House and the Capitol, it would include a tunnel, a new subway, electric lines, and so on.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I think I gave that information a few moments ago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish the Senator would turn to page 23 of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is a heading, "Additional office building for the United States Senate." Is it not true that the language reads as follows:

Construction and equipment of additional Senate Office Building: To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, to continue to provide—

Mr. ELLENDER. "To continue."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes—

for the construction and equipment of a fire-proof office building for the use of the United States Senate, \$10,000,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. Is it not true that the Senate Office Building Commission is given the authority to continue that work?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, but only under the plans heretofore submitted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. Is it not true that the Senate Office Building Commission was instructed on page 11 of the report to do the work in a certain way, and not the way that was originally planned?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have consulted with the lawyers of the legislative counsel's office, and I am informed that, if a substantial change is made in the plans, it may not be possible to have them pass the scrutiny of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If that is so, what has the Senator from Louisiana to worry about? Then we would not spend the money.

Mr. ELLENDER. What the Senator from New Mexico proposes to do is to erect the building as originally planned. That is what he has in mind.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not think the Senator has any justification whatever to say what I have in mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has been working pretty hard for it, and I said in the committee that—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me advise the Senator from Louisiana that the only thing the Senator from New Mexico has in mind is to carry out the wishes of the Senate, and not the wishes of lawyers employed by the Senate. The Senate took its part in passing the law. Others may have made an interpretation of that law, but I still have lots of faith in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished Senator from Illinois referred to the cost of the building. It is not only the cost that we must consider now but also the upkeep of the building. The record shows the maintenance of this building will cost from \$550,000 to \$600,000 a year; and that, of course, is in addition to the funds required to erect the new building.

Where are we going to get the money to construct this new building?

Have we a surplus in the Treasury? The Nation is \$257,000,000,000 in debt, and every dime spent for this building will have to be borrowed. The interest rate on that money will be at least 2½ percent. While I am discussing this phase of it, I will say to the Senator from

Illinois that the twenty-one-odd-million dollars he mentioned a while ago does not include the cost of the furniture and other items that go into the building. I would say it might cost as much as \$22,500,000 altogether properly to equip the building. If on that sum we figure 2½ percent interest per annum, which our Government will have to pay, it will add another half million, and make a total of over a million dollars a year just to maintain this new office space for Senators. To put it another way, it would cost the taxpayers more than \$10,000 for each Senator in order to provide office space for about eight Senators who need additional rooms. That is simply going too far.

As I said, I am proposing an amendment which provides for the appropriation of \$10,000 to enable the Senate Office Building Commission to delve further into the question. I have no doubt the Commission will find a necessity for the erection of some type of building. At that time conditions may be far better than they are now. We may not be at war with the North Korean Communists, as we presently are. We do not know what the future holds for us. The adoption of my amendment would give us a further opportunity to study carefully the whole situation.

Mr. President, let me ask my distinguished colleagues: Are we going to continue to add costs to the operation of the Senate? I have in my hand a table showing the amounts that have been expended on the Senate side and on the House side since 1941. In 1941 the entire cost to operate the House side was \$9,512,000. In that year the entire cost to operate the Senate side was \$3,998,000. Do Senators know what the cost is today? The cost on the House side today is \$21,631,000, and on the Senate side \$11,689,000. And now it is proposed to add still more to that cost.

Let me further point out to the Senate that in 1947 the cost merely to pay the salaries of employees in Senators' offices, that is, the administrative assistants, the clerks, and other such costs, was \$2,754,603.48. In 1948 that cost rose to \$3,882,000. In 1949 it rose to \$4,272,000. For the fiscal year 1950, the cost was \$4,588,776. That is what it cost merely to pay the office force of the Senators. It does not include the amount of money spent for the committees or anything like that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield in a moment. I wish to point out to the Senate by way of emphasis that the cost today merely to pay the Senators' office force is greater by almost \$1,000,000 than the total cost of operating the Senate, including the salaries of the Senators, in the fiscal year 1941. Yet there are Senators who want to heap more expenses on to that cost. If we are to set examples to the various departments, Mr. President, the saving must start here. This is the place to begin saving, instead of piling up costs as is now proposed to be done. I believe that like charity, economy should begin at home.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Can the Senator tell me which particular Senator out of the 96 is wasting money by the hiring of one single unnecessary clerk in his office? Which Senator is doing so? I include the Senator from Louisiana in that question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not want to be personal, but I wish to make a statement, and I speak for myself only. I do not at this time feel justified in spending all the money allotted to me to run my office. What do I do? I am now able to save the taxpayers about \$16,000 that I do not need and I do not use. What is the Senator from New Mexico doing?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am doing just as much, and giving service to the people of my State.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well. I did not mean to go into personalities. I have no administrative assistant today.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Probably the Senator from Louisiana is bright enough not to need one.

Mr. ELLENDER. That may be so; I dispensed with the position of administrative assistant last January. I am not using more than \$10,000 of the basic salary allowance allocated to me. With the gross salaries permitted by that basic allowance, I could employ five or six clerks if I desired at a total cost of around \$16,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment. I say, Mr. President, before this bill is finally passed, the departments will be asked to cut their requirements here and cut them there. In view of that, should we say, "Do not cut us; the legislative branch is excluded"? I say that if we are to ask the departments to take cuts we should begin to cut here. We ought to set the example.

Mr. President, I realize that it may be necessary to supply additional office space for 8 or 10 Senators. I realize that at the present time they are short of space. But it is now proposed, in order to provide space for the few Senators who are badly in need of additional rooms that we spend \$20,600,000.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator from Louisiana know how many Senators are using the entire amount allotted to them for administrative assistants and secretarial staff?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know. I have not made a survey of that. I wish to say to my distinguished friend, however, that I am somewhat alarmed over the trend with respect to expenditures by the Senate, as disclosed by the figures I have just stated. If the Lord spares me, and my distinguished friend, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] should reappoint me to be chairman of the subcommittee to handle legislative appropriations, I promise the Senate to go into details to find whether or not we can cut here and cut there, so as to set an example for the Government departments and if we can accomplish that we can then apply to others the yardstick we apply to ourselves.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I believe I concur with the Senator from Louisiana in the energy he is expending in trying to save the taxpayers' money. May I ask a question? Is the amount of money the Senator is saving in operating his office refunded to the Treasury or is it used for some other purpose?

Mr. ELLENDER. It goes back to the Treasury, as I understand. I know I do not touch it.

Mr. FREAR. I do not know either. I should like to know whether that money is refunded to the Treasury.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure it goes back to the Treasury. I am glad the Senator from Delaware asked the question. If that money does not already go back to the Treasury, I shall make certain that it does.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, while I am on the subject, I desire to make another statement. I am glad my distinguished friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] is present, because what I have to say affects the Committee on the Judiciary. Before the reorganization I served as chairman of the Claims Committee for 4 years. It was then the custom in that committee for individual Senators to handle the various claims referred to the committee. As I recall, 11 or 12 Senators served on that committee. As chairman of the committee I had the clerk each week assign to each Senator who was a member of the committee a certain number of bills to report upon the following week. I had one clerk who handled that work, and the salary paid him at the time was \$3,600 a year.

Mr. President, I am informed that the Committee on the Judiciary has been obliged to have its appropriation increased 20-some-odd thousand dollars in order to operate under the new method now in vogue. Instead of the claims which are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary being considered by the respective members of the committee, they are considered by clerks, and those clerks are the ones who do all the work in connection with the claims, and then report to the Senators who are committee members. That may be a good way to handle the bills, but it is an expensive way. If we were to follow more closely the methods which were in vogue before the reorganization measure was passed I believe we could dispense with much of the extra help now employed by the committee to perform work which, accord-

ing to the views of many Senators, is so necessary to perform.

(At this point, Mr. ELLENDER yielded to Mr. HUMPHREY, who spoke on the amendment on p. 19, relative to the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and debate ensued, all of which, on request of Mr. ELLENDER, and by unanimous consent, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD following his remarks.)

Mr. ELLENDER. During the course of my remarks I cited certain expenditures by the House and Senate since 1941. I tried to show that in 1941 the total expenditures involved in the operation of the Senate of the United States, including payments to Senators, all office help, and all expenses connected therewith, amount to \$3,998,000. Today that amount has increased to \$11,689,000. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table showing these figures be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Expenditures by House and Senate

Year	House	Senate
1941.....	\$9,512,000,000	\$3,998,000,000
1942.....	9,678,000,000	3,998,000,000
1943.....	9,361,000,000	4,249,000,000
1944.....	10,944,000,000	4,472,000,000
1945.....	11,660,000,000	4,672,000,000
1946.....	14,243,000,000	5,916,000,000
1947.....	16,012,000,000	8,167,000,000
1948.....	18,095,000,000	9,546,000,000
1949.....	18,110,000,000	10,288,000,000
1950 (estimate).....	21,392,000,000	11,560,000,000
1951 (estimate).....	21,631,000,000	11,689,000,000

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing the salaries of officers and employees of the Senate, not including payments to Senators. The table shows that for the fiscal year 1947, for the Office of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, the standing committees, and for the Senators' offices, the total amount was \$4,900,298.33. For the fiscal year 1950, just ending, the amount was \$7,102,896.35. I wish also to emphasize the point which I made in the course of my remarks a short time ago, to the effect that the amount of money which is now being spent by Senators for their respective offices amounts to \$4,588,776.28, in contrast to a total for over-all expenses of the Senate in 1941 of \$3,998,000. I ask that the table be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Salaries, officers and employees, Senate

Division of payroll	Amount paid			
	Fiscal year 1947	Fiscal year 1948	Fiscal year 1949	Fiscal year 1950
Secretary and Sergeant at Arms ¹	\$1,093,369.97	\$1,137,169.06	\$1,339,714.12	\$1,477,279.24
Standing committees ²	1,052,324.88	799,310.20	921,119.43	1,036,840.83
Senators' offices.....	2,754,603.48	3,882,889.35	4,272,634.02	4,588,776.28
Total fiscal year.....	4,900,298.33	5,819,368.61	6,533,467.57	7,102,896.35

¹ Includes office of the President of the Senate.

² Includes conference of the majority and the minority.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a detailed statement showing the office space which would be made available in the proposed new building be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I think it would be of value to Senators to have this information available in the RECORD, and I therefore ask that it be incorporated at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Fifteen committee rooms and 3 subcommittee rooms, as follows:

One large committee room with rostrum, for use of Committee on Appropriations, 60 feet by 70 feet by 21 feet, capacity 250 persons.

Three subcommittee rooms for Committee on Appropriations, sizes: one, 32 feet by 78.5 feet by 21 feet, capacity 150 persons; two, 31.4 feet by 66 feet by 12.5 feet, capacity 100 persons each.

Two committee rooms, each 32 feet by 55 feet by 21 feet, capacity 120 persons each.

Twelve committee rooms, each 31 feet by 52 feet by 23 feet, capacity 90 persons each.

One conference room, for Appropriations Committee.

Two special hearing rooms, each size of present caucus room in S. O. B.

One auditorium, with seating capacity of 500 persons, and with facilities for recording hearings, moving-picture projection, broadcasting and television.

Eighteen anterooms for standing committee rooms.

One hundred and thirty-nine office rooms for committee chairman, committee staffs, and senatorial office staff of committee chairman (five office rooms for staff of each committee chairman, 4 office rooms for staff of each committee).

Fifteen office rooms, 1 for banking minority member of each standing committee.

Thirty office rooms for staffs of joint committees and 4 special subcommittees.

Four office rooms for Vice President.

Twelve office rooms for Legislative Counsel.

One library room for Legislative Counsel.

One file room for Legislative Counsel.

One room for press and periodical press.

Three rooms for radio and television.

Eight rooms for page school.

One hundred and twenty-five unassigned office rooms, to be assigned on the basis of 5-room suites to 25 Senators to be moved from old to new building.

MISCELLANEOUS

Cafeteria, seating about 700 persons, with kitchen and other auxiliary services; also, dining rooms with waiter service.

Folding room.

Stationery room.

Barber and beauty shops.

Mechanical and maintenance shops.

Shipping and receiving facilities.

Mail receiving and distribution center.

Telephone exchange.

A physical therapy department, with swimming pool.

Garage space for 200 cars.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a composite table showing the office space which would be made available in not only in the contemplated new office building, but also under plan 4-B and plan 4-C.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Complete new building	Plan 4-B	Plan 4-C
Office rooms.....	329	220	206
Hearing rooms.....	18	9	6-9
Conference room.....	1	1	1
Cafeteria.....	Yes	Yes	Yes
Page boys' school.....	Yes	Yes	Yes
Storage facilities.....	Yes	Yes	Yes
Facilities for building guard and maintenance force.....	Yes	Yes	Yes
Receiving and shipping area.....	Yes	Yes	Yes
Extension of subway to new building and construction of pedestrian tunnels between present Senate Office Building and proposed new building.....	Yes	Yes	Yes
Telephone exchange and communications.....	Yes	Yes	Yes
Folding room, storage and other quarters for Sergeant at Arms force.....	Yes	Yes	Yes
Garage for 200 cars.....	Yes	Yes	(1)
Post office.....	Yes	Yes	None
Anterooms for standing committees.....	18	9	None
Special hearing rooms (size of caucus room in Senate Office Building).....	2	None	None
Auditorium (500 persons capacity).....	1	None	None
Physiotherapy and swimming pool.....	Yes	None	None

¹ Open parking space.

Estimated cost: Complete new building, \$18,600,000; plan 4-B, \$14,000,000; plan 4-C, \$11,700,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now send to the desk an amendment which would strike the language presently under consideration beginning at line 24 on page 23, and ending at line 4, on page 24, and in lieu thereof would place in the bill the language of the amendment.

I wish to reiterate that the purpose of this amendment, which I ask to have considered, is to appropriate the balance of the \$25,000 heretofore authorized, for the purpose of studying plans or devising ways and means by which Senators may be provided with more space. Under my amendment the commission which is authorized by the Senate to study the problem would be in a position to go forward with new plans. I desire to reemphasize the fact that in view of the present world situation I honestly and sincerely believe that this question should be studied further and the commission should use every effort at its command to propose a more or less utilitarian building which would provide basic services for Senators, rather than the monumental-type building now proposed under the adopted plans.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator feel that we could get twice as much space or at least the same amount of space for half the money if we go along on the basis of a substantially modern and simple office building?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about it.

Mr. TAFT. We already have a monumental building in the Senate Office Building, in which there is a tremendous

amount of waste space, it seems to me, as compared with any privately constructed office building that I have seen. In my opinion we could perfectly well construct a building which would be designed from the standpoint of the most economical use of office space.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly what my amendment proposes. The amendment I propose does not contemplate any additional appropriation other than the \$10,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Ten million dollars.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, \$10,000. The present plans now before the Commission could be used as a basis, if the architects saw fit. If they wished to do so, they could use much of the information which has been gathered. As I pointed out a short time ago, what bothers me most is that I do not believe the Commission would be authorized to make the extensive changes that should be made in the present plans of the proposed new Senate Office Building.

As was emphasized by the architects, in order for the Commission to be in a position to erect a really utilitarian building, one that would do away with all the excess rooms and excess space, they would have to scrap the present plans and start anew. Even though the plans were scrapped, the fees of the architects, and the cost of everything connected with a new utilitarian building giving ample space for Senators, would be a little more than half of what the presently planned monumental structure would cost.

Mr. President, I ask Senators to support the position taken by me on this question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Just a moment. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, beginning with line 24, it is proposed to strike out through line 4, on page 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Plans for additional Senate Office Building: To enable the Architect of the Capitol further to carry out the provisions of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the United States Senate," approved July 11, 1947, \$10,000.

During the delivery of Mr. ELLENDER's speech,

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator from Minnesota desires that I yield to him, I do so at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Do I correctly understand that thus far in the course of the consideration of House bill 7786, the item on page 19, between lines 8 and 15—the item pertaining to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures—has been approved?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to say, since I, too, am deeply concerned about the issue—

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator do so in his own time? I do not wish to lose the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that I strongly object to this useless expenditure of the people's money. Let me say quite frankly, if the Senator will permit me to make an observation—

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota may make a short observation without causing me to lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's emphasis on the adjective, because I am sure the observation will not be too long.

I merely wish to point out that under the Reorganization Act of 1946, the duties of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures were absorbed by the House and the Senate Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

I have brought this issue to the attention of the Senate on several occasions. I am not in any way chastising the Joint Committee for the good work it did up to 1947. We needed the Joint Committee up to that time.

However, this is nothing more than an outright duplication of functions to render service duplicate to that which already is being performed by one of the standing committees of the Senate and one of the standing committees of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, at this moment the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is holding hearings on what is known as the railway mail pay case, the round-trip provisions which pertain to payments for the shipment of mail by the Post Office Department on the railroads. I was chairman of a special Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee which held extensive hearings on the same subject. Not only did we hold hearings on the same subject, but we have on the calendar a bill on the same subject. Furthermore, many of the same witnesses are now testifying before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, after having testified before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Not only that, but the witnesses are using much of the same testimony and are reading many of the same documents. In that connection, Government officials appear and testify. In short, they appear before two committees and give the same testimony before each of them.

Mr. President, I am happy to see the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] come to the floor while this issue is being raised, because it is one which has been before the Senate on previous occasions.

Insofar as the junior Senator from Minnesota is concerned, his position is iron-clad. There is not one iota of evidence to support the continuation of this Joint Committee.

So, Mr. President, I strongly object to having this provision in the bill, and I intend to move for reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. President, at this time I so move.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before the Senator from Minnesota makes the motion, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me, to permit me to make a statement concerning this matter?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course I would not want the Senator to lose the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Tennessee for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Let the Chair state that a motion to reconsider is not now in order, because another amendment is pending.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then I withdraw the motion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at any rate I should like to make the explanation now, if the Senator will permit me to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. This amendment was not suggested by the Appropriations Committee or by any member of the committee, but it was offered by my distinguished and attractive and very handsome friend, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], whose views about economy are well known. Heretofore, as I recall he brought up the amendment on the floor, and it was adopted and became a part of the authorization bill.

Confidentially, although I did not vote for the amendment, I doubt very much whether the Senator from Minnesota will get very far in attempting to remove it from the bill. The Senate has a great deal of confidence in these matters in the Senator from Virginia, and I doubt whether the Senator from Minnesota will get very far in his effort. I wish to make that explanation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate the explanation. I wish to say to my friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that I am well aware of the fact that I may not get very far in reference to this item. However, I wish to say again that insofar as the legislative functions of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures are concerned, those functions are appropriately referred, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, to the House and the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

I note that of recent date the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures was holding hearings on legislative matters identical with those upon which a Senate committee has held hearings.

Recently on the floor of the Senate I said that I consider this to be more than just an ordinary controversy. It is unwise, it is unfair, it is beneath the dignity of this body to place the responsibility for a full-scale investigation of

a particular agency of Government in the hands of a standing committee, whose chairman appoints a subcommittee to carry out committee functions of investigation and study, but then, once the study has been completed and a bill on the subject has been prepared and reported and is on the Senate calendar, to find that another committee does identically the same work—hears the same witnesses and receives the same testimony.

Mr. President, this has gone on too many times. I merely register by objection. I am not so foolish as to believe that I shall be able to persuade the Congress to do away with this joint committee; but I say it is just as useless as livery stable at a Ford automobile plant. It is time this joint committee were abolished.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to comment upon this matter at this time, except to say, as the Senator from Tennessee already has said, that the Senate itself has already passed on the issue and has authorized appropriation of the \$20,000. As the Senator has well said, the Senate already has acted on the proposal.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Delaware for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate the Senator's yielding, at this point. As one who believes in economy in the Government as much as does any other Member of the Senate I rise to support the full appropriation requested by the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and to express not only my disapproval but disgust with the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. In my opinion this committee under the chairmanship of the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], has made a greater contribution toward promoting economy in Government than has any other Senate committee, and there is no Member of the United States Senate who has contributed more toward good sound government than has the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

What makes the attack on this committee even more unjustified is that the attack comes from one who has consistently voted against any reduction in Federal expenditures. In fact he once made the statement on the floor of this Senate that he does not even believe in the necessity of a balanced Federal budget. Now he makes a great furor about a \$20,000 item in a \$34,000,000,000 appropriation bill. I am confident that he is the only Member of the Senate who will vote for his motion.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the animosity of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to this committee is well known. He has made frequent attacks upon and many misrepresentations

with respect to this committee. I undertook to answer 10 of the misrepresentations, which he could not question, when I addressed the Senate a little while back on this subject.

The Senator from Minnesota says that this expenditure of \$20,000 is the No. 1 instance of waste and extravagance in the Federal Government. No one could make such a statement as that unless he was influenced and guided by a blind intolerance. To say that an expenditure of \$20,000, even if every cent of it was wasted, was the No. 1 instance of waste and extravagance in a total expenditure of \$40,000,000,000, is so fantastic as to be simply absurd.

I wish to say in explanation of this amendment that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is mistaken in saying that the Senator from Virginia offered this amendment. This amendment was recommended by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is a member.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator. I thought it was he who offered the amendment. I had been so informed.

Mr. Byrd. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKellar. Evidently the use of the Senator's name had its effect, for in the committee a motion to strike out the amendment was rejected, and I believe it was also rejected afterward by the Senate itself.

Mr. Byrd. This appropriation of \$20,000 was requested by the joint committee at the meeting held on March 17. The motion was made, as I recall, by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges]. I think that when we hear this denunciation of the work of the committee, it is well for the Senate to understand its membership. I have the honor to be its chairman. When we met on March 17, I placed in nomination for the chairmanship the name of the distinguished vice chairman of the committee, Representative Doughton, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Doughton declined to accept it, and my nomination was made by him and unanimously adopted by the committee.

Under the law creating this committee, it can be terminated at any time by a majority of the membership. I think that when I read the names of the members of the committee, it will be understood that they would not continue what the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] says is the No. 1 instance of waste and extravagance in all the expenditures of the Federal Government. Eliminating myself, the vice chairman is Representative Doughton, a man in whom the entire Congress has great confidence, and who is chairman of the great Ways and Means Committee. Other members of the committee on the House side are the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, Representative Cannon, Representative Kerr, Representative Cooper, Representative Taber, and Representative Reed. They unanimously agreed that this committee

should be continued. From the Senate we have as members of the committee the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], the able and splendid chairman of the Appropriations Committee; the Senator from Georgia [Mr. George], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Butler]. In addition, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget are members of the committee.

I do not think that these gentlemen, constituting respected Members of the House and Senate, would deliberately waste \$20,000 a year, as the Senator from Minnesota charges.

Mr. Bridges. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. Byrd. I yield.

Mr. Bridges. Twenty thousand dollars, in the light of the present budget, as the Senator from Virginia well knows, is less than one two-millionths of 1 percent of the total expenditures of the Government. It is simply ridiculous to talk about a \$20,000 waste when hundreds of millions of dollars are being wasted all along the line.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, I want to say, so far as I am concerned, that I think this body, and every Member of it, knows that I am not inclined in the slightest way to waste the Government's money. I do not vote that way, I do not act that way, I do not work that way, and I do not go along with those who do.

Mr. Byrd. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has referred to duplication of effort. Well, there is more or less duplication in nearly all the committees which function in the Senate. One of the greatest duplications that I know of is that there are 12 standing committees of the Senate with the right to approve authorizations for expenditures—12 of them. And an authorization nearly always becomes an appropriation. In a sense, at least, these 12 standing committees are duplicating the work of the Appropriations Committee. That happens in the case of many other committees, where there is overlapping.

Let me say that this committee has been functioning for 9 years, and it is true that, after certain investigations and certain reports were made by the committee, other committees copied what this committee was doing and issued similar reports.

The case about which the Senator from Minnesota is making such an ado now is the investigation of the Post Office Department. The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures was investigating it from the standpoint of the increased deficit resulting from the operations of the Post Office Department. I know of no other committee that made that exact investigation. The Post Office Department is now showing a deficit of \$500,000,000 a year. At the hearings before this committee—which, incidentally, did

not cost anything, since these gentlemen came before the committee and gave their very valuable views when Representative Doughton and other members of the committees was present—we were told that if the railroad increase were granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the deficit of the Post Office Department alone next year would be \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. Humphrey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. Byrd. I will finish my statement first.

When we take the fact that there are many committees spending the people's money, it seems to me that a puny \$20,000 expended in an effort to save some money for the Federal Government and the taxpayers of the country should not be under daily and constant attack by the Senator from Minnesota as now seems to be the case.

Let me give a statement of what this committee is now doing and the investigations it is now undertaking. This committee makes a standard report of Federal employment—the first such report that was made until the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service copied what we were doing. The committee's report on Federal employment shows exactly each month how many new employees are added to and how many are eliminated from the different subdivisions of the Government.

The committee is now working on a report which will be of great interest, and which will show every Federal employee in each county, city, and State, which information is not available from the ordinary branches of Government. I think it will be very important to Senators and Representatives to find out how many employees in each of their counties come under the numerous Government agencies that are employing in all about 2,000,000 Federal employees, with a pay roll of nearly \$8,000,000,000. I am speaking only now of what the committee is undertaking at this time:

First. A special investigation was made of the civilian employment in the Military Establishment, 1945-49. I do not know of any other committee that is doing that.

Second. Employment trends in major employing agencies as compared with the rest of the Government. Those are employment trends in agencies, exclusive of the Military Establishment;

Third. Employment trends in agencies exclusive of the Military Establishment;

Fourth. Making an investigation of the post-office personnel, 1939-49, and pay;

Fifth. The inaccuracies in post-office personnel reporting. This committee condemned it, and was, Mr. President, if you please, the only committee to ascertain that the Post Office Department had inaccurate reporting, whereby from 25,000 to 30,000 employees were not reported in the list of employees as given to the Congress.

Sixth. Civilian employment reduction in the Military Establishment under the

Johnson order of August 24, 1949. I know of no other committee, I know of no agency that is making an investigation to ascertain whether the personnel in the armed services has been reduced as much as it should be, although I desire to compliment Secretary Johnson in saying that he made a reduction of 130,000 civilian employees.

Seventh. Employment in three major agencies, 1939–1948, and average for the first half of 1950;

Eighth. The development of civilian employment incident to the mutual defense assistance program;

Ninth. Employment data incident to the Seventeenth Decennial Census; and

Tenth. Employment transfers incident to reorganization plans effective as of that date.

The committee, during the past year, has completed four major studies on an intracommittee basis; namely, studies on expenditures on foreign programs, employment by localities, top-flight pay bill, and budget analysis.

Staff work has been completed on a revision of the committee's 1947 report on grants-in-aid, in response to a demand for the historical development and current information in this field.

The committee has also complied with many requests from Members of Congress requiring special studies, compilations, and informal reports, and, in addition, has fulfilled more than 200 requests from other Members of Congress and the general public for information not requiring extensive staff work.

I shall not go back and take up the time to show that this committee, during the 9 years it has been operating—and it has only spent \$127,000 in that 9-year period, an average of but \$14,000 a year—has made numerous reports, major reports recommending reduction of expenditures, many of which have been adopted by the Congress.

What purpose does the distinguished Senator from Minnesota have in these constant attacks and insinuations upon the work of this committee, composed of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Budget? I do not know. I think he could devote his time more profitably, perhaps, in connection with some other activities toward economy. If he has ever cast a vote for economy on this floor, I do not know when he did so. He speaks of economy in terms of saving \$20,000 on the part of a committee which, even though I am chairman of it, has done a good work. I am willing to admit that we cannot conduct with such a small sum an investigation of a very careful or inclusive character, but at least we have done something. The committee has kept alive in the public mind the fact that there is such a word as "economy" in the English language. That, alone, Mr. President, is worth the full value of the \$20,000 which has been expended. Not only that, but the committee receives hundreds of letters from citizens which are answered in detail,

giving information as to the transactions of the Government, and other information which the writers of the letters request.

I could extend my remarks much further, Mr. President, but I do not care to do so. I think the Senate is informed with reference to the committee. I do not believe that anything like a majority of Senators agree with the Senator from Minnesota. I think the members of the committee can be trusted. The committee was created with the provision of law that whenever the committee ceased to perform a useful function, the membership itself, by vote, could terminate its activities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield in order that I may make reply to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I did not know, when I yielded, that so much time would be required. I do not have much more to say, Mr. President, and I should appreciate it if the Senator from Minnesota would wait until I conclude my remarks.

I ask unanimous consent that all remarks which have so far been made with reference to the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures be placed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my remarks will not be extended, and I should greatly appreciate being able to make my reply immediately after the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Virginia. I shall limit my remarks.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota may be permitted to reply to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we have listened very attentively to the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana opposing the committee's proposal. It was my purpose to proceed to give the committee's side of the controversy after the Senator had concluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. That will be within a very short time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request that the Senator from Minnesota be permitted to reply to the remarks of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from New Mexico and to the Senator from Louisiana.

I wish to say that the junior Senator from Minnesota has never for a single minute attacked the caliber and the leadership qualities of the distinguished members of the well-known Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures. I regret the fact that the Senator from Virginia has again seen fit to introduce personalities and to become personal toward me, thus confusing the issues. It has been the contention of the junior Senator from Minnesota, which he has documented by reports on the floor of the Senate, that the committee is one which duplicates the work and functions which have already been

assigned under existing law. Whether \$20,000 is too much or too little is not the point. The point is that there is already established governmental machinery in standing committees which do the job of this joint committee. I regret that the Senator from Virginia has not faced up to my arguments but has instead mistaken the merits of my proposal as a personal attack against him. Personal animosity has not at all been my motivation or my guide. I do suggest, however, from the nature of the Senator's comments on March 2 and again today that it may well be a vital consideration in his own attitude and presentation.

I am impressed by what the Senator from Virginia said in his most eloquent and persuasive manner about the splendid work the committee is doing. It may be a great program, but I submit to the Senator from Virginia that the bulk of that work logically falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. If that committee is not doing its job, then the committee of which the Senator from Virginia is chairman—

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. For a question.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to ask the Senator with reference to the resolution which he submitted. Why does he not have a hearing on his resolution? He is a member of the committee. I assume he is willing to let the Senate be the final judge.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am more than happy to do so.

Mr. BYRD. Instead of these guerrilla attacks which he is constantly making, let him have a hearing on his resolution and let the Senate decide the matter one way or the other.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The junior Senator from Minnesota has been cooperative with the committee of which he is a member. The committee has had the responsibility for all of the reorganization plans sent down by the President, and the committee has been extremely busy. The chairman of the committee and I discussed plans for my resolution. In view of the fact that time-consuming hearings were held on the reorganization plans, and in view of the fact that it appeared we could not get action on the proposal during this session, since the majority leader stated that the Senate would adjourn about August 1, it would be difficult to take the time to hold hearings. But I can assure the Senator from Virginia that we will hold hearings and if facts—not sentiment, not consideration such that we happened to like one another and respect one another—will tell the story, there will not be any doubt as to what will happen to the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The Senator from Virginia points out that his committee is making a study of employment. That is a fine thing, and I am all for it. I have read the figures. But I would remind the Senator from Virginia that Civil Service Commission makes the same sort of study, the Bureau of the Budget makes the same kind of study, and the Com-

mittee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments makes a study twice a year, a seasonal study. The information is available. The junior Senator from Minnesota has all that information in his personal files, including information from the Bureau of the Budget—

Mr. BYRD. I wish the Senator from Minnesota would make public that information.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Bureau of the Budget has all that information.

Mr. BYRD. I beg the Senator's pardon. It does not have that information. It does not have the number of employees in each county and city.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The junior Senator from Minnesota has the number of Federal employees in every State of the Union. All we have to do is to ask the Civil Service Commission to provide that information.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator said he had information as to every county and every locality.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota says that if the Senator from Virginia will ask the Civil Service Commission, he can get the information which I have mentioned.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is mistaken. His statement is like many other statements he has made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The junior Senator from Minnesota is not mistaken and has State employment figures in his office. I am very confident that figures for counties and cities are also easily available from the agencies.

What about the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service? What kind of an insinuation is this upon the chairman of that committee, to be told that there has been no study made of the matter of postal employees? The subcommittee of which I am chairman has made a complete study of all the employees of the Government of the United States who would get uniforms if a uniform allowance were made. There is to be a study made of annual leave and sick leave, and hearings will be held upon that question. The Bureau of the Budget has made its preliminary report. Insofar as the Post Office Department is concerned, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has spent months studying the matter.

I shall not belabor the point further except to observe that it is not very persuasive to say that \$20,000 does not mean very much. The fact is that if we are spending \$20,000 on a committee which has no function to perform under the law, it is \$20,000 too much to spend. It is not \$20,000 which is well spent.

The Senator from Virginia concluded his argument with the irrelevant and personal statement, "I wish the Senator from Minnesota would tell us what economy measures he has voted for." The Senator from Minnesota will answer to his constituents for his votes which are in accord with his conscience. He believes very strong in intelligent economy and has so voted. Furthermore, he has a different view of the question of economy. I happen to believe that it is economy to fight the Communists in Europe with the Marshall plan. I happen to be-

lieve that it is economy to appropriate all the funds necessary to fight the Communist menace, and to fight it not only with guns but with ideas and economic rehabilitation. I submit that the most extravagant thing that could be done would be to vote against the point 4 program, or to vote against the Marshall plan. In my opinion, that would be real extravagance.

It is a question of how we interpret economy. Some people believe it is economy to save money and not to have one's teeth fixed. I believe it is economy to have one's teeth checked regularly. Some people believe it is not economy to take care of our natural resources. I believe it is economy to take care of them. I believe it is sound economy to aid people who are fighting in defense of their homeland. Votes have been cast in the Senate which do not go in that direction. At any rate, I shall stack up the votes of the junior Senator from Minnesota with those of the Senator from Virginia. The economy which is advocated by one is the economy to cut off expenditures alone. The economy of the junior Senator from Minnesota is a matter of economizing to the point of protecting our national welfare and national security. In my judgment, such an approach is intelligent economy.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I renew my request that all the remarks pertaining to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures be placed at the end of the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

After the conclusion of Mr. ELLENDER'S speech,

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we all agree with the Senator from Louisiana that we should be as economical as we possibly can. That is the proper attitude for us to take.

We are dealing now with a matter which is of great concern. In the first place, it has been definitely decided, and it is admitted by the Senator from Louisiana, that more space for Senators is absolutely necessary. I have on my desk answers from individual Senators as to their need for more office space, in reply to inquiries made by me as chairman of the Committee on Public Works. Sixty-eight Senators replied that more space was necessary.

The inquiry was brought about by the fact that the Eightieth Congress, in its wisdom or otherwise, did authorize the appropriation for a Senate office building, authorized the expenditure of moneys for planning and designing such a building, and authorized the expenditure of money for the purchase of the real estate necessary. I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations for many years, and I recall vividly the occasion during the Eightieth Congress when the proposal was made to that committee, which was then under the chairmanship of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senate at that time authorized the expenditure.

Of course it is going to cost money, but I want my colleagues to listen to

what I have to say to them. This country was created on an idea. Franklin, Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and the other great men of their time created a concept of freedom and a concept of government that meant something beyond dollars and cents. The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, which we all love and revere, were not idle dreams; they were concepts of free people trying to create a government.

Of necessity, and because it was right and sound, the Government was divided into three branches—the executive, the judiciary, and the Congress. Can anyone believe that in his dream of a beautiful Capitol building Washington thought of what it would cost the American people? Or did he want to make it a symbol of what the American people had created? Why are the folk in the galleries now there? Is it because they come here to look at individual Senators? No; they come here to look at a symbol of free government.

Yes; we could save money. The Capitol does not have to be as it is. We could still have the columns in front, but we could save a great deal of money on other places. But do the American people want us to do that?

The Architect of the Capitol himself is authorized and instructed to proceed, just as soon as this session is concluded, to refurbish the Capitol building, the floors, and other parts. Is that being done for us as individual Senators, or is it being done to represent to the fine people of our country what this Capitol stands for? I wish every child in America could come to Washington and visit the Capitol of his country, irrespective of what it might cost the Government.

Do we judge the Capitol of our country as a matter of dollars and cents, or is it something of which we are proud, something we revere, and for which we are willing to die? Remember the boys in Korea. Remember the white crosses throughout the world. What do they represent? They represent a noble sacrifice for a principle.

Of course, we could build an office building, not for \$4,000,000 or \$18,000,000, but we could build it for \$500,000, and give Senators all the space they needed. Is that what the American people want? The American people are willing to dig down into their pockets and give billions of dollars for war. Are they not willing to give a few million dollars to create something. A committee of this body was in Rome last fall. The Italian Government was constructing a "Union Station" for the railroads. The American people were donating \$4,500,000 for that purpose. Yet there is complaint because we are trying to get something dignified for the American people while we are providing space for those who are temporarily Members of this body.

Mr. President, to me as an American the Senate means a great deal. The Capitol of the United States means much to me, not because of the fact that the people of my State were kind enough to trust me for the moment so that I could walk in and appear here before the Senate and plead for their concept of free-

dom of action, but because it is a dignified symbol of a great Nation.

I wish the Senator from Louisiana were present, because I should like to call attention to the fact that the pending bill contains appropriations amounting to \$43,000,000,000, possibly more money than was spent by this Government in the first hundred years of its existence. It is the American people's money, but the bill contains provisions for the appropriation of money that is not to be spent for the American people, but for others.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator from New Mexico advise me if the President has authority to stop the spending of money provided for by this appropriation in the event of an acute national emergency? I should like to know what the situation would be in that respect.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad the Senator brought up that point.

Mr. AIKEN. What I want to find out is whether the spending of this money in starting construction of a building would be obligatory in the event the exigencies of war dictated otherwise?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not think it would be. I call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the fact that the Eightieth Congress authorized the construction of the building, authorized the purchase of the property, which has been purchased, and authorized the expenditure of money for planning. Five hundred thousand dollars has already been spent for planning. That amount of money would be completely wasted if something is not done in connection with the planning.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont voted against the appropriation 2 years ago, but had in mind to vote for it at this time unless the exigencies of war dictated otherwise.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Committee on Appropriations came to a definite conclusion with respect to the erection of the building, after it had received information from 68 Senators that they wanted additional space. I have now on my desk copies of letters from 68 Senators in which they say they want additional space. I take it for granted they would not try to secure extra space unless they needed it. I have, for example, before me copies of letters, from the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. Both Senators from New York in their letters said they needed additional space. That can easily be understood when we consider the amount of work a Senator from New York is required to do in performing his duties. When we know that a Senator from New York has only three rooms in which all his work is done, nothing else need to be said on that point.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I invite attention to a provision which is to be found on page 469 of the bill as follows:

In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements or greater efficiency of operations.

That matter was discussed in the Committee and reference was made to the fact that the President of the United States has claimed from the beginning the constitutional right—

Mr. CHAVEZ. The inherent right.

Mr. HAYDEN. That notwithstanding an appropriation is made by Congress, he can exercise his judgment as to whether or not the money should be expended.

Mr. AIKEN. Even with respect to a legislative expenditure?

Mr. HAYDEN. With respect to any expenditure. The provision is perfectly wide in its scope. Congress has never by any act gone any further than the language I have read, which I think appears for the first time in an appropriation bill, and which even authorizes the President to establish reserves "for contingencies, or to effect savings." If there were a contingency which required that this money should not be spent there is no question in my mind that the President would have authority to suspend its expenditure.

My first experience in this respect was when once I secured an appropriation to build a bridge across a stream, and made it partly reimbursable from Indian funds. The Indian Bureau did not want it to be made reimbursable, and did not want the bridge built. There was no way that I, as a Representative in Congress, could make the Bureau build the bridge. There is no way in any language contained in this bill by which Congress can compel the President actually to set in motion the steps necessary to put a measure into effect. He can stop the work if he wants to. If there were a national emergency, as the Senator from Vermont has in mind, which required the Commander in Chief of the Nation, the President, to do so, he could stop the construction. There is no question about that in my mind.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, is the Senator perfectly satisfied that there would be no competition for labor and materials with some agency which was engaged in work in connection with major warfare? The Senator feels safe on that score?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do entirely.

Mr. AIKEN. That is what I wanted to find out.

Mr. HAYDEN. At the beginning of the last war I brought before the Senate the Interior Department appropriation bill. It contained authorizations and appropriations for large sums of money to build hydroelectric plants, construct dams, and so forth. I stated to the Senate at that time that if, after the bill became law, we should become involved in a war, I fully expected the

President of the United States to stop the construction of those works if the men and material used for such construction were needed to carry on the war. And that is exactly what the President did.

Mr. AIKEN. If I may I should like to add another word? I voted against this proposal 2 years ago because at that time there was an extreme shortage of both material and labor. I think the Members of the Senate should take what steps are necessary for them to carry on their work, and I feel free in supporting a measure such as this, because I was not one of the 68 who requested more space. But I did want to be sure that if the appropriation were made we would not find ourselves building a new office building for the Senate in competition for material and labor which might possibly be required for a war effort.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has stated correctly what would happen in such an event. Furthermore, the instructions given to the Commission are very definite. The committee wanted to be sure, after it was found that additional space was absolutely necessary, that money was not wasted, so the committee instructed how the money should be used, and for what purpose. On page 11 of the report the following language will be found:

After full discussion, the committee voted to request the Senate Office Building Commission to review forthwith the detailed plans of the proposed Senate Office Building with a view of simplifying the building to bring about savings, and with the expressed desire of the committee—

I repeat, "with the expressed desire of the committee"—

to make the new office building more of a working and utilitarian unit than the present plans contemplate.

Mr. President, I believe the Eightieth Congress acted in keeping with the needs of Members of the Senate, and in keeping with the dignity of the United States of America, when it authorized the construction of the building. Of course, we could build a structure on the premises for \$1,000,000, but I ask in all sincerity, would we want to do so? We can afford to give \$27,000,000 to Greece for the purpose of draining land in the vicinity of Athens. When we can do that, shall we say we cannot spend, in behalf of the American people, a few million dollars to house the Senate of the United States?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from New Mexico a short while ago engaged in a colloquy with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. Is it the Senator's understanding, as chairman of the Senate Building Commission, that the act gives that Commission the power to scrap the present plans and start over again if, when the Commission comes to review the plans, they believe it wise to do so?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to answer my good friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, in this way. I am a great believer in carrying out mandates of the Senate. The Senate said, "Save money." It is the purpose of the Commission—I am sure I speak for the other members of the Commission in saying this—to carry out that mandate. We have spent \$500,000 on plans. If we can utilize any particular part of those plans, and thereby can make use of the money we have spent in that way, I think it would be within our power to do so. If it is necessary, in order to carry out that mandate, to do those things, that is what the Commission has in mind to do.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That would include, would it not, scrapping the plans, if in the opinion of the Commission, on the basis of its conclusion, it was necessary to go that far?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Commission had to go that far to carry out the mandate, that would be done.

The first thing the committee decided upon and insisted upon was that something be done in a hurry, but the Committee did not want waste and did not want the elaborateness called for by the plans prepared during the Eightieth Congress.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said that we have been worrying about this matter for 6 or 7 years and now he wanted the Commission to go to work and begin construction of some kind, without waste.

That is why in the report the Commission was definitely instructed what to do. The Appropriations Committee wanted the appropriation made only for that reason. The Committee decided that Senators need more space. I shall not insert in the RECORD the names of the Senators who need more space; but 68 Senators out of the 96 need more space.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this time, to permit me to comment about the need for space?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. HAYDEN. The one Senator, above and beyond all others in the Eightieth Congress who was responsible for the authorization of this new building, was former Senator Brooks, of Illinois, who at that time was chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

At the time I did not pay very great attention to the proposal, because coming from a State with a comparatively small population and never having utilized my full allowance for clerical hire in my office, I got along very well with the rooms I had.

However, when I inherited, because of the political change, the position formerly occupied by former Senator Brooks, of Illinois, and became chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, I had not been very long in that position before I realized that Senator Brooks was fully justified in every step he had taken in this regard, because the demands upon the Committee on Rules and Administration for space are enormous. After all, the

most precious thing in the Capitol of the United States and in the Senate Office Building is a square foot of space.

We had some data assembled and published for the information of the Senate; it appears in Senate Document No. 137, Eighty-first Congress, second session, entitled "Space Requirements of the United States Senate." I should like to read briefly from that document:

In December 1909, when the Senate first occupied its newly completed office building, there were 92 Senators and 575 employees. Today there are 96 Senators and approximately 1,670 employees, or a 190.43 percent increase in total personnel.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, those figures do not include personnel from the various executive departments who have offices in the Senate Office Building; do they?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; they do not. Of course, we have liaison officers and all kinds of outside help who come to the Senate Office Building and have rooms there. That is quite necessary, of course. On the other hand, I am speaking now only of Senators themselves and of their office forces.

I read further from Senate Document No. 137:

A survey conducted by the Architect of the Capitol in December 1949 showed a total of 846 persons then working in the offices of the Senators in the Senate Office Building. This figure did not include those working in committee rooms or the service areas of the building. The survey also revealed that 82 percent of the same 846 were working under conditions of 55 square feet of space per person. Yet Government building code practice, controlling the downtown agencies, aspires to more than 100 square feet of space for each Government employee.

We are crowded everywhere. Every Senator to whom I have talked, particularly those coming from States with large populations, is distressed at the present situation. There is no remedy except the one which has been voted by the Appropriations Committee, namely, to direct the Senate Office Building Commission to proceed with construction of the new Senate Office Building; to modify the present plans, if they are too elaborate, but to do something.

Mr. President, we made a very serious mistake last year in postponing the construction of this building. If we postpone construction for another year, as suggested by the Senator from Louisiana, that will mean just that much more time lost.

By means of the appropriation of the amount of money contained in this item, in accordance with the authority granted to the Commission which has charge of this matter, we can have a new Senate Office Building within a reasonable period of time.

Let me add for the information of Senators who are questioning the use of labor and material, that in the case of all contracts let throughout the United States, about which we have had reports before the committee, we have found that there is an abundance of contractors, and the bids are getting closer and closer. Unless we get into a major war, I anticipate that the new Senate Office Building can be constructed during the

next year, if a contract is let, cheaper than it could have been constructed last year or the year before.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Arizona, the Senator from Vermont, and the other Senators interested in this matter that there was testimony before the committee that even if we were to carry out the original plans—which were changed, under instructions of the committee—we possibly could construct the entire building for approximately \$20,000,000, instead of \$18,500,000. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, if we proceed with the 4-B plan, which would provide two-hundred-and-some-odd rooms, there would be a saving of approximately \$4,600,000, while under plan 4-C there would be a saving of \$7,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But under the other plan there would be a saving of \$2,000,000. The architects testified that under such circumstances it would be possible to construct the building in accordance with the plan recommended by the committee and as authorized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Earlier in the debate I pointed out that there are 5 Senators with 6 rooms, 26 Senators with 5 rooms, and quite a number of Senators occupying rooms in the Capitol Building. Let me inquire as to what effort, if any, has been made by the Committee on Rules and Administration to redistribute those rooms, so that Senators who really need more space can obtain it, and so that space will not be used by Senators who actually do not need it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator will understand that, primarily, space is distributed on the basis of seniority. There are Senators of advanced years, and of long service in the Senate, who, because of their service, we feel are entitled to rooms in the Capitol Building, more so than other Senators are. Therefore, the assignment to such Senators of rooms in the Capitol Building is made entirely for their convenience. In a number of instances, that is the explanation for the assignment of an odd or additional room here or there, to one Senator or another.

What the Senator from Louisiana would have us do would be to take away rooms from the Senators who happen to have the few rooms which are to spare in the Capitol Building, and assign them to other Senators.

Mr. ELLENDER. Even in the Senate Office Building there are quite a number of Senators who occupy rooms which I feel certain they can spare, and yet have sufficient space left to carry on their work. I wonder whether the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration has made any effort to redistribute those rooms.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have been diligent in connection with that matter, and I have talked to Senators. Some of them have been kind enough to give up space.

They regretted to do so, but it was necessary.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration assigned to me an extra room in the Capitol Building. I felt so sorry for the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], that I gave up that little space in this building. It is a little cubbyhole up next to the room occupied by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico neglects to say that the reason that room was assigned to him was because he suffered a very serious operation, and he had to have a resting place in the Capitol Building, because of his health.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Whatever the reason was, I have turned the room back to the junior Senator from New York, and he has as many as four or five young women using that room. I know that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] has as many as eight persons using one room. All of us know that even the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] does not disagree as to the need for space.

Those of us who serve on the Senate Office Building Commission are called upon to get construction of the new Senate Office Building under way. As the leading country in the world, I think we should have the new building. Of course, one could be built for \$1,000,000 or even for \$500,000, for that matter; but I do not think the Senate wants to proceed in that way.

I assure the Senator from Louisiana that this mandate from the Appropriations Committee will be carried out by the Senate Office Building Commission.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. In distributing the additional space, as I understand, the Commission, through the Committee on Rules and Administration, will see to it that each Senator is given five rooms.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That depends upon the kind of building we erect. We want to carry out this mandate.

Mr. ELLENDER. But, under either plan, as I understand, either plan 4-B or the original plan—

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not think we are confined to any particular plan which has been submitted heretofore.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not to a plan, but I am talking about an assignment of rooms. The point I wanted to explore with the Senator is this: Has he ever consulted Senators to determine whether they could get along with three rooms or four, instead of an average of five?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, hence I have not done so. As chairman of the Committee on Public Works, I wrote to every Senator, stating that we were considering this particular matter, and requesting a statement of whether he needed more office space.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will read those letters, he will discover that most of the Senators said that although

they could use more space, that they did not need it acutely.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would like to again invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that at present there are 5 Senators who have 6 rooms each, 26 Senators with 5 rooms each, and 35 Senators with 4 rooms each. I am one of those 35 Senators, and I want to say that I do not want and do not need more than four rooms. I am sure there are many other Senators who feel as I do. As a matter of fact, I know of some Senators who do not want more than three rooms, simply because they do not need more than three.

With respect to the necessity for the additional rooms, the point I want to emphasize is that under the plan the Commission has adopted, it apparently without consultation allots five rooms to each Senator. Irrespective of whether he needs that many, the same old plan is followed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Louisiana is completely in error. The Commission does not assign rooms.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am aware of that, but I maintain that the Commission is seeking to provide five rooms for each Senator regardless of who assigns them to specific Senators.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Committee on Rules and Administration assigns rooms.

Mr. ELLENDER. But, if the Senator will read from the report just cited by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, he will note that even by providing five rooms for each Senator, there will be an excess of many rooms. I feel certain that we are going to have an excess of many fine hearing rooms, which have been used heretofore in the present Senate Office Building, but which will be designated subcommittee rooms.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am trying to impress upon the Senator from Louisiana the fact that, whether we like it or not, and notwithstanding it is contrary to the way I should have done things, we are not now discussing the plans which were originally submitted. We are now discussing an item in the appropriation bill for 1951, and an instruction by the Appropriations Committee as to how we shall proceed. That does not call for five rooms for every Senator, or for three rooms for every Senator. It instructs the Commission to provide the space, and to proceed with the work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the Senator's contention that the Commission can now change the present plans and use the money provided, without endangering the right of whoever performs the work to receive payment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, he is going to be paid.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it has to be done according to law.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And it has to be done also according to plans.

Mr. ELLENDER. But as I pointed out, this appropriation is being made to carry out plans already prepared and already submitted to the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. We tried to change those plans. Several Senators, including the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Here is the item:

Construction and equipment of additional Senate Office Building: To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission * * * to continue to provide for the construction and equipment of a fireproof office building for the use of United States Senate, \$10,000,000.

It then proceeds to give an instruction as to how the Commission shall proceed.

Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. While I am on that point, I should like again to say to my distinguished friend that we are proceeding now under an authorization to provide money with which to build a Senate Office Building, in accordance with plans already drafted. The law states:

Construction and equipment of * * * building: To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, at a total cost, exclusive of site and other expenses authorized under the preceding paragraph, not to exceed \$20,600,000, and in substantial accordance with the preliminary plans prepared under authority of the act of July 11, 1947.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, let us get the question straightened out as to the law. It is correct that the original law is as stated, except we did not carry it on to the total.

Construction and equipment of buildings: To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission—

This is the original law—

at a total cost, exclusive of sites and other expenses authorized under the preceding paragraph, not to exceed \$20,600,000, and in substantial accordance with the preliminary plans prepared under the authority of the act of July 11, 1947 (Public Law 169, 80th Cong.), and approved by the Senate Office Building Commission—

Mr. ELLENDER. They drafted it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With what?—

with such modifications as may be necessary or advantageous to provide for the construction and equipment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, could I refresh the memory of the Senator from New Mexico?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the committee, as this proposal was originally submitted, it was tied down to that act.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. It was the deliberate judgment of the committee that it should not be tied down tightly to it. The committee struck out the reference to the act, and it does not appear in the bill as it is today.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the authorization comes from that act. It comes from the same law. Otherwise, it would be out of order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But this is part of the same law:

with such modifications as may be necessary or advantageous to provide for the construction and equipment of a fireproof office building.

What has been done but to give instructions as to how to proceed?

Mr. ELLENDER. I simply want to inform my distinguished friend that the legislative counsel is of opinion that if substantial changes are made in the present plans there may be difficulty in the contractor getting his money. I say that if the plan is changed to the extent of eliminating the 18 large hearing rooms, the auditorium, and other things, difficulty may arise as to the ability of the contractor to collect.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Do not worry. There will be plenty of contractors who will be tickled pink to be awarded the contract.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico one more question. It has already been indicated that if the men and material needed in the construction of the building are needed in the war effort, the President may order the construction stopped or slowed down. Can the Senator from New Mexico tell us whether the Building Commission itself would have authority to slow down the construction of the building without waiting for a directive?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me repeat, if I may, that the Commission is to carry out a duty. I happen to be the chairman of the Senate Office Building Commission. The other members are the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. I have faith in that Commission. We believe in obeying a mandate of the United States Senate. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] made a statement before the Commission which was as long as that which he has made on the floor today. It was a very able speech.

I read from the report of the committee:

After full discussion, the committee voted to request the Senate Office Building Commission to review forthwith—

Which, in my opinion, means exactly what the law says, in order that the new plan may be advantageous for the purpose for which it is required—to review forthwith the detailed plans of the proposed Senate Office Building—

For what purpose, and with what view?—

with a view of simplifying the building to bring about savings, and with the expressed desire of the committee to make the new office building more of a working and utilitarian unit than the present plans contemplate. When this review is completed and the plans revised to meet the suggestions of the Commission, the construction is to go forward as expeditiously as is practicable in an effort to relieve the congestion and crowding that now exists in the offices of many Senators and in the space allotted to each committee of the Senate.

We think we have the authority, in view of the war effort, with the increased

use of steel, cement, and gravel, to stop the construction, if necessary.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the Senator is perfectly satisfied that nowhere in the bill is there any mandate for the Commission to continue with the construction of the building in competition with any war effort unless stopped by an order of the President.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am positive of it, and I am positive that that is the attitude of the Commission.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I think the statement should be in the RECORD.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I stated previously, Mr. President, there is very little difference of opinion as between the attitude of the Senator from Louisiana and that of the Senator from New Mexico. It goes only to the question of what type of building should be constructed. I went along with the original plans. I voted for them originally in the Eightieth Congress. I thought it was necessary. I thought if we had a type of country which could afford to spend billions upon billions of dollars elsewhere, we certainly should not be stingy with ourselves in providing office space for Senators.

We could have saved money through a different type of construction. I have seen this body appropriate many millions of dollars for buildings in the city of Washington. The first chapter of this particular appropriation bill provides for the District of Columbia \$12,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. Was there any complaint with regard to that? Not a bit. But if we try to provide office space in a dignified building, we hear it said that we ought to save money. We provided millions of dollars for a new courthouse in the city of Washington, within a few blocks of the Capitol, for 15 judges, including the municipal court judges, but complaint is made because we want an office building in keeping with the dignity of the Nation. We provided \$25,000,000 for a building for the General Accounting Office. Did anyone complain about that? We appropriated millions of dollars for buildings for the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and other Government departments.

It is not a question of the expenditure of the money. I want to save as much money as does anyone else, but I am not in favor of lowering the dignity of this body. We should not go back on the concept which Jefferson had in mind with reference to the Capitol. It is all right to save a million dollars here and there.

I again invite attention to the guests we have with us. Did they come to see the Senator from New Mexico or any other Senator? No, they did not. They came to see the Senate of the United States. The Senate should act as a symbol of the idea which has made this country what it is. The city of Washington was originally laid out with the concept of having the dignity befitting the center of a great nation. Long before the Declaration of Independence, Benjamin Franklin was possibly dreaming that eventually somewhere within the Thirteen Colonies there would be a capitol. For what purpose? To satisfy

individual Senators or to satisfy the American people?

The concept was embodied in works of such illustrious men as Thomas Jefferson, who was himself an architect of repute, and of other architects of the time who believed in a living development of classic architecture, that is to say, an organized arrangement of simple forms on dignified lines.

I have been to Charlottesville and to Monticello Mr. President, and I have seen the work of the illustrious Jefferson, the manual work he performed. That is why I appreciate what he did when he thought and dreamed of the Capitol of the United States.

The Thirteen Colonies were small, Mr. President, but we have made more progress in raising the standards of living of a free people than has been accomplished in Europe, with thousands of years of effort. Europe has not yet reached the standard developed under the concept of the founders of the Capital of the United States.

We can build a barn for the United States Senate and provide plenty of space, but I hope we shall not do that.

All the official buildings of Washington, the Capitol, the White House, the Senate and House Office Buildings, the United States Supreme Court Building, embody the principles and concepts to which I have referred. All these buildings in their various forms, express the idea. They are different from purely commercial structures designed along functional lines, without dignity, and meant solely for functional uses.

Who wants Washington to be a commercial city? Washington is not the industrial center of the United States, but it represents the concepts and the ideals which have made possible the great industrial centers of the United States. It represents a political philosophy of a free people. It represents the hope and the confidence of free peoples throughout the world. That is why we must build along the lines which I have suggested.

These buildings have become a symbol of the seat of Government for all America. The American people have always viewed these buildings with love and respect. They do not visit Washington in order to see me or to see any other Senator. Of course, we have individual visitors from our home States, but when visitors come here by bus loads, they come to see the capital of the United States, and we love to have them here.

The American people have always viewed these buildings with love and respect and they cherish them as a symbol of their hopes, their unity, their growth, and the splendor of the Nation which they have built. They should be proud. We should be proud, Mr. President. We should not be stingy in our efforts to promote the beauty and glory of the capital of the Nation.

When the present Senate and House wings of the Capitol were planned and built shortly before the trying days of the Civil War—and let us remember that we had a Civil War, and it was necessary that we show our unity—they were of dignified design and even in those days were constructed of marble, in keeping

with the dignity of our Government. Oh, Mr. President, we can construct a building of white pine. We can save money, and give it to Europe. We can give it to Asia. We can give it to anybody. However, we are asked to save money on these plans.

The present Senate and House Office Buildings and the United States Supreme Court Building, subsequently planned and constructed, were also planned and built along lines of dignified design, and they are likewise constructed of marble. Would anyone want the Supreme Court Building and the House and Senate Office Buildings to be of a different design than in the dream of Jefferson? I am sure no one would want that.

The proposed new Senate Office Building has been planned along lines of similar dignity and in harmony with the Capitol and other buildings in the vicinity of the Capitol.

The project was authorized by the Eightieth Congress, to be carried forward in substantial accordance with preliminary plans approved by the Senate Office Building Commission in June 1948. The detailed plans were developed during the period August 1948 to April 1949. They were approved by the Senate Office Building Commission, as presently composed, in April 1949.

Since that time—and I call this to the attention of the Senator from Louisiana—the Senate Committee on Appropriations has taken different action, and it is the duty of the Commission to follow that action.

This is not a new Commission. It has been in continuous existence since 1904. That is 46 years, Mr. President. This Commission not only directed the construction of the three original wings of the Senate Office Building, but also the construction of the fourth or First Street wing in 1931–33, the alteration of the C Street facade of the building, and the completion of the approaches to the building.

Congress has seen fit for the past 46 years to entrust this Commission with the direction of construction of quarters for the United States Senate and the Commission has always been composed of both majority and minority representation. From 1904 to 1947, the Commission consisted of three Senators. In 1947, the membership of the Commission was increased from three to five Senators.

When the Senate Office Building preliminary plans were authorized in 1947, the Commission consisted of former Senators Revercomb, Brooks, and Overton, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. When the preliminary plans were approved, in July 1948, and the new building project authorized, the Commission consisted of former Senators Revercomb and Brooks, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The Commission as presently constituted consists of the Senator from Rhode

Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the present speaker.

Mr. President, I hope that this body will want to take care of itself. Oh, we can vote billions of dollars without batting an eye. We can appropriate automobiles for third-class clerks in a department, and we can appropriate travel money for departments. However, when it comes to doing something for the people of the United States we are told that we must be extremely careful that we do not waste the people's money. Mr. President, not only the Building Commission but the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Appropriations, after due deliberation and consideration, reported this item to the Senate. We feel justified in asking Members of the Senate to stand by the committee and not approve any amendments with respect to this item.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the letters from Senators which I discussed during my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
August 22, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,

MY DEAR SENATOR: You wrote me on August 19 with reference to my thoughts on the necessity for a new Senate Office Building.

Almost complete plans had been made for the new Senate Office Building, during the Eightieth Congress, before I learned of them.

Certainly there is a shortage of space for the Senators from the larger States who have more than the minimum number of clerks in their offices.

I believe the idea of an additional story on the present office building was not investigated thoroughly enough. Also, additional room could be provided if several unused and unnecessary elevator shafts were done away with. Also, there are several unnecessary departmental liaison offices still in the building.

I believe the block of land across the street east from the present office building could be used to great advantage as a parking lot for the cars of Senate office employees.

Sincerely yours,
CHAN GURNEY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
August 22, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I have your letter of August 18 with reference to present office space and additional needs. In reply I wish to advise that I believe additional space is needed. I believe it can be secured on a basis acceptable generally to the membership of the Congress. Frankly, I do not think we need as much space as was contemplated in the plans heretofore discussed. It occurs to me that serious thought could be given to the development of a plan for a new building and the construction of one wing at a time as needs would justify.

I am quite aware of the real need for more garage space. I think this could be taken care of in the basement.

I will be glad to discuss this with you further at your pleasure.

With every good wish, I am,
Sincerely yours,

ROBERT S. KERR.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
August 20, 1949.
The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of the 19th which reopens the discussion on the Senate Office Building.

I can easily realize that it might seem more practical to get plans drawn up for the new office building without submitting those plans to the criticism and suggestions of the Senate. You would have so many different ideas, so strongly expressed and so at variance with each other, that you would be fearful of getting nowhere.

On the other hand, you have had the example of the difficulties of the opposite course. Doubt as to the project was aroused in the minds of many Senators including myself as to the size and lavishness of the project; the whole thing burst on us without warning, and the first reaction was unfavorable in a body which is for the most part deeply concerned with economy.

My personal requirements are for one more room and three toilets. They need to be good sized rooms, larger than those which face on the court of the old office building. I would like to stay right where I am and have another room added to the suite, made available by the general redistribution resulting from the new building if it is built.

With regard to the building itself, I would strongly urge that you display the floor plans in some convenient spot such as the Senate Caucus Room.

My own suggestions would be that we provide only for new committee rooms and suites for committee chairmen, plus a new Senate and staff restaurant with its own staff and kitchens. This will relieve pressure on the crowded dining rooms in the Capitol, which however, will be still the major facility for the Senators and their Capitol staff while the Congress is in session.

It would seem that these results can be obtained by completing the ell whose sides front on Constitution Avenue and First Street. Removal of the corresponding committee offices will leave a lot of space available for storage at the subway level of our old building. These are the suggestions which I would like to see carried out.

Sincerely yours,
RALPH E. FLANDERS.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., August 20, 1949.
The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: This is in reply to your communication of August 18 with respect to construction of a New Senate Office Building to house Senate Committees. I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

We are quite comfortable in two of the three rooms assigned to me, Suite 252. The center room, between the reception room and my office, is very crowded. In that four and oftentimes five of my staff are required to perform office functions in a very small area. In fact, my Administrative Assistant has space in this office, and is constantly meeting visitors without privacy, which, in my opinion, is not in accordance with the dignity of his office. One additional room would benefit us considerably.

If your committee desires personal comment to justify the construction of this

building I would be pleased to attend one of your meetings.

With personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

LESTER C. HUNT.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
August 20, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I appreciate your letter of August 18, relative to the projected new Senate Office Building. Of course my staff and I find our three-room suite inadequate and I have been trying to get a four-room suite for some time.

I shall give specific thought to the matter and will discuss the situation with you later.

With kindest regards, I remain,
Yours faithfully,

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
August 19, 1949.

The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I have your letter of August 18, and thank you for the opportunity to give you a statement of my experience with present office facilities.

For the first 4 years of my term, I occupied a three-room suite which was quite inadequate. On January 1 of this year, I was fortunate to acquire another room which, while an improvement, is still inadequate considering the number of personnel required on my staff, the necessity for crowding several people in each room, along with filing equipment, and storage space. I could, therefore, definitely use another room.

I feel that one of the vital needs is for larger committee hearing rooms and sufficient space for committee staff quarters which are now wholly inadequate.

With kind regards, I am,
Yours sincerely,

B. B. HICKENLOOPER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND
FOREIGN COMMERCE,
February 27, 1950.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I apologize for the long delay in replying to your letter of February 14, wherein you invite me to comment on the adequacy of the office space which I now use in the discharge of my duties here in the Capitol.

For some time past I have found my quarters quite inadequate to conduct the business of a State as large as Pennsylvania, and have from time to time been compelled to rent outside space in order that my staff could be properly quartered. Most of the girls work under severe handicaps and most trying conditions, and I am looking forward eagerly to the time when this might be corrected.

Thank you for your interest in writing me.
Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1950.
The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DENNIS: I want to thank you for giving me an opportunity to express my views on the adequacy of my present office space.

I am satisfied with what I have, of course, under the circumstances. The record will show that I have a three-room suite, but certainly I would use an additional room and maybe two. This is not from the standpoint of additional space for comfort but for adequate working space in connection with my duties in the Senate.

I think it is wise for the Legislative Appropriations Committee to give consideration to the suggestions of the Senate Office Building Commission to provide adequate working space for Members of the Senate.

Kindest regards and all best wishes.

Sincerely,

HARRY DARBY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 23, 1950.

The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks very much for your recent letter inquiring whether or not I consider my present office space and the facilities of the Foreign Relations Committee ample or inadequate.

At the present time the space allotted to me in the Senate Office Building for my office staff is ample to meet our requirements. On the other hand, I have been attempting for the past year to secure additional space for the Foreign Relations Committee. As you may know, the committee and its staff are confined to the committee room proper and two additional rooms in the Senate wing of the Capitol. We find this space quite inadequate. Since I took over the chairmanship a year ago, it has been necessary for two of our staff members to use the office space which has been normally assigned to the chairman. I am very hopeful that we may be able to find one or two additional rooms so that the committee work may not be hampered by lack of space.

With cordial good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

TOM CONNALLY, Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D. C., September 19, 1949.
The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I have your letter of August 23 referring to the new Senate Office Building and also asking questions concerning the office facilities afforded us at the present time. Senator CHAVEZ, our office space is very inadequate and it is most difficult for my staff to do their work. We are crowded into three rooms. I have requested additional room several times, but have always been informed that it is not available, and in the meantime my staff continues to work under the handicap of crowded, congested office space where efficient office functioning is most difficult.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
September 22, 1949.
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Replying to your inquiry concerning the adequacy of my Senatorial office, I regret to inform you that our space is entirely insufficient for the personnel permitted a Senator from the State of California. I am somewhat more fortunate in that I have a total of 4 offices rather than the three allocated to many Senators, but nevertheless I find it necessary to have some of my personnel working outside the office and some assigned to California, although I would prefer to have them in Washington if I had sufficient space for them.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

SHERIDAN DOWNEY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES
IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
October 7, 1949.

The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
United States Senate

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Some time ago I wrote you a memorandum and then held it up, eventually misplacing it. This was with reference to your letter of August 22 regarding the proposed new Senate office building.

Quite frankly, I want to add my experience to a number of others you no doubt know of who, while we are first year men, find ourselves in cramped quarters, even though we may not have the volume of work our seniors have.

Naturally I want to be economical, but the volume of mail and the requests from my home State, to say nothing of my activities in committee and related matters, require that I do not cut down on my office staff. I have seven on my staff at present and find that I must add to this number, and you can readily see what that means by way of office space and filing accommodations.

I hope this gives you some idea of how I feel about needed office space.

Sincerely,

ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
February 15, 1950.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Public Works Com-
mittee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: This will acknowledge your letter of February 14, which has been received in the absence of Senator Long in Louisiana. I have discussed the matter with him by telephone since receipt of your letter.

If I correctly understand, he is not prepared to take any position with reference to the new building. At the same time, we are faced with considerable difficulty in trying to operate our office in very cramped quarters; and, because of an extremely heavy volume of work, we have found it necessary to split our operations into shifts, with a small group working at night.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE TUCKER,
Administrative Assistant.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
February 15, 1950.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for your letter and as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I shall of course give every consideration to the thoughts expressed by the various Senators. As far as I am personally concerned I have sufficient space.

Sincerely yours,

BURNET R. MAYBANK.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
February 16, 1950.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building Commission,
Senate Office Building.

DEAR DENNIS: Your letter of February 14, supplementing your letter of August 18 with regard to the proposed new Senate Office Building, has been received.

I appreciate your bringing this to my attention at this time, and in connection therewith, I should like to say that my suite in the Senate Office Building is at present definitely inadequate. We have felt the need for additional office space for some time and in the past 2 years, this need has become acute. I now have a three-room suite with an additional room downstairs in the basement for storage purposes. Another room could be used to good advantage.

With every good wish,

Sincerely yours,

C. W. TOBEY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
February 16, 1950.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DENNIS: I am in receipt of your letter of February 14 relative to space in the Senate Office Building.

As you will recall, last year I voted against going ahead with the building because I felt we should not ask other departments to cut down their expenses and not agree to do so ourselves. To answer your question specifically, as far as I personally am concerned, of course I could use more space in my office.

I am a member of the subcommittee on legislative appropriations and certainly will be only too happy to look into this matter very fully when the subcommittee meets.

With best regards and thanks for writing me, I am,

Sincerely,

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON RULES
AND ADMINISTRATION,
February 16, 1950.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Your note of February 14 was awaiting me when I returned to Washington.

I want to be entirely consistent in replying to your query as to the matter for additional space in the Senate Office Building. Although I have been among those who have insisted on the utmost economy in governmental expenditures, I can readily appreciate the insistent demand for enlarged quarters.

As one's tenure in the Senate grows there is additional demand made for additional services. I find myself in that situation

and can honestly tell you that we are in need of at least one more room.

I regret the delay in replying.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

W. E. JENNER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
February 20, 1950.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission,
Committee on Public Works,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In answer to your letter of recent date, in which you request my views with respect to the proposed new office building, I might cite the fact that for several years I have been seeking an additional office, in order to relieve congestion in my present quarters.

I am not familiar with conditions in other Senators' offices, but I do know it has been impossible for me to find the additional space in the Senate Office Building, which my constantly increasing volume of business requires.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

HERBERT R. O'CONOR.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
February 17, 1950.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I appreciate your letter with regard to my office space.

I find that my staff is very much crowded; however, I am not pressing that a new building be built because of our special congestion in this office.

With appreciation of your consideration, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRANK GRAHAM.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1950.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DENNIS: I agree with the general statement of conditions in the Senate Office Building contained in your letter of August 18 last, which I regret escaped my attention. Not only do I find space insufficient, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and as chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, but my own quarters are scarcely sufficient for the activities of such a staff as any Senator now requires.

The responsibilities of Congress are steadily increasing, as everyone knows. As the duties of the committees continue to increase along with the business of each Senator's office, the present inadequacy of space in the Senate Office Building will, in my judgment, only result in making more difficult the accomplishment of our responsibilities.

With every good wish.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
February 15, 1950.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: This acknowledges receipt of your letter relative to Senate Office

space. This is the only letter from you that has been called to my attention relative to this matter. I presume your former letter was misplaced.

I am not familiar with the conditions in all the offices. I should prefer to have the result of the investigation from all of them, as I would be willing to forego any convenience to myself if all the other Senators are properly provided for. I am ready to abide by the decision of the committees handling the matter.

Thank you for calling this to my attention.

Yours very truly,

GARRETT L. WITHERS,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
October 6, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for your letter of August 19, which I have just seen on my return to the office, regarding space in the Senate Office Building.

I have always felt that if a diagram of the Senate Office Building and the Senate wing of the Capitol were made available to every Senator showing the allocation of each room that we could then judge better whether we needed more space or not. As you know, however, this has always been considered a very confidential matter and it seems impossible for the rank and file of Senators to know how the rooms are used.

I have not studied the drawings for the proposed new Senate Office Building carefully, but I did look at them once and I noted what seemed to me to be rather a grave defect in the planning. In the proposed new committee rooms, there was a very inadequate amount of space allowed behind the places where the members of the committees are supposed to sit. One of the troubles in the Finance Committee room in the present Senate Office Building and in the caucus room, as well as in the Appropriations Committee and Foreign Relations Committee rooms, is that the space behind the Senators is so small that there is always a great deal of congestion and noise. If we are to have a new Senate Office Building, the committee rooms should be designed so that there is plenty of room behind the Senators for the members of their staffs and their advisers to sit and for messengers to pass by without constantly causing a realignment of chairs. I think that this is one respect in which we should learn from experience.

In fact, I think it would be wasteful, not to say stupid, for us to put up a new Senate Office Building in which the errors of the present building were blindly repeated.

With best wishes,

Very sincerely yours,

H. C. LODGE, Jr.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
August 22, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: This will acknowledge your letter to Senator LODGE. It arrives as he is temporarily out of the office on a trip taken in connection with his official duties. I will show him your letter as soon as he returns and assure you that it will have his immediate attention.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANCIS MCCARTHY,
Secretary to Senator Lodge.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
August 22, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your letter regarding the new building, the principal criticism which I have heard from other Senators is that the plans for the proposed building are much too elaborate. From what I have heard, I believe a new building constructed along more functional lines, as many of our modern business buildings are, will attract the support of the Senators. Generally speaking, I think our public buildings are about as inefficient and wasteful of space as any I know. Personally, a small detached room for some privacy would be extremely convenient. Otherwise, my office is quite satisfactory.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON RULES
AND ADMINISTRATION,
August 23, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: My rather brief experience here serves to convince me that the facts contained in your letter of August 19 are true, beyond any question of doubt. However, I am so deeply concerned about the fiscal problems of our Government that I hesitate to subscribe to any program which will impose new burdens upon our taxpayers unless that program is absolutely essential to the needs of the people.

And now, with respect to the proposed new Senate Office Building, I know that it would be helpful insofar as the Senators are personally concerned but actually is it not true that we can get along without it until we reduce some of the other expenditures of government? Many times during the recent war I had to work in offices which were virtually pig sties and on some occasions my office was nothing more or nothing less than a security box in a badly damaged building, but somehow I was still able to produce, and as I look back over some of the records in my files I am not at all ashamed of the quality which that work discloses.

As a new Member of the Senate I am extremely anxious to cooperate with my colleagues in anything which will be helpful to their worthy objectives, but in this instance, I cannot bring myself to the view that the expenditure is justified at this time.

Perhaps some day you and I should sit down together and discuss this whole problem in detail—maybe you can convince me that I am in error. I certainly will be the first to admit it, if that is so.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
August 23, 1949.

The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your kind letter of August 19, regarding the proposed new Senate Office Building.

In answer to your inquiry, I find that my office facilities are adequate. While I could undoubtedly make use of additional space, yet I believe the necessary functions of the office can be carried out within our presently allotted suite.

I greatly appreciate your kindness in contacting me.

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN FREAR.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
August 25, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of August 23 making inquiry regarding my situation as to office space.

Fortunately, I have sufficient room. A great many other Senators, I am sure, however, are not so fortunately situated and particularly those from the larger States.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
August 26, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I have yours of August 22 about building an additional Senate Office Building.

I am opposed to spending money to increase present quarters and facilities until we have successfully balanced the budget. When we have done that, it will be time to consider this matter.

With my best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

CLYDE M. REED.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
August 31, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DENNIS: This will acknowledge and thank you for your recent letter concerning the new Senate Office Building, of which you are committee chairman.

I deeply appreciate your writing me concerning the possibility of obtaining additional space, but I have four rooms now, and feel that four rooms is ample space for my office staff.

Hoping you are well, and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

BILL LANGER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
September 8, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DENNIS: Replying to your inquiry as to whether I find my office space adequate or not, I will say that I do find the facilities which I now have entirely satisfactory and see no necessity for increasing them in the immediate future.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1950.
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of February 14 in regard to the proposed new Senate Office Building, and I regret that I did not reply to your letter last summer about this matter.

Since Delaware is next to the smallest State in area in the Union, I find that my office space of three rooms is adequate to my

present needs. Should it become necessary to make any new additions to my staff, additional space would be desirable.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 16, 1950.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This will reply to your letter of February 14.

I am sorry if your previous communication regarding the proposed new Senate Office Building was not answered.

I am glad to advise you that my present office space is entirely adequate and satisfactory.

With warm personal regards and best wishes,

Cordially and faithfully,

A. H. VANDENBERG.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
February 16, 1950.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DENNIS: I have your letter of February 14.

I have sufficient space to transact my office affairs. Under present conditions I am opposed to the construction of a new office building. I believe, with proper utilization, the existing space will be adequate for some while to come.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING
AND CURRENCY,
February 15, 1950.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR DENNIS: Replying to your letter of the 14th will say that my present office space is adequate for my present needs.

With kind personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.

AUGUST 18, 1949.

HON. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In the first session of the Eighty-first Congress the construction of the projected new Senate Office Building east of the present Senate Office Building was temporarily delayed as a result of objections by a few Senators.

As Chairman of the new Senate Office Building Commission, I have given considerable thought to the matter, and it is my observation that most of the Senators and committees now housed in the Senate Office Building are sorely crowded for space. Since we will try to go ahead in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress with plans for the new Senate Office Building, I write you in the hope that you will take a few moments to give me a few expressions about the new Senate Office Building and your own space conditions.

Not a few of the committee chairmen have voiced the complaint to me that there are not enough committee rooms available when Congress hits even a normal business cycle. We find three or four committees trying to borrow rooms every day, and in the case of my own Committee on Public Works, were we to lend our committee room, it means the Public Works staff must stop its business because there is no place for them to work aside from the committee room. We are forced into the situation of operating with only one subcommittee at a time, unless we are fortunate enough to borrow another room, and we have succeeded in borrowing facilities only about three or four times in the last 6 months.

Perhaps you know that we have proposed in the new Senate Office Building to house the committee chairmen, the committee staffs, and the office staffs of the chairmen. We had thought that this consolidation of all committee activities in one building would greatly increase the efficiency of the committee work and at the same time release substantial space now occupied by committees and their chairmen for use by other Senators.

I am inquiring of not only the committee chairmen, but the individual Senators about office space for their staffs. I wonder if you would be good enough to give me a statement of your experience with your committee facilities and tell me whether or not you consider them ample or inadequate. I should like a separate expression on whether or not you consider your own office facilities adequate for your staff for your State work. Any statistics on present and future staff and space needs would also be very helpful.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office
Building Commission.

AUGUST 18, 1949.

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In the first session of the Eighty-first Congress the construction of the projected new Senate Office Building east of the present Senate Office Building was temporarily delayed as a result of objections by a few Senators.

As Chairman of the New Senate Office Building Commission, I have given considerable thought to the matter, and it is my observation that most of the Senators and committees now housed in the Senate Office Building are sorely crowded for space. Since we will try to go ahead in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress with plans for the new Senate Office Building, I write you in the hope that you will take a few moments to give me a few expressions about the new Senate Office Building and your own space conditions.

Perhaps you know that we proposed in the new Senate Office Building to house the committee chairmen, the committee staffs, and the office staffs of the chairmen. We had thought that this consolidation of all committee activities in one building would greatly increase the efficiency of the committee work and at the same time release substantial space now occupied by committees and their chairmen for use by other Senators.

The Architect of the Capitol estimates that if the new Senate Office Building could be constructed and the committees and committee chairmen moved into it, it would make an average of one more room available for the individual Senators and their staffs. To me, that addition of one more room on the average would materially help in the space situation.

I am fully cognizant of the cramped quarters in which many Senators find themselves, and it is my hope that we can work out some program of construction and realignment which would make for more satisfactory working conditions for the Senators.

My only thought in continuing to press for the new Senate Office Building is the uncontested fact that the Senators do not have sufficient space to accomplish properly their every-day missions in their offices. I am confident that something to provide relief can be accomplished in the second session if the Senators will give the Commission members their wholehearted support.

I wonder if you would be good enough to give me a statement of your experience with your office facilities and tell me whether or not you consider them ample or inadequate. Any statistics on present and future staff and space needs would also be very helpful.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
February 27, 1950.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DENNIS: I have just returned to my office after being away to recuperate from a recurrence of a virus pneumonia attack I suffered last November, and am taking the first opportunity to reply to your letter of February 14 in which you make inquiry concerning my feelings about the proposed new Senate Office Building.

I am of the same opinion I had a year ago and that is that we need such a new Senate Office Building. So far as I personally am concerned, I need additional space for the efficient operation of my office.

With every good wish,

Sincerely yours,

STYLES BRIDGES.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
August 19, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of August 18 inquiring about (1) office space for committee and staff work and (2) space for our regular senatorial duties received and noted.

Frankly I must say that it seems to me that so far as my committee and staff work is concerned we have ample space for the Committee on Appropriations over in the Capitol.

I have four rooms over here and we are not cramped at all so far as I know.

However, since the Senate has decided to have an additional building and additional space I shall not put anything in the way but will go along with my colleagues.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely your friend,

KENNETH MCKELLAR.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND
PUBLIC WELFARE,
August 19, 1949.

The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I received your letter of August 18th in regard to the possible construction of a new Senate Office Building. You asked me to write to you giving a

statement of my experience with my present office facilities and whether or not I consider them ample or inadequate.

I can answer very briefly and pointedly. My physical office facilities are extremely inadequate from the standpoint of space. We currently have three rooms, approximately 15 feet by 25 feet. One of these three rooms is my personal office. We have eleven people on the staff. Ten of whom are crowded into the two remaining rooms. My administrative assistant shares my office primarily due to lack of space.

Frankly, it is impossible to care for more than a limited number of constituents at one time. I simply do not have sufficient space for chairs to even allow my friends and constituents as they arrive from Minnesota to sit down.

This extreme shortage of physical area, I firmly believe, is a handicap to good office procedure and efficient work. Every member of the staff constantly has the feeling that he is either under someone else's feet or that someone else in turn is under his feet.

Then, of course, there is the very major problem from the standpoint of inadequacy of filing area. As you well know there is a tremendous amount of correspondence in a Senatorial office and filing becomes a major problem. We currently have nine files and could well use twice this many.

Also, as you know, it is necessary that we keep sufficient supplies in the immediate office to handle the many hundreds of letters every day. As it is at present members of my staff must make frequent visits to our storeroom in the attic to replenish the supply of working materials.

Inasmuch as the State of Minnesota is currently within 60,000 of reaching a population of three million, I have every reason to believe that my staff will increase in size within the next year or so. Under present office arrangements we could not accommodate additional people, though we might have the budget and the need is dire.

I assure you of my wholehearted support in your efforts to prevail upon the Senate to appropriate the funds for the construction of the new Senate Office Building.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
August 20, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: With reference to the projected new Senate Office Building, I wish to go on record as definitely in favor.

As you know, I am chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and as such must of necessity have a full staff in order to handle the heavy work load. The members of my staff are working under a handicap in that there is not sufficient space. If there were available connecting rooms for the professional staff members, I believe the output of work would be increased, since when there are hearings scheduled the staff members must refrain from conducting business. This is a great loss of valuable time.

I am heartily in favor of this new building, and sincerely hope that action will be taken as soon as possible to proceed with the project.

Further, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I have the Immigration Subcommittee. The subcommittee is now located in room 449. If you were to go there, I believe that alone would be a selling point for the new building. It was necessary for me to place four or five of my stenographers in the

corridor in a poorly lighted place. This, too, is not conducive to good work.

My kindest personal regards and all good wishes to you.

Sincerely,

PAT McCARRAN,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
August 20, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,

Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to go on record as being most heartily in favor of the new Senate Office Building.

My present office space is overcrowded and inadequate for my office staff, and I am convinced if sufficient space were available, it would be conducive to better work, more work, as well as beneficial to the health of my employees.

I hope you will make this letter a part of your file in favor of the new Senate Office Building.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

PAT McCARRAN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
August 20, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,

United States Senate.

DEAR DENNIS: I have your note of August 19, and want to say that I am in favor of an additional Senate Office Building, as you already know. I voted for it in committee, and also on the floor of the Senate.

At the present time I do not have room enough for all of my office force, and have three of them housed downtown. This is not the condition that makes for utmost efficiency and I think that each Senator should have at least four rooms and some of us need five to do proper work.

I hope that you will present this matter during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
AND FORESTRY,
August 22, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,

Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: For some time I have planned to discuss with you the construction of the projected new Senate Office Building, and to express to you my views regarding the urgent need for the building and the additional space which it would afford.

While I am speaking for myself just now, I have talked with several Senators who take the same attitude I do, and we are all of the opinion that a great many of the Senators are in need of more office space.

As you perhaps know, I occupy a suite consisting of three rooms. I find this space wholly inadequate for my present staff. The crowded conditions under which they work are certainly not conducive to the most efficient performance of their duties. My administrative assistant shares a room with three other employees who are surrounded by 11 file cabinets and several bookcases. Between their desks there is hardly room to place the chairs. Such a situation makes it impossible not only to extend to constituents and others the courtesy of a private interview, which very often is desirable, but also to properly analyze legislation and other material which is necessary to digest.

The inadequacy of office facilities in my own case causes me to express the fervent hope that the construction of the new building may be started at the earliest date possible, and I assure you that your commission will have my wholehearted support in its endeavor to bring this about.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., August 22, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,

Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DENNIS: Your letter of August 18, regarding the great need which some of us have for more office space, is very greatly appreciated. As you may know, I have four rooms, one of them apart from the others. This situation leaves me in a terribly cramped condition; as a matter of fact, one of my staff has to work in my own private office while the other staff members are almost sitting on top of one another.

Really, if I were to have the office space which the very large amount of correspondence and general business transacted in my office required, I would need two additional offices. However, if I could obtain only one more, as your letter suggests, it would be a godsend to me.

It was because of this personal situation that I was very glad to support the efforts you made in behalf of a new Senate Office Building.

With very best regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

IRV IVES.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
August 20, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,

Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Thank you very much for your letter of August 19, 1949. I am glad to know that you will try to go ahead in the second session of this Congress with plans for the new Senate Office Building.

For many years I had inadequate quarters with serious overcrowding of staff and I know that the same situation prevails with other Senators. The present situation where committee staffs and the staffs of chairmen and the office of the chairmen are scattered all over the place represents deplorable inefficiency. The chairmen who are responsible for the work of those staffs have to waste a lot of time running back and forth between scattered offices or they disrupt the orderly work of staff members by having the members do the running back and forth. Personal supervision is impossible. I cannot understand the qualms which Members of Congress feel against doing something that will put them into position to do a better job. We pour out our money for the executive departments and stint our own demonstrable needs.

May I express my appreciation of your active interest in this matter and wish you the best of success. I shall be glad indeed to give my personal support to your effort.

With very best regards, I am,

Sincerely,

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
August 22, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,

United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: My sympathy for the point of view contained in your welcome

letter of August 18 is very keen. I think that the sooner a new Senate Office Building is constructed the better off the Senate as a whole and as a working force will be.

For the present and for quite a long time to come I have all of the space I need because my suite consists of four rooms. This fact, however, is beside the point. Most of the Senators whom I know are confronted and worried by space which is inadequate. I have but recently moved from a three-room to a four-room suite. My considered opinion is that the effectiveness of my staff has been immeasurably increased and I am able to render much better service through myself and my staff. In knowing the vast difference in effectiveness which comes from adequate space I am anxious to assist you in securing comparable accommodations for those of my fellows who are not properly accommodated now. I want to look to you for suggestions to cover the ways in which I might be of service.

Most cordially,

HARRY P. CAIN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., August 23, 1949.
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your letter requesting my impressions on Senate office space is at hand.

I am convinced that most Senators' office space is overcrowded and too cluttered up for good, efficient work. I feel quite sure that one additional room on the average would be most conducive to more efficient operation of the offices.

It is rather difficult for anyone to have to think and analyze and interview people in a room where there are several typewriters in operation.

I will be glad to support you and your committee on recommendations which you may see fit to offer.

Best personal regards,

Cordially yours,

ZALES N. ECTON,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
August 22, 1949.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,

Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your good letter of August 18 concerning improving the facilities for office space for Senators either in the Senate Office Building or in some new building.

May I burden you with my own situation. I do so because I believe that it is typical of what every Senator is up against. I have three rooms, facing the inner court of the Senate Office Building. My administrative assistant, executive secretary, and legislative secretary, occupy one of these rooms, together with a large number of filing cabinets. The second room is used as a reception room, filing room, and as a place where seven other secretaries and stenographers have to do their work. Then, too, this room is occupied by a large number of filing cabinets. The third room I occupy as my own private office.

In this office I have several bookcases and filing cabinets which contain the necessary papers and correspondence pertaining to the job. These crowded quarters make it extremely difficult for people to do their best work, and I am very, very hopeful that something can be done to improve this situation.

It seems to me that an administrative assistant and an executive secretary, especially the administrative assistant, are each entitled to a separate office of his own. It would

greatly help if the executive secretary had one, too, because a great amount of the detail that a Senator's office has to carry on must be done by and under the direction of these two people.

The tremendous increases in the activities of the Federal Government in the last 25 years have greatly added to the amount of work that every Senator and Member of Congress must do. If he is to do it well, he must have adequate quarters and adequate help to assist him.

Crowded quarters make it extremely difficult to properly and effectively organize the work of a Senator's office. For that reason, too, additional office space is necessary.

I wish you success with your plan.

Yours very sincerely,

RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
United States Senate.

UNITED STATES SENATE, COMMITTEE
ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
August 23, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: When the proposal to authorize the construction of a new Senate Office Building was considered by the Senate Public Works Committee, I stated that I was in favor of the new building and that, in my opinion, it was necessary to provide additional space. I used the situation in my own office as an example before the committee.

I have attempted to obtain additional office space without success. At the present time it is necessary that I have five persons and the files in one room and four people and storage cabinets in the other room. I seriously doubt that the present working conditions in my office would meet the minimum requirements established by either Federal or State health officials.

It is essential that I have additional space in order to efficiently conduct the duties of my office and to maintain adequate working facilities for the members of my staff. I shall be glad to support legislation that will remedy this situation, in which I am sure many other Senators find themselves.

From my point of view, there may be a serious question as to whether the plan to erect a new building for our committees is sound. It seems to me this would result in an unnecessary duplication of existing facilities, and for other reasons may not work out too well. I think what we do should be done with as little expense as possible to meet the existing needs.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. KEM.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
August 22, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHAVEZ: I have your letter of August 18 with reference to the construction of a new Senate Office Building.

The Senate Finance Committee Room is adequate, but poorly arranged. The staff greatly needs at least two additional rooms. I hope you will succeed in building the east wing of the Senate Office Building.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER F. GEORGE.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., August 27, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DENNIS: I have your letter of August 23. I do not think much of the idea of try-

ing to move all the committee chairmen and their staffs over to the new building. The new building will be a long way from the Capitol and I think you will find that most of the older Senators prefer to stay in the old building, hoping, of course, for more space.

I believe the new building should be a simple one with more rooms and smaller rooms than we have in the old building, and whatever additional committee rooms we need. I wouldn't try to assign any special function to either building, but simply provide more rooms per Senator and let the Senators have their choice of location.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. TAFT.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
August 27, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In connection with the proposed construction of a new Senate Office Building.

While I thoroughly appreciate the need for economy, I am not convinced that cramped space plus poor and inadequate equipment contribute to that end—in the long run.

Expanding responsibilities and increased workload call for adequate space and up-to-date facilities, if a good and efficient job is to be done.

While I can get along with my present space, I really need one more room and could use two advantageously.

Certain members of my staff, especially those who handle bulk correspondence, legislative and departmental work, are obliged to operate in cramped quarters.

Filing space is very limited.

Space for visitors is not adequate, particularly during the peak of a legislative session.

The staff of my subcommittee is presently occupying quarters in the basement which are too small and not otherwise conducive to the best possible results.

In order to get a full return from our investment in personnel, it seems to me we are thoroughly justified in bolstering the other factors which contribute, proportionately, to such return.

Sincerely,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
August 29, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate.

DEAR DENNIS: Answering yours of the eighteenth, with reference to the proposed new Senate Office Building.

I now have four units and am getting along very decently, but, of course, I could make use of additional space if I had it and could rearrange the present four rooms to much better advantage with a fifth one where I would hope to put most of the filing cases.

The above suggestion perhaps is not too important, but I do think that it might be wise to use most, if not all, of the present committee rooms here in the old Senate Office Building, especially those built for committee rooms. For instance, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the second floor is suitable for our purposes, but it does not have space for the committee staff. There would be sufficient space if they had the units now located to the north of the committee room—the units formerly occupied by Senator Wagner and now occupied

by Senator O'MAHONEY. There might be enough to give one Senator five units and the balance of those units in the same string to the chairman of the committee whose units should be located next to the committee room. I think also there should be a rule established that the chairman of a subcommittee automatically falls heir to four or five units for his own personal staff adjoining the committee room and the staff rooms of his committee. As it is now arranged, the chairmen of many committees are a long way from their committee rooms. This would be a job for the architect to figure out.

I am glad to know that it is your plan to go ahead with the construction of the new office building at the opening of the next session. Of course, it will cost some money, but it will be well worth the investment.

Yours very truly,

HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN
THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
August 29, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of August 19, with reference to the proposed new office building.

In regard to your request for information as to my own office space requirements, it is my opinion that the present quarters are so cramped that it is impossible to make effective use of my staff. When so many staff members are crowded into one small room, the distraction of telephone conversations and visitors coming into the office makes it impossible to get the work done that should be done. It is, of course, false economy to operate in this fashion. I think our production could easily be doubled and the work much more efficiently done if we had adequate space.

With a State the size of mine, I average close to 1,000 letters a day. The mechanics alone of answering those letters, even if none of them involved telephoning and other special attention, is a considerable problem, and you simply cannot effectively handle even the letter-answering phase of our work in the very cramped office space we have. I personally think that each Senator should have a minimum of five rooms, if possible.

It is very unfortunate that the new office building was voted down at this session. While in the minds of a very few this was a vote against additional convenience for the Senators, there is no doubt but that actually it was a vote for bad service for our constituents.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES
IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
September 2, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman,
Senate Office Building Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This acknowledges your letter of August 18 regarding the proposed new Senate Office Building. I apologize for not having responded sooner to your request that I give you an expression of my views on this proposal.

In my opinion, this project is highly desirable. More office space is needed by the Senators. The plan to house all committee rooms, committee staffs, and committee chairmen in one building is attractive. This no doubt would afford convenience and possibly better coordination and more efficiency.

At present I have reasonably sufficient office space. However, the arrangement is poor. I have a three-room suite and a fourth, an extra, room on another floor and on the other side of the building. If the four rooms were together they would possibly be sufficient to accommodate my staff, but considerable inconvenience attends the present arrangement.

When we can achieve a balanced budget and make appropriations for this structure within that area, I shall be most happy to support funds for its construction.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
September 12, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It has just come to my attention that the enclosed letter, dictated by the Senator just before he left for Europe, had not been mailed. I am sorry for the delay but hasten to send it on to you.

Sincerely,

CHARLES G. NEESE,
Administrative Assistant to Estes Kefauver.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
August 31, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am certainly most interested in the construction of the projected new Senate Office Building to which you referred in your letter of August 18.

We are terribly crowded in our present space. There are 12 people in our 3-room suite one of which is necessarily set aside for my own use. My administrative assistant has a partitioned space at the end of one of these offices which is highly unsatisfactory for our purposes.

It would certainly aid materially in relieving our situation if we had at least one additional room and you may depend on me to support your fine efforts to relieve our overcrowded conditions.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D. C., September 12, 1949.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Replying to your letter of August 19, I am very glad to have an opportunity to give you a statement as to my office facilities and their inadequacy.

Illinois, as you know, has a population of approximately 8,000,000 people, and consequently I have a larger staff than most of the Members of the Senate. I have never at any time had adequate space for my staff in the Senate Office Building.

In my suite, 353, there are four rooms. My own private office is the only room in the suite which is occupied by only one person, myself, and consequently there is no other place in my office where my constituents may hold a private conversation with any of my staff members.

The second room in the suite is occupied by my administrative assistant and two other girls. The third room is the reception room and is large enough for only the two people who occupy it, leaving little space for people who are waiting for appointments.

The fourth room in the suite, which is an unusually large one, is occupied by six people. In addition to the 6 desks there are 35 file cases in the same room.

I have an additional room across the corridor, 356 B, in which four girls work, handling all of my mail on legislation. When you take into consideration the fact that at times during this year our outgoing mail on legislation alone numbered 2,000 pieces a day you can understand how crowded are the four girls who work in this one room.

Offices have been assigned to me in the Capitol as majority leader, and also for the Policy Committee staff. As you know, the Capitol offices are not adequate for any sizable staff, and the people who work there are as crowded as those in my office in the Senate Office Building.

I am heartily in favor of a new building to relieve the space situation.

Sincerely yours,

SCOTT W. LUCAS.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
September 20, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please accept my apology for not getting an answer to your August 19 letter long before this. Until the first of this year my office space was so small that I simply did not have room enough to carry on my work properly. In January I was able to get another room which has made it somewhat better but I definitely need more space for my staff. I hope we are successful in getting the new building.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
RULES AND ADMINISTRATION,
February 24, 1950.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: This concerns your letter of February 14, 1950, on space.

I consider my present office and committee facilities ample for present needs.

As you know, however, I have been charged with assignment of space in the Senate Office Building and my experience with this in the past 1½ years is conclusive that the majority of the Senators needs more room than one is able to give them at the present.

I support your known attitude that work on the new Senate Office Building ought to go forward at once, and assure you of my future support for that project.

Very sincerely yours,

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
February 18, 1950.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I have read with more than casual interest your letter of February 14, 1950, and the enclosure thereto. The following paragraphs contain a statement of my experience with my office facilities and some statistics in regard to my staff and space needs.

I have found that the three-room suite allocated to me is completely insufficient for my needs. As you know, I am the junior

Senator from the largest state, population-wise, in the Nation and am receiving approximately 2,000 letters per day. This mass of correspondence plus the other duties I have, require me to maintain a staff of 22 persons.

At the present time I have a three-room suite on the fourth floor of the Senate Office Building in which 10 persons work. In Room 5B, Senate Office Building, 10 more staff members are quartered. In 5B, also, are my current files and my mailing operations. In Rooms 41 and 42, Deck A, of the Library of Congress are quartered three other persons. Their presence in the Library of Congress makes necessary the addition of a messenger to transport materials between the Library and the above-mentioned offices. While I am grateful for having space in the Library of Congress, it has proved completely unsatisfactory from the standpoint of efficiency and I am presently contemplating taking office space, for which I will pay personally, in a private building more closely situated to the Senate Office Building.

Some time ago in conjunction with 10 or 12 other Senators faced with the same problem which I have described, I signed a petition addressed to the Senate Rules Committee, offering some suggestions to provide interim relief.

It is my opinion that the proposal for a new Senate Office Building is not only meritorious but absolutely essential. I find my activities hampered at every turn by my space problems.

Yours very sincerely,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 16, 1950.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I am in favor of completing at the earliest possible time the new Senate Office Building. I think it was a serious mistake not to have appropriated for this at the last session of Congress.

Space is badly needed by everyone connected with the committees I serve on.

With kind personal regards.

Most sincerely yours,

ELBERT D. THOMAS.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
February 15, 1950.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I have your letter of the 14th and in reply advise that I have supported the proposal to build a new Senate Office Building and have not changed my mind, and still think we should proceed with the program.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

ELMER THOMAS.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN
THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
March 10, 1950.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Lack of office space has been a critical problem for me. I was assigned a three-room suite. For a while it was necessary to have nine girls working in one room of about 450 square feet. The situation became so serious that I was forced to rent several rooms in the Carroll Arms Hotel.

I believe it was originally intended to have one room for receiving visitors. I have

16 people assisting me in my Senate work. To provide adequate office space for them I would need five rooms.

One reason for the need of this space is that the Senate has provided for automatic typewriters. It is impossible to carry on general office work in a room in which these robotypes are being used. Therefore, I would suggest the following utilization of space of the needed five rooms. One would be for my own use. A second would be a reception room occupied by two members of my staff. A third would be for general office work and occupied by seven people. A fourth would be for automatic typewriters and files and used by three people. The fifth would be used by my executive assistant, administrative assistant, and two legislative assistants.

I believe that the proposed new Senate Office Building would go a long way toward relieving the pressure of space. As it cannot be completed for at least 2 years I feel the Senate should consider making some arrangements for the interim.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BENTON.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
March 6, 1950.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office
Building Commission,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to acknowledge your letter of the 14th requesting my comments regarding the need of a new Senate Office Building.

I believe this building should be constructed immediately. Many Senators are unable to employ their full complement of clerks because of lack of space, and there is no privacy when conferences are to be held in the Senators' offices.

It has been pointed out to me that many of the administrative offices of the Government have twice the amount of space per employee as is available to us on Capitol Hill. Further than that, many Senators need additional space immediately in order to increase their staffs.

I am definitely in favor of having prompt action taken relative to having this building constructed, and trust that this year Congress will appropriate the necessary funds.

Yours very truly,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., August 22, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My DEAR SENATOR: Thank you so much for your letter of August 19. I was glad to learn that a commission has been appointed to investigate the space needs of individual Senators. This is an undertaking long overdue.

Frankly, I presently have neither the staff nor the office space to do the job which 10,000,000 Pennsylvanians are entitled to expect of one of their Senators. If funds and space were available, I would add at least four more people to my staff. During the present session of Congress I have been receiving daily an average of 1,000 communications, all of which I have been acknowledging. Moreover, the proximity of my State to the Capitol prompts many personal visits by constituents.

One room of my four office suite, 261 B, has been officially condemned by the United States Public Health Service. If a private employer were found to be operating under similar conditions, he would not escape prosecution for long. The seven members of my staff working in this room each have less

than 40 square feet within which to work. This compares with the Government minimum standard of 110 square feet per person. That these hard-working employees are required to labor under such unhealthy and substandard conditions is a disgrace. I invite the Commission to visit this office. Words are not adequate to describe the situation there.

The other two rooms, occupied by six members of my staff, including my secretary and administrative assistant, are equally inadequate for the job which faces us. There is no element of privacy, a factor which is of paramount importance in dealing with certain constituents. Our problems are so numerous and varied that it is difficult to find answers to them under prevailing working conditions.

Two additional offices would probably solve my space requirements. If one could be found immediately, I would certainly welcome it. I realize that the long-established seniority rule governs the allocation of space and that the needs of the individual Senator are not always considered. I voted for the construction of the new Senate Office Building in the present session for I felt that that was the only way I could get additional space, which would enable me and my staff to do the best possible job for my 10,000,000 constituents. There is a great deal of merit to a recent proposal that space be allocated on the basis of need, but I am just afraid that need will very rarely ever be considered one of the principal criteria in the allocation of office space to individual Senators.

Room 261 B is the best evidence I can give the Commission that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania needs additional space, not next year or the year after, but now.

If the Commission somehow can pry loose for me another room, I would be everlasting grateful.

With best wishes, believe me,

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD MARTIN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
August 25, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Permit me to acknowledge your letter in regard to the new Senate Office Building.

There is no doubt in my mind that we need additional space. I voted against the bill this year because I thought the new building too elaborate. We should have at least one-fourth more space than we at the present time, with several additional committee rooms.

I trust that you will have the plans revised and ready to present at an early date. I shall be happy to support you. I badly need another large office.

Sincerely yours,

DICK RUSSELL.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
August 25, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Public
Works, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DENNIS: Thanks for your letter of August 23 regarding your plans for continuing to press for a new Senate Office Building in the next session of Congress. As you know, I supported this in the present session and I assure you that I will continue to support it.

In my case, I have three rooms. I am the only one connected with my office who has ample space. In the room to which the public is admitted, I have my administrative

assistant, chief secretary, and receptionist. In the third room, I have five girls and one man. Any time I have any extra employees I am compelled to crowd them into this third room. These conditions do not make for efficient operation. I have frequently said that every Senator ought to have a minimum of five rooms. We require no agency, bureau, or department head to operate under such cramped conditions.

You may be assured of my continuing support.

Sincerely,

JOHN SPARKMAN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
August 25, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Com-
mission, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: In reply to your letter of August 19, I want to go on record now as supporting the proposal to construct a new Senate Office Building.

The office space problem confronting Senators at this time is serious, and I can see no relief for the situation unless additional facilities are constructed. For example, I was recently instrumental in obtaining the enactment of a resolution to obtain a committee on labor-management relations, the purpose of which will be to conduct an extensive study into the causes of labor-management disputes. Although the staff will be small and could possibly be housed in one room, Senator HAYDEN has advised me that it will probably be necessary to use part of the funds authorized to be expended by this subcommittee to rent quarters outside the Senate Office Building and the Capitol Building. The only other alternative is to attempt to obtain rooms in the Library of Congress, which, I understand, is now filled to capacity.

While this is only one example of the serious need for space, I am sure it is likewise true in other cases.

It is neither economical nor in the interest of efficient service to permit this condition to continue, and I sincerely hope that you and your associates will be successful in the next session of this Congress in your efforts to obtain adequate space and facilities for Senators and their staffs.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
August 24, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Replying to your letter of August 18, I believe the need for additional office space to house the committees of the Senate is extremely urgent.

The present facilities occupied by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I have the honor to be chairman, are wholly inadequate. The committee workers are huddled together in overcrowded rooms. The committee room tentatively assigned for public hearings is entirely unsuited for any such purpose. In fact, during the Joint Committee's investigation of the Atomic Energy Commission this summer, it was necessary to hold hearings in the majority caucus room in the Senate Office Building. However, while the hearings were in full swing, we were notified that the committee would have to look for rooms elsewhere because another committee wanted to use the caucus room.

I believe it is bad business practice for the Senate to be carrying on public business

under such conditions. It seems to me that the building of a new office building with adequate facilities for all committees, is very necessary.

With regard to the office facilities assigned to me personally, the situation is the same. We are very much overcrowded, and the space available to my staff is totally insufficient. I have practically no facilities for the reception of visitors, and there are a great many of them coming in from the State of Connecticut constantly. I do need additional space, and need it badly.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

BRIEN McMAHON,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
February 17, 1950.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of February 14 in which you refer to a letter you wrote to me on August 18, 1949 with regard to construction of a new Senate Office Building.

The space available to me in the Senate Office Building is inadequate for the most efficient performance of the duties of my office. However, in view of the present financial condition of the Federal Government, I am strongly of the opinion that we should postpone expenditures at this time for the construction of a new Senate Office Building alike with retrenchment in every other field of Federal activities.

Sincerely yours,

GUY CORDON.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
March 2, 1950.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This will acknowledge your recent letter relative to the proposed new Senate Office Building.

When this matter was considered last year, I voted to postpone action, and my opinion has not changed. While I realize there is some discomfort and crowding in all offices, including my own, I think that as an example to the country we should take the lead in cutting Federal expenditures.

With all good wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

KENNETH S. WHERRY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
September 2, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of August 23 with regard to the construction of the projected new Senate Office Building is received. In light of the existing budget situation I feel that it was the wise thing to do to put this off, because I am against any expenditures that are not absolutely necessary.

Answering your question, of course we are all badly crowded, and while I am favored with a four-room suite, I certainly could use an extra room, as I have too many people in the rooms that I have. On the other hand, I feel that the Senators with three-room suites should get preference over the Senators with four rooms, and on that score I don't imagine the construction of the new building would relieve my immediate situation.

I would be interested to know whether you feel that the new building, if built, would have to be used entirely for committee meet-

ings and for the staffs of the various committees. I gather from your letter that the chairmen of the committees would have their suites in the new building, as well as their staffs, etc.

If your committee should decide to go ahead with this project, I would be glad to talk to you further with regard to the needs of my particular office.

Always cordially yours,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
August 26, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DENNIS: I received your letter of the 18th and I am glad to write you both respect to the Committee on Armed Services and my own individual office.

So far as the Senate Committee on Armed Services is concerned, the space allocation is sufficient. However, such is not the case in my individual office. I have a staff of 11 including my administrative assistant and secretary, and in each of two of the work-rooms there are 5 members of the staff working. For instance, in the office where my administrative assistant and secretary sit, there are three other desks and with three and four telephones constantly ringing and four typewriters in operation you can well appreciate how difficult it is to work.

We have in my personal office 3 book-cases completely filled and 6 tiers of filing cabinets or 24 cabinets. In addition, it is necessary to store there two trunks filled with needed office material. In the other 3 rooms there are 48 tiers or 192 filing cabinets and these comprise files only from 1945 to date. It is frequently necessary that trips be made to the attic to refer to previous files.

As you know, living close to my State I have many callers and in the reception room where there is one desk for the reception clerk, the entire wall space is taken over with files so that there is not much room for those who call at the office on business.

An additional room to my suite would add immeasurably to the efficiency of the office.

With best wishes and kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

M. E. TYDINGS.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
August 30, 1949.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of August 18 has been received and is very much appreciated.

Like many other Senators, my present office space is inadequate to meet our needs. Representing one of the larger States, with a population of over 10,000,000, and with 23 congressional districts the volume of mail and other business places a very heavy strain upon our facilities.

With best personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
August 31, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: This is in reference to your letter of August 23 concerning the need for additional office space for Members of the Senate.

From my own personal experience, I know that the present allocation of office space fails to meet the need. In my case, I have three rooms allocated to me. It is necessary to use one of these rooms as a combination reception room-office. In this room I have a receptionist and one stenographer. In the second room I have my administrative assistant, my legislative assistant and four young ladies. The third office is reserved for my use.

This space allocation is totally inadequate. While my State is approximately 1,000 miles removed from the national Capitol, I have had more than 1,000 visitors from my State this year. This total does not include many visitors who come to the office. This means that it is practically impossible for one woman to be used for any other purpose than the receiving of visitors.

The concentration of six people in the second office has a definite effect upon the amount of work done and the type of work accomplished. My assistants for administration and research find it necessary to utilize my office for dictation during the periods when I am absent at committee meetings, on the floor and for other purposes. It is necessary for my personal secretary to have her office in this crowded room since the space in my office is insufficient for her needs.

I have found that as one becomes more engrossed in committee and legislative work the incoming correspondence increases accordingly. I feel that it will undoubtedly become necessary for me to add one or two additional stenographers in the future.

I should like to also present the thought that since it is necessary to have another building to relieve the situation it certainly seems that sufficient additional space should be provided to insure more than just one extra room for each Senator as time goes on. It seems to me that an advanced fixed allocation of space presents an inflexible situation that should not be permitted to exist. It occurs to me that thoughtful planning in advance could well lead to a solution of the present space problem that would prevail for a great number of years.

I want you to know of my sincere desire to cooperate with you in reaching a proper answer to the current space problem. Insofar as my own office is concerned, it is acute.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. STENNIS.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
August 29, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Commission, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DENNIS: This will reply to your letter of August 20, in which you make inquiry of me as to the sufficiency of my present office quarters.

Although I am in a more favorable position than most Senators, in that I have a four-room suite, my present quarters are most cramped. Even if my quarters were sufficient because of the fact that I have four rooms, I would not want to deny other Senators with three-room suites the opportunity of sufficient quarters with which to carry on their work.

As you know, the work of a United States Senator has been increasing yearly. This is evidenced by the fact that the Senate has from time to time allowed additional clerk hire which is sorely needed. My present quarters are such that I do not even occupy a private office, but share my office with one of the members of my staff. My administrative assistant shares his office with three additional clerks. I have a very small reception room, which is occupied by only the receptionist, and the remainder of my staff is all crowded into the remaining office.

I hope that this information will be helpful to you in presenting the matter to the Senate.

Warm regards to you, and,
Always sincerely,

CLAUDE PEPPER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES
IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
August 30, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I will be very glad to advise you of my office facilities, in accordance with your letter of August 23.

I now have a three-room suite, which has proven entirely inadequate. Another room is needed to provide proper working space for my staff.

Sincerely yours,

GLEN H. TAYLOR.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES
IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
August 27, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN: I agree completely with you on the need of more office space. I know that I certainly need at least one more room.

At the present time, I have five in one room and two in the reception room of my 3-room suite. I need one additional room, not only to ease the crowded condition in the room where there are five, but also to provide privacy that is sacrificed by placing my receptionist and executive assistant in the reception room. I've tried to meet this problem by installing a hush-a-phone on my assistant's phone, but it only partially meets the need of privacy.

Has any consideration been given to extending the Senate wing of the Capitol or to adding floors to the top of the Senate Office Building? From the advantage of proximity to the Senate floor, I would think that these alternatives might be better.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
August 25, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of August 18 with reference to the proposed new Senate Office Building. In complying with the request set forth in your letter, I want to point out that when I took office in January, I was assigned a suite of three rooms at 231 Senate Office Building. At that time I had 16 people jammed into two rooms. It was an almost intolerable situation, and after several weeks Senator HAYDEN was kind enough to assign me another single detached room on a different floor which has relieved the situation somewhat.

My mail is extremely heavy, running about an average of 12,000 letters a month. As a result I have personally acquired two electric typewriters and robotype equipment for them in order to process my mail. My staff present consists of 17 people, and certainly even the space which I now have could hardly be called ample or even adequate for the efficient operation of my office. Unquestionably any additional space which might be available to me would be most desirable and would most definitely increase the efficiency of my office.

Early in the session I had some hopes that we might have a new Senate Office Building for much less money than has been proposed that we spend on it. I have not gone into that, however, and do not feel that I am in a position to hazard a guess whether or not the necessary space desired could be acquired for less than the proposed cost.

I am hopeful that some arrangement can be made to provide additional space to the Senators.

With assurances of my highest regard, I am,

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE,
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
August 25, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: This is in reply to your letter of August 18 in which you ask about the space requirements of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The space facilities for this committee are far from adequate. I have tried for some time to secure additional space, and the Committee on Rules and Administration has tried to be of assistance, but apparently there is just no space available.

As you probably are aware, in addition to its regular committee work this committee was authorized and directed to make four very important and far-reaching studies and investigations. We have employed additional temporary personnel to assist with these studies, but because of the very unsatisfactory space situation these employees are located in three widely separated rooms in the Senate Office Building and a substantial part of the committee's files are located in the Capitol Building. Room 457 is assigned to this committee, but because of this space shortage we have had to convert it into a work room, consequently we cannot use it for hearings and have to hunt around for a room when hearings are held.

In connection with the four investigations I have mentioned above, I had hoped to set up a central stenographic pool, which would have cut down on the number of employees, but manifestly that is impossible when the committee staff is scattered all over the building.

The Rules Committee tells me that there is just no more space available. It would seem that the only answer is to enlarge the Senate Office Building or construct a new building.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. JOHNSON, *Chairman.*

I wish we might build an addition on the Capitol Building instead of spreading so far to the east as is contemplated in the proposed building.—E. C. J.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., August 26, 1949.
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of August 18 in which you request information concerning my present office facilities.

The space is wholly inadequate for my present staff, which may be increased somewhat next year, and the small space now allotted me is such that proper arrangement, conducive to orderly staff functioning, is impossible.

With best wishes and kindest regards,

Sincerely,

HOMER CAPEHART.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
AND FORESTRY,
August 26, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Public Works, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I thank you for your letter of August 18, 1949, and I am glad to have the information which you give with reference to the proposed new Senate Office Building. I shall be glad to consider this fully before the time comes to take it up in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

With best wishes always, I am

Yours very truly,

CLYDE R. HOEY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., August 23, 1949.
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In your capacity as chairman of the Senate Office Building Commission, I should like you to know that it has been my experience that added space would be most helpful to promoting more efficient operation of the senatorial office.

Although I come from a small State and hence, do not have the demands of many of the larger ones, I too have had to face this problem. It would be my hope that before long, adequate facilities might be available.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. HOWARD McGRATH,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING
AND CURRENCY,
August 24, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have received your letter of August 18 referring to your continued efforts directed toward the construction of a new Senate Office Building.

In answer to your specific question, I believe that I could now use, and will in the future continue to need, more space than I am presently assigned. We are crowded now, and fully expect to be more crowded as time progresses.

Further I would appreciate having a more convenient office arrangement. At the present time, one of the rooms is entirely separate from the other three. It would be not only more convenient but more efficient to have the office suite in one unit.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. BRICKER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
August 25, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: In response to yours of August 19, 1949, relative to office facilities will say that I incline to the opinion that my office staff is less in number than is that of the staff of most of the other Senators and particularly those Senators representing more populous States.

It is practically mandatory that a Senator have a room by himself in order that he may dictate and hold consultations without interruptions. His office should be so arranged that his administrative assistant and executive secretary should be in a position to attend to their duties and work without

the interruptions occasioned by visiting delegations and others during office hours. Such an arrangement cannot be had with the limited number of rooms apportioned to most of the Senators.

My opinion of the matter is that the office facilities of most of the Senators at least are inadequate and that, viewed from my experience with the staff I have, additional space would be very helpful.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Yours sincerely,

BERT H. MILLER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
August 23, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to acknowledge your letter of August 19.

I do have inadequate office space but I am one of those who oppose the construction of the projected new Senate Office Building. I am advocating economy in government and am willing to practice it myself. If all the various agencies of government would follow our example we would have real economy.

Kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

HOMER FERGUSON.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Dexter, Maine, August 22, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DENNIS: I am heartily in favor of expanding the facilities for Congress to cope with the tremendous increased responsibilities of the Federal Government.

Congress is still trying to operate in the twentieth century with a nineteenth-century machine.

Cordially yours,

OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
August 23, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building Commission, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Replying to your courteous letter of August 20, I hasten to say that I appreciate the thoughtful inquiry and add that I have been especially cramped in office quarters since my return to the Senate in January of this year.

As one of the newer Senators, I have a three-room suite and space is so limited that for more than 6 months after coming to the Senate in January I was unable to appoint an administrative assistant because I had no place to put a desk for him. Through the kindness of Senator THOMAS, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I was able to provide temporary space for an administrative assistant during the past 30 days in a room adjacent to the Agriculture Committee room. It is an imposition on Senator THOMAS and a tremendous inconvenience to me.

I am convinced that when I return to Washington at the beginning of the next congressional term that I shall have to dispense with an administrative assistant unless I can find some quarters for him to have desk room where I can contact him with reasonable facility.

Personal greetings.

Sincerely,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
Washington, D. C., August 23, 1949.
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Office Building
Committee, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Thank you for your very friendly note about the new Senate Office Building and inquiry about my conditions so far as space is concerned.

May I reply with equal frankness and friendliness.

Although my offices are probably more overcrowded than those of any other Senator, I do not favor spending the money which a new building would cost. I have only a three-room suite, plus a small room in the basement, to handle the affairs of a State with 8,500,000 people, with a correspondence that runs between 700 and 800 letters a day and with a swarm of visitors.

But the need for economy is, in my judgment, so great that I am willing to put up with this inconvenience in order to save the \$20,000,000, plus upkeep, which a new building would entail.

Appreciating the sincerity of your motives and with best personal wishes,

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in the light of recent events the appropriation in this bill of \$1,200,000,000 for armed aid to western Europe is woefully inadequate. This country is faced with a grave decision. We must build up the forces of western Europe. We must contribute, for our own welfare, vast amounts of equipment to our allies there. We must build up the Armed Forces of the United States to an extent to make it impracticable for the Soviet Union to launch a general war. We must at once mobilize American industry commensurate with the crisis. This is the best way to prevent general war.

Mr. President, the main thing that the events in Korea have shown is how woefully weak, how woefully unprepared we are in the face of the gravest threat ever faced by the American people. The lesson in Korea is valuable, but Korea, and all of Asia, for that matter, though extremely important to this country, are not the main show. Their conquest by communism is not the paramount danger to the United States. This country can live without Asia, but we cannot live without Europe. Do not misunderstand me. We must prevent Communist aggression in Korea. We must prevent by the use of Armed Forces Communist conquest of the Continent of Asia. Our Government is following the only course we can pursue in this matter.

Mr. President, be this as it may, there is no way that the United States can live if Europe is controlled by the Soviet Union. In my judgment, the very life of the United States—the lives, the welfare, the security of the American people—depend absolutely upon the prevention of the conquest of western Europe by the Soviet Union. To capture western Europe is the primary objective of the Soviet Union. The prevention of this conquest must be the primary objective of the United States. In fact, our frontier is not upon the Rhine, but it is the Oder-Neisse line.

Now, Mr. President, what are the facts? As a result of the war and of the devastation and chaos which ensued, a vast vacuum or void was created in western Europe. Today that vacuum has not been filled. It will be filled by some nation in time. If we do not act, it will be filled in time by the Soviet Union, and then all will be lost. The states of western Europe which comprise it are bitterly anti-Communist, but weak, helpless, and without armed resources because of the war. In western Germany we find the people are among the leading anti-Communist people of the world. They are a strong race. They are a people whose historic mission has been to prevent the expansion of the Mongol-Communist hordes into Europe. We have forbidden the people of western Germany, even though they desired to do so, to arm and defend themselves from communism. In Russian Germany and in the satellite states there are vast Communist armies, well trained, in the "pink" of condition, equipped with artillery, guns, tanks, planes—all of the latest design. In fact, this army is invincible in Europe today. Russia knows that no formidable force confronts it in Europe, and it knows that it could largely win its war and gravely weaken the United States by the occupation of western Europe.

Why does it not do so, Mr. President? The authorities, the experts, those high in Government who should know, say the following is the reason why Russia does not openly intervene in Korea and launch a general war at this time:

The atomic development of this country is far advanced over the atomic development of the Soviet Union. In fact, the atomic development of the Soviet Union is in its infancy. These authorities hold that Russia will not unleash a general war until her atomic development has progressed to a point where it can neutralize ours, and she could bomb American ports and cities and thus prevent our sending a military force for the reconquest of Europe and to repulse the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, the destruction of a very few American ports would make it impossible for this country to launch an offensive in Europe.

The main reason is, however, the authorities hold, the fear on the part of the Soviet Union that because of our atomic advances we could devastate the cities and industry of Russia with the atomic weapons which we possess. These same authorities hold, however—and my judgment is that they are correct—that given 2, 3, to 4 years, when Russia's atomic-war industry will be much further developed, she will have atomic weapons in such quantities as to neutralize the atomic weapons of the United States. We will be in a position with atomic weapons then as great nations now are with poison gas; it is too dangerous for each side to use atomic weapons as it now is to use poison gas. We will be in a position where the atomic weapons of each side will neutralize the other, and then, Mr. President, the Red army will march, provided the west is not

adequately defended. The Red army will march if we are weak. The Red army will march if the Atlantic community of nations cannot immediately defend themselves. The only reason that would make war inevitable is that the west is weak and Russia, a predatory aggressor, is strong. If France and Britain had not been militarily weak in 1939, there would have been no World War II. Aggressors do not march when their foes are equally as strong. Aggression breeds upon weakness, not strength. If it is too dangerous to do so, Russia will not march, as Hitler would not have done in 1939.

Unless we are adequately defended we are absolutely certain to have a general war with the Soviet Union. We have only 2 to 3 years at the most to accomplish this, and, Mr. President, we must build up the defenses of the country; we must rearm; and we must rearm our allies abroad.

It is senseless not to cooperate with the two strongest peoples on the continent of Europe, the people of Spain and Western Germany. These are the people with a will to fight communism. These are the people who will take up arms to prevent communist aggression. I say it does not make sense to the American people that we do not make use of the manpower and resources of these two countries in the defense of western civilization.

Observe what is happening in the Soviet zone of Germany today. Russia has built up a large force, and has facing us from 50 to 75,000 so-called German police, a force which is being rapidly expanded to 150,000 men. This force is similar to the communist puppets in Korea, is organized as they are, and is equipped with arms, tanks, and weapons similar to those used by them. Furthermore, they have built there a skeleton army of 50,000 from officer and non-officer cadres around which a German army could be quickly built. In fact, she has created there a skeleton army which could quickly be expanded into a strong army for use against us.

While Russia does this, Mr. President, the United States will not take steps to build up an allied army in western Germany to enable the Germans to defend themselves, and thus increase our strength and lessen our responsibilities.

Our policy in refusing to use German and Spanish manpower and resources is to appease for political purposes certain left-wing and radical groups in the United States and abroad. This political appeasement, Mr. President, has jeopardized the defense of our country, and if not quickly changed will be paid for by the blood of thousands of American boys.

The United States, unless it is rearm, mobilized and prepared for defense, faces defeat in war, or isolation in the world. Each of these means the death and destruction of the country. We do not have today as many men under arms as we had in 1940, and the dangers which face us are many times more serious and more deadly. This

country must have industrial mobilization immediately on a scale commensurate with the crisis. We cannot rearm ourselves and help to rearm our allies, in the short time allotted by fate to us, on a policy of business as usual. The \$1,200,000,000 requested in this bill is totally inadequate. Last year we appropriated \$1,500,000,000 for armed aid to western Europe and to implement the North Atlantic Pact. This was all right as a starter, but it is suicide to continue at the present pace. The rate of rearmament must be greatly stepped up both at home and abroad. We must be fully rearmed within 2 to 3 years. This is the time that is allotted to us.

Mr. President, we should double the arms aid program for western Europe this year. We must immediately mobilize our industry, and build up the Armed Forces of the United States. Who says we have enough guns, enough planes, enough weapons of any kind? Who says we are not woefully weak? Who says we are not too weak for our own security? Who says we have armed forces capable of protecting us? We cannot speedily mop up the communist bandits in Korea.

Mr. President, this is an intolerable situation, with world conditions as they are today. In fact, strong American forces are the key to our security, the key to European security, the key to Asiatic security, the buffer to prevent Russian aggression. In 1939, when the danger to civilization was not as great as it is today, we became the arsenal of democracy. Today the cupboard is bare, and we are not taking steps sufficient in this emergency to protect this country. If we are to avoid war, we must make it too costly and too dangerous for predatory communism to attack.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Federal Government has just ended another fiscal year in the red. This was the eighteenth Federal deficit during the 20 years since 1930, and 13 of these annual deficits have been in peacetime years. The deficit record, exclusive of the war years follows:

1931	-----	\$400,000,000
1932	-----	2,500,000,000
1933	-----	1,800,000,000
1934	-----	2,900,000,000
1935	-----	3,200,000,000
1936	-----	4,500,000,000
1937	-----	3,100,000,000
1938	-----	1,400,000,000
1939	-----	3,500,000,000
1940	-----	3,600,000,000
1941	-----	5,100,000,000
(1942-46, war years.)		
(1947-48, surpluses.)		
1949	-----	1,800,000,000
1950	-----	3,100,000,000

The 2 years in the black were in the period of the Eightieth Congress.

The total debt is now \$257,220,328,000.

The \$3,100,000,000 deficit for the year 1950 compares with the President's January estimate of \$5,500,000,000.

The President arrived at this deficit estimate by calculating that receipts would be \$37,800,000,000 and expenditures would total \$43,300,000,000. Reve-

nue fell \$800,000,000 short of his estimate and be overestimated expenditures by more than \$3,100,000,000. The result was a deficit of \$3,100,000,000 instead of the estimated \$5,500,000,000.

EXPENDITURE SLOW-DOWN

It would be a mistake to assume that all this \$2,400,000,000 reduction in deficit spending represents a saving. In a large measure it merely represents a slow-down in the schedule of construction and procurement expenditures which probably will be made up in the fiscal years 1951 and 1952. The money is still appropriated and is still available for spending.

The President's estimates failed to materialize primarily for two reasons. One was uncalculated increases in employment generally which curtailed expenditures in the big veterans and social security programs, and simultaneously reduced the demand for Government loans and increased the market for paper held by Government lending agencies.

The second reason is to be found in a chain reaction which was set in motion by delay in the enactment of last year's appropriation bills. This delay in passage of appropriation bills slowed down expenditure schedules particularly in programs and agencies where funds in large measure were to be used for construction and procurement. And in some cases when these agencies appeared before the House Appropriations Committee with unexpectedly large balances in view the committee accordingly cut back the appropriations for fiscal year 1951. This committee action plus further reductions voted on the floor of the House and the tightening up of the antideficiency provisions had the effect of freezing, or at least further slowing down the rate of expenditures during the final quarter of fiscal year 1950, because the agencies did not choose to expand during the last few months of the past year in the face of an impending cut-back at the beginning of the new year.

Examples of expenditure schedules affected by increased general employment follow:

[In millions]			
Agency	President's January estimates	Actual expenditure	Reduction
Social Security Administration	\$1,212	\$1,154	\$58
Other Federal Security	333	277	56
Veterans (exclusive of national service life insurance fund)	6,280	6,044	236
Reconstruction Finance	1,000	589	411
Home Loan Bank Board (collections)	197	275	78

Mr. President, there is another list of examples of the expenditure schedules affected by slow-down in construction and procurement of supplies, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In millions]			
Agency	President's January estimates	Actual expenditure	Reduction
Rural Electrification Administration.....	\$362	\$293	\$69
Atomic Energy Commission.....	673	524	149
Civil Aeronautics Administration.....	188	166	22
Public Roads.....	507	486	21
Defense Establishment.....	14,500	13,500	1,000
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	4,100	3,500	600
Mutual defense assistance program.....	160	44	116
Bureau of Reclamation.....	334	300	34
Other Interior.....	304	276	28
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	52	18	34
General Services Administration.....	797	588	209

Other areas in which estimates exceeded actual expenditures included

[In millions]			
Agency	President's January estimates	Actual expenditures	Reduction
Korean aid.....	\$60	\$40	\$20
State Department.....	358	339	19
Maritime activities.....	162	94	68

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, among all these items, the curtailment by some \$600,000,000 in expenditures for veterans and RFC programs represents the principal real savings. The other expenditures in a large measure represent deferments to some subsequent fiscal year—in most instances fiscal year 1951 or fiscal year 1952.

EXPENDITURES SPEED-UP

Offsetting these miscalculations in estimates on the reduction side there were some items where expenditures exceeded the estimates. Among these were:

[In millions]			
Agency	President's January estimates	Actual expenditures	Increase
Farmers Home Administration.....	\$26	\$182	\$156
Commodity Credit Corporation.....	1,556	1,713	157
Labor Department.....	157	258	101
Postal deficiency.....	573	593	20
Interest on the debt.....	5,725	5,750	25

Mr. President, I attempt by this to show the reasons why the actual deficit was less than the estimated deficit.

COMPARED WITH 1949

Despite this slow-down under the expenditure tempo as estimated by the President for fiscal year 1950, we still exceeded 1949 expenditures by more than \$100,000,000 and thus set a new peacetime record. While expenditures went up, receipts came down. They finally totaled \$800,000,000 less than the President estimated and nearly \$1,250,000,000 under 1949.

EFFECT ON 1951 EXPENDITURES

It is difficult, of course, at this time to estimate how much of the 1950 ex-

penditure slow-down will be made up in increased expenditures in fiscal year 1951, but it is certain that the carry-overs are not likely to result in reductions in 1951 estimates. There are some which obviously are just the difference between obligations and expenditures such as the carry-over from 1950 expenditure estimates for public roads, airports, TVA steam plant, and General Services procurement.

There are others where more than 1 year may be required to make up for the slow-down, such as the REA's rural-telephone program, ECA commitments, Reclamation construction, procurement, and development, atomic-energy activities, and military construction and procurement.

The reductions in such veterans' programs as on-the-job training, which occurred when industry payrolls absorbed the veteran trainees during the year, and reductions resulting from the failure of demand for Government loans to materialize, and the spurt in the market for Government loan paper, may definitely be regarded as a saving in 1950 budget estimates without qualification.

1951 REVENUE

There appears to be reason to expect that at least some of these carry-overs will result in increased spending in 1951. In this situation consideration should be given to the fact that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, subject to revision if a new tax bill is passed, estimates that revenue this year will not exceed \$35,100,000,000—a reduction of \$2,000,000,000 under the year just ended. If this estimate were to be sustained, Federal revenue will have dropped \$3,000,000,000 in 2 years. Of course, this estimate may be changed by the economic conditions of the country.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

My BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator is a member of the Senate Finance Committee. In view of the situation which seems to be developing in Korea, is it the view of the Senator that the committee should proceed with further consideration of the bill which the committee has been considering?

Mr. BYRD. In answer to the Senator from Connecticut I will say that it is my personal judgment, as a member of the Finance Committee and as a Member of the Senate, that no bill should be enacted which would bring about a net loss of revenue to the Federal Government. Because of the very serious conditions confronting the Nation and in view of the fact that we must look forward to increased expenditures for military purposes, I do not think we should reduce by even a small amount the net income we now derive under the present schedule of taxes. That is my feeling as a member of the committee. Of course, I cannot speak for the other members of the committee.

If we can arrive at a balanced bill whereby the loss of revenue on certain

items can be made up by increasing the taxes on others, of course, that will present a different situation; but certainly, in my judgment, we should not decrease the present tax revenues.

The joint committee's revenue estimate for the year just ended was closer to the actual figure than the administration's forecast. By the administration's most optimistic estimate to date, revenue in the current fiscal year 1951 would be one-quarter of a billion dollars less than receipts for 1950, and this would be a full billion dollars under the 1949 revenue.

DEFICITS CONTINUE

If the joint committee's revenue estimate prevails, and if the President's expenditure requests should be granted in full, the deficit next June 30 would be \$7,300,000,000, exclusive of expenditure increases resulting from the 1950 slow-down. Even if the revenue should exceed the administration's most optimistic estimate, the President's expenditure requests for fiscal year 1951, plus the uncalculated carry-over from the year just ended, would result in a deficit this year of more than \$5,000,000,000.

Thus, in 3 years—based on the actual figures for 1949 and 1950 and on the President's estimates for the current year—we shall have indulged the people of this Nation in \$10,000,000,000 of deficit spending. With no sense of pride, I recall my prediction a year ago, when, with no war in sight, it became evident that we were entering a prolonged orgy of deficit financing.

At that time I estimated the 1949 deficit at \$800,000,000, and was a billion dollars too low. My estimate for the current year was a \$3,400,000,000 deficit; and if it were not for the delay in construction and procurement expenditure schedules, I would have been more than \$1,000,000,000 low again. My deficit forecast for the coming year was \$6,500,000,000. I hope my 1951 estimate will be high for a change; but even excluding consideration of the effect on the budget of the aggravated foreign situation, there would be reason to expect it to be low again unless substantial reductions were made in the President's requests.

In any event, it is certain that there will be another big deficit in the fiscal year 1951, exclusive of the unestimated costs of the Korean outbreak. This will be the third deficit in successive years of peak employment and inflated income. These facts raise the question as to whether we shall ever again balance the Federal budget.

DESTRUCTION OF THE SYSTEM

It should be noted that all of these calculations are exclusive of the effects of the current international situation and the pending tax bill. Consideration of these factors will be reached later on.

Meanwhile, with or without a tax bill or the additional costs of an international crisis, the President does not give even lip-service sympathy to reductions in his proposals to spend \$42,500,000,000 in the current fiscal year. This silence is despite the fact that his requests include demands for \$12,200,000,000 in domestic programs, exclusive of defense, veterans, foreign assistance, and interest on the

debt—an increase of \$5,300,000,000 since 1948.

When, in January, the President made these requests, on the basis of his own revenue estimates, he admittedly proposed deficit spending for fiscal year 1951 to the extent of \$5,100,000,000, which was approximately the equivalent of the 2-year increase in domestic civilian spending. This could be regarded as evidence that we have been led into a fallacious policy of deficit financing to create inflation, which in turn would produce more synthetic revenue to justify more Federal spending.

How Government-fed inflation works is simply illustrated as follows:

Since 1939 population has increased 16 percent; Federal expenditures have increased 500 percent; personal income has increased 180 percent; the cost of living, exclusive of taxes, has increased 180 percent; Federal collection of taxes has increased 700 percent.

We have before us the pre-Korean crisis expert warning of Dr. Edwin G. Nourse that inflationary dangers are inherent in the current deficit-financing policy.

Since the appropriation bill has been before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Dr. Nourse has expressed apprehension that the rate of deficit spending by the executive branch, aggravated in the legislative process, may produce accelerated prices which might lead to a run-away boom. This, he said, could be followed by a genuine depression and brutal deflation that come with a sharp contraction of demand due to unemployment and drying up of active business investment.

The Federal Government is directly responsible for what Dr. Nourse described as credit expansion policies which have led not only to cashing in past savings but also drawing on future income, in contrast with the sound policy of finding a true market balance between full volume production and current consumer income.

Thus, he said, we have failed to conserve our market-supporting ammunition.

Mr. President, continuous deficit spending inevitably will destroy our form of government through confiscatory taxes, inflationary booms, complete regimentation or unmanageable debt, or the combination of one or more of these evil companions of continuing deficits.

In peace, nothing is more subversive to our form of government than unnecessary deficit financing.

Most of the deficit spending contemplated in the pending appropriation bill was conceived and proposed in the absence of any imminence of war or international crisis. The effect on the deficit of any additional requirement for expenditures resulting from recent incidents abroad will be only a matter of degree.

THE ALTERNATIVE

It may be said that our deficit-financing policies might readily be the most effective fifth column now at large in the United States. The alternative to destruction by deficit—in hot war or cold war, in peace or in conflict—is reduction

of nonessential domestic-civilian expenditures. On the basis of the President's January requests, the budget would be balanced for fiscal year 1951 if Federal expenditures for strictly domestic-civilian activities—exclusive of defense, foreign assistance, veterans, interest—were on a level with such expenditures in 1948. In other words, if we were to spend for domestic-civilian activities, exclusive of defense, foreign assistance, veterans, and interest, the same amount we spent in 1948, the budget now would be balanced. It is my firm conviction that this retrenchment in these activities certainly would neither jeopardize the national welfare nor disturb the sound prosperity of the Nation. On the contrary, it would reenforce the moral fiber of our citizens for whatever tests may lie ahead, and would put us in a better position to develop an invincible military defense.

COMMITMENTS

I realize, of course, that some of the \$12,250,000,000 which domestic-civilian programs would cost us under the President's requests is tied to long-term commitments now rooted in authorizations made by law. I take this occasion to repeat what I have been saying for years: We should proceed with caution toward the enactment of basic legislation which in effect commits the Federal Government to virtually permanent spending programs.

I went into this matter in great detail last December, before the President brought in his budget requests for fiscal year 1951, hoping that he would recommend basic legislative action curtailing these programs. We know from experience that reductions in the cost of Government involving entrenched long-term programs is next to impossible without the force of executive recommendation and attitude.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

The pending budget for fiscal year 1951 was submitted without either recommendation or sympathetic attitude with respect to retrenchment in domestic-civilian deficit spending. On the contrary, the President's budget document contained nearly two full pages of recommendations for new programs and extension of expiring programs; and the majority of these proposed legislation items fall into the strictly domestic category.

We must effect substantial reductions which would ease the fiscal strain to which the Federal Government is being subjected unnecessarily by nonessential expenditures—when I say “nonessential” I mean nonessential especially with respect to the national defense—for strictly domestic-civilian activities at a time when the need for additional military outlays appears to be imminent.

Fortunately, the Senate for the first time in modern history is considering the Federal expenditure budget in a single appropriation bill; and this makes it possible to apply reductions throughout the entire budget, with due consideration given to the merit of each and all items which are embraced by the measure.

Under the able leadership of the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of

the House Appropriations Committee, it has been demonstrated that such reductions can be made fairly, effectively, and orderly—without the meat-ax approach which was necessary when appropriations were considered in 12 or more separate and unrelated bills brought before Congress over a period of six or more months. Under the forthright leadership of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senate Committee, too, has done excellent work with this initial effort to bring out a single appropriation bill. Despite its size, we are still months ahead of the appropriation bill schedule of last year.

We should sustain the House reductions, Mr. President, and we should increase them in every possible way, as they relate to nondefense spending. Actually, a good part of the reductions accomplished under the President's estimates are in terms of legislation he requested, but which has not been enacted. There is on the statute books much legislation which can be cut without impairment of any essential function.

If we are not willing to give up non-essentials while Americans are being shot, we are not worthy of our position of world leadership.

Recent developments indicate that Russia is waging a war of economic attrition to destroy the solvency of the United States, which means the destruction of our private-enterprise system and the loss of our freedoms. First, we had the airlift incident in Berlin, which cost hundreds of millions. We now have the Korean incident, which will probably cost billions, with the loss of many American lives, and, if the 50,000 troops in North Korea are conquered—as, of course, I feel they will be, in time—this will lead to a long-time occupation of Korea, which will add still further to the cost. It is likely and probable that other such incidents will break out elsewhere on the globe in which our Nation will be involved.

These vast expenditures come at a time when the President and the Congress have deliberately neglected the opportunity to balance the budget, which can be done by economy and retrenchment in domestic spending. I repeat: In fiscal 1948 domestic spending, exclusive of veterans, national defense, foreign aid, and interest on the national debt, was \$6,900,000,000. The President recommends in his budget for the pending fiscal year an expenditure for the same domestic purposes of \$12,200,000,000, an increase of nearly 100 percent.

We must face the situation squarely. We must retrench at home or run the risk of weakening day by day our fiscal economy by adding to a public debt which is now more than a quarter of a trillion dollars.

If a war incident such as is now occurring in Korea should develop into a world conflict, we would incur a public indebtedness which would be so colossal and overwhelming that it would be impossible for us to maintain our free-enterprise system, which has been the foundation on which the progress and success of America has been built.

I emphasize again that every single dollar should be saved in all expenditures

not affecting our national defense and our security, because no one can foretell, in these difficult days, what demands may be made upon us in the days and years to come.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, did the Chair recognize the Senator from Illinois?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say I should be very glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question, or for an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to obtain the floor in my own right. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Senate committee's amendment which is now the pending question before the Senate. This appropriates initially the sum of \$10,000,000 to start a new and additional Senate Office Building. We have heard this morning that if the original plans are to go through, the ultimate cost of this new building will be approximately \$21,000,000, and if abridged and simplified plans are put into effect, that the cost will be \$16,000,000. I want to say I think the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is completely correct in objecting to this building, particularly at this time. The senior Senator from Virginia has just reminded us that the deficit for the fiscal year which we have just passed, ending the first of July, was \$3,100,000,000. The deficit for the coming year, even according to the appropriation bill presented to us, and without allowance for further war emergency expenses, may run to \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000. If we should become involved in large military expenses in Korea, in Asia, and in other portions of the world, the deficit will be much, much more than \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000. Therefore, Mr. President, I submit that we should think very carefully before we commit ourselves to appropriating \$10,000,000 for an office building this year, knowing that it will require the appropriation of additional sums of from \$6,000,000 to \$11,000,000 in future years, and knowing also that, as the senior Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, the costs of maintenance, exclusive of interest upon the building itself, will run between \$500,000 and \$600,000 a year.

Mr. President, I do not think we should make this expenditure. I want to say that I am aware of the fact that a good many Senators find themselves in crowded quarters. I happen to represent the fourth State in the Union from the standpoint of population. My mail is probably among the first 12, measured in volume, received. I am not as crowded and I do not have as large a volume of mail as the two Senators from New York, and probably not as large a volume of mail as the two Senators from Pennsylvania. But my mail runs well over a thousand letters a day, and we have a large volume of work to do.

Naturally, as a junior Senator, I am not entitled to very much office space. I am not entitled to the four-room suite of offices to which senior Senators are entitled. I was given a three-room suite, and I make no complaint about that whatever. I want to say that through the kindness of the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] I was given an additional room in the basement, to help handle some of my mass mail. But, nevertheless, even with four rooms, I suppose that, with the exception of the two Senators from New York, I am about as crowded as any Senator in this body. Naturally, we could use a little more space. But I do not think it is worth \$20,000,000 to accommodate me and to accommodate other Senators who may be in the same position.

I intend to make no comments upon the allocation of such space as we have as between Senators, because that would be unseemly and unbecoming in a relatively junior Member. I would merely remark, however, that some Senators, because of their seniority, acquire the chairmanships of committees, and, at the same time, that they have a four-room suite, receive additional office space. I would suggest that a reallocation of existing office space would receive such needs for added rooms as may exist.

I want to say that I am not urging such reallocation; I am not asking for it. I am quite content to exist with the office space I have. I am far more content to remain in the small suite of offices I have than to agree to a bill which provides for spending \$20,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for a new office building.

Mr. President, I think we have got into the habit, within the past 20 years, of building elaborate quarters here. The early buildings in Washington, to which we still point with pride, were simple in nature, but they have been relatively adequate. The very able Senator from New Mexico invoked the name of Thomas Jefferson. He was quite right. Thomas Jefferson was a great architect and a great landscape gardener, in addition to all his other qualities. If we visit Monticello, the University of Virginia, and the Capitol building in Richmond, it will be found that Jefferson got his results through a minimum of expense, and yet achieved dignity and simplicity.

The White House to which visitors go when they come to Washington, is an example of dignified simplicity. The Capitol is not excessively elaborate. The House and Senate Office Buildings are simple and dignified. But, beginning in approximately 1930, we moved into the Imperial Roman period of architecture with the erection of the Commerce Building. I went into the Commerce Building in the early 1930's. I was struck by the big offices and the elaborate space provided for the Secretary of Commerce and for the Under Secretaries of Commerce.

As other department buildings were erected on Constitution Avenue, every secretary, every assistant secretary, and every bureau chief demanded that his office should be as large as or larger than the comparable offices in the Depart-

ment of Commerce, until finally, I am told, some secretaries would send men around with measuring tape to find out what was the actual size of the offices of other Cabinet officials and insist that in their new building they must have more square feet or more cubic feet of space.

Mr. President, I think we have now reached the point where the average American citizen feels very much embarrassed in going into the average governmental building, particularly the departmental buildings. He feels overawed by the architecture; he feels he is insignificant and that the people who dwell in these magnificent buildings and who have such large offices must be above and beyond him. In a democracy, Mr. President, every citizen should be able to go into a public building and not feel ashamed of himself and not feel insignificant. He should feel that he is on an equality with the persons who dwell therein. That is the characteristic of Monticello. The humblest and poorest American citizen can go to the hilltop of Monticello, look at the building, and feel that he is a part of it. He is not overawed by it. He can walk down the campus of the University of Virginia, down those declining terraces, see those brick buildings with colonnade pillars in front, and he can feel that this noble architectural work of beauty belongs to him and that he is a part of it. He is not overawed by it. But let the average American citizen go into the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, the Department of Agriculture, or the Post Office Department, and see the secretaries dwelling in marble halls, in offices so large that it is almost necessary to put on roller skates to go from one end to the other, with the carpet so thick and soft that snowshoes are needed in order to prevent falling through, and the average American citizen does feel overawed. We have given up democratic simplicity in most of our executive buildings and are going in for almost oriental magnificence.

This infection is spreading to Capitol Hill, Mr. President, because we look down Constitution Avenue and see the secretaries and assistant secretaries and bureau chiefs, who come before us for appropriations and for confirmation of their nomination—we see them driving up in automobiles as big as trucks, and we say to ourselves, "Are we not as important to the United States as are these men, and should we not have as elaborate buildings as they occupy? Build us more stately mansions, oh my soul; put up another office building so that we, too, may have large offices, so that people may walk before us in that air of hushed reverence with which people greet the functionaries downtown."

Mr. President, I think that is a false sense of values. We do not obtain dignity by the size of our offices, by the size of our buildings, or by the elaborateness of our quarters. We obtain dignity by our behavior as Senators, and not by the external accouterments of power with which we may surround ourselves.

Mr. President, I hope very much, therefore, that we will not put up any

additional office building. I hope that we shall stay where we are. I hope we can get greater simplicity in our administrative and judicial buildings and keep our own simplicity. I am perfectly willing to say in the presence of the good and genial chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration that I am willing to stay in the suite which has been assigned to me. I would rather be a doorkeeper in the House of the Lord and live within our budget than to dwell in the elaborate palace which the Senator from New Mexico is urging upon us and require the Nation to write a promissory note for our quarters.

CAMPAIGN OF TRUTH

Mr. EENTON. Mr. President, I am rising to address the Senate today to suggest certain concrete and urgent proposals bearing directly and immediately upon the hot war now raging in Korea and the cold war in progress all around the iron curtain.

For 3 days last week, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations conducted an extraordinary set of hearings on Senate Resolution 243. These were planned to help crystalize the national and congressional policy in behalf of a great new Campaign of Truth. It was not especially noteworthy that many of us in the Senate who joined in sponsorship of this resolution gave testimony in its support. It was not unexpected that those officials of the State Department engaged in the limited program now in progress should have testified for its expansion. What was noteworthy and tremendously important for the future of the world is that great and universally respected figures in our own twentieth century history of international relations gave unanimous utterance to the supreme importance of ideas and ideals in the present world conflict.

Their testimony, Mr. President, gives new hope for world understanding and peace, if we will but heed it and proceed boldly.

International relations since the dawn of history have manifested themselves under what I regarded as four major categories.

First, "force," the armed might by which one people puts its will down the throat of another people, as we are now witnessing in Korea.

Second in point of development was "Diplomacy" or "Deals," the process of winning advantages or victories by negotiations, threats, or trades, rather than by force of arms.

The third major category in international development has been "Goods," the process of trade, and, in many cases, the calculated use of economic power to win advantages or victories in the international arena. Such are the victories under the Marshall plan won by Paul Hoffman and the ECA.

The fourth great category in the field of international relations is "Words" or "Ideas," the projection of information or propaganda by one nation to win the minds and loyalties of men in others. In this fourth category, Mr. President, the record of international relations since 1945, is replete with examples of startling

victories won by the masters of the Kremlin. Many persons will attest that even China, which fell to the hammer and sickle without a single Red Army corps, was a victory of Soviet propaganda.

In this vital fourth area, the Soviet Union has pressed forward to victory after victory, literally by default. Now at long last, now that we've had these hearings, the fight which some of us have been waging since 1945 may come to fruition. At last we seem to be moving to put our backs into this world-wide struggle for the minds and loyalties of men, by projecting to all men the great ideals and ideas of freedom which have rung down to us in the United States through the generations.

I shall not stop to recount the testimony, briefly reported in the press of recent date, by General Eisenhower, General Marshall, General Bedell Smith, Bernard Baruch, Secretary Acheson, and the great pioneer in the field of broadcasting, Brigadier General Sarnoff. Each of them has won renown in international relations through one of the first three categories I have cited. Yet each of them attested to category number four, to the urgency of the need to propagate our democratic creed as an instrument of supreme national policy, and to propagate it at once and on a vast scale because already it is late and there is no time to lose.

Today I shall only stress to the Senate the statement of Ambassador John Foster Dulles, who has just returned from Korea and Japan. I shall read a direct quotation from the statement Ambassador Dulles made at a committee hearing. He said:

I believe that the question of whether we have a general war or not may depend, may hinge, very largely upon the relative effectiveness of the Communist propaganda and the free world propaganda * * * I believe that the effectiveness of the so-called propaganda information * * * to nail down the fact that the threats of violence come from the Communist world and that we are the freedom-loving, peace-loving people, upon the effectiveness of that may hang the question of war or peace within the next few months.

World opinion, Ambassador Dulles said, is as vitally important to us as it is to the Russians. The difference I wish to point out, is that the Russians know it is important, and communism has always known it.

As I have stated before on the floor of the Senate, the heroes of the Communist revolution are the propagandists. It is Lenin, the great propagandist, who is enshrined in the tomb in Red Square.

The Kremlin was well prepared and was in high gear on that fateful Sunday, June 25, with its story that the North Korean aggression was merely a defensive reaction against a South Korean attack started with American support. Ambassador Dulles predicted that, if the Kremlin can put across that false and fantastic story, or even sow confusion with it, the U. S. S. R. would be emboldened to launch new aggressions in other areas. If the Soviets can convince people they are peace-loving while they attack, and they shoot and they

bomb, why should they hold back in Iran, in Greece, in Indochina, or even in France or Italy? The United States is vulnerable, unfortunately, and tragically vulnerable on a dozen exposed fronts.

Mr. President, here in Korea we face the test of the big lie. Does anyone doubt that the Communist propaganda machine will put every ounce of energy and ingenuity it has behind the big lie? Does anyone doubt that this big Russian lie is believed behind the iron curtain? Does anyone doubt that it will create uncertainty and hesitancy in many critical areas of the world?

I testified last week before Senator THOMAS' committee on the day the New York Times ran an editorial commenting on how fantastic the Gromyko statement sounded. Yes, it sounded fantastic to us in the United States. The terrifying fact is that it does not sound fantastic to the Russian people, or to the North Koreans. The terrifying fact is that Gromyko, the propagandist, knows what he is doing.

A truly effective international information program on our part could help prevent such big lies from taking hold. What other defense have we—without this one also? We must seize this defense and use it at once.

If Ambassador Dulles is right—and indeed if there is a one in five chance that he is right—what is called for now is an extraordinary and immediate effort against this single lie, and conducted with all the urgency of wartime. We must project to hundreds of millions of people the findings of the United Nations-Korean Commission. We must dramatize the resolution of the Security Council. We must spread by every possible means the facts about the contributions which many nations are making to the joint campaign in Korea, and the fact that this Korean war is so clear, so demonstrable, and so naked an act of aggression as to warrant, for the first time, the use of the United Nations flag by the defending forces.

It goes without saying that in this crisis the existing facilities and personnel of the State Department Information Services should be utilized to the utmost. They should be integrated with the Department of Defense, and with General MacArthur's forces in the field. They should be more energetically tied in with the program and facilities of other individual members of the United Nations. Assistant Secretary Barrett, who is bringing such leadership to the Department, ably testified on Friday to the steps which have been taken and the emphasis which is now being placed in the Department upon this vital area of international affairs. It goes without saying that the efforts of Mr. Barrett and his able associates must be pressed and supported with the utmost vigor and dispatch. Further, all other Government facilities—those of the armed forces, for example—should be reviewed at once for immediate potential use in this crucial area.

However, Mr. President, there are other avenues which should also be immediately explored. I now suggest six

additional areas to be exploited, as illustrative of those which in my judgment should be under consideration by the administration, the Congress, and the appropriate agencies of the United Nations. I cite these six merely to stimulate other such ideas in this new and vital field and to show the possibilities for quick and bold action. These six illustrations show that we can develop opportunities and we do have possibilities at hand if we are bold and if we are willing to act.

First, I feel our Government should immediately approach the United Nations with an offer to assist and help finance the United Nations Division of Public Information in a great worldwide campaign on the issues involved in Korea. The impact of a United Nations campaign in many areas of the world and among many people would be much more effective than anything we in the United States could do ourselves unilaterally. Would the United Nations be prepared, for example, to utilize the clever scheme of the Soviet Union involving the signing of peace petitions throughout the world?

Would the United Nations foster such petitions in appropriate areas, so that the millions who genuinely crave peace will identify peace with the United Nations? People everywhere can sign UN petitions in good faith. Through them they can learn that the United Nations stood fast on the Korean issue, and is working in the interests of people everywhere for peace.

The United Nations could call upon the best talents of this and of other nations. General Eisenhower said last week he believed many of the nation's leaders in the field of communications would welcome, would indeed jump at, the chance to serve their country in this field. I agree with General Eisenhower that this is a time to summon an ad hoc group of communications leaders and ask them to devote themselves for the crucial months ahead of us to this problem Ambassador Dulles has posed so cogently.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have been listening to the Senator's remarks with considerable interest, and I certainly agree that there is a wide field for getting over the facts in the case, not only to the United Nations members, but particularly behind the iron curtain. I am fully conversant with the fact that the able Senator from Connecticut has been interested in the establishment of a system of international law and order so that the peace of the world could be preserved, and for that reason this country went into the United Nations.

I wonder if in his remarks the Senator is going to discuss today what he feels the obligations of each of the members of the United Nations is toward a system of collective security, and whether he feels that that obligation is properly dis-

charged merely by voting for a resolution in the Security Council, or in support of action which has been taken by the Security Council.

I should also like to know if the able Senator from Connecticut would indicate whether or not he feels that each and every member of the United Nations, regardless of how small its contribution might be, does not have some obligation to join with the United States in sending, or at least in offering to send, some ground combat troops to help preserve the system of collective security which we have, and whether or not he feels that they have discharged their obligations merely by sitting on the sidelines and applauding decisions which have been made, and the action which this Government and a relatively few additional governments have taken.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I had not planned to discuss the subject today brought up by the Senator from California, but I should like to comment briefly on the important contribution he has made.

I agree that I would like to see each nation urged to make its contribution. This should be made, however, to the United Nations Information Division, through ideas, money, and local facilities within each country, as well as contributions in troops at the scene of the battle.

I will say further that the contribution of certain troops from Asia to the Korean front could be very helpful indeed on the psychological side, entirely apart from the military contribution which might be made by troops, let us say, from Pakistan or the Philippines.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. May I finish my answer to the Senator from California?

Mr. FERGUSON. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. BENTON. I have one further thought in reply to the Senator from California. Troops in Korea from the Philippines or Pakistan would help to dramatize to the Korean people the fact that this is in no way a whiteman's imperialist war, with our soldiers in Korea in advance of our businessmen for the purpose of exploitation, which, unfortunately, was too much the history of Asia during previous centuries, as the Senator well knows.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I realize how the distinguished Senator feels about what might be called propaganda for information, but I am wondering whether at a time like the present, when we have the police force of the United Nations in Korea, actions really would not speak louder than any printed words that we might publish and try to circulate in Korea or in China, or in other parts of the world. Would it not be better for each and every one of the members of the United Nations to take upon itself full responsibility to carry out the mandate of cease fire and return north of the thirty-eighth parallel? If each and every member of the United Nations which desires to be on the side

of the resolution would send troops, even if it were only a battalion or a token force, that would speak much louder than any printed word by those nations or the United Nations, because it would be deeds by the United Nations, which would convince the world that the United Nations was the power moving to stop aggression, and if aggression broke out anywhere else in the world, all the member nations would fight on the side of the United Nations?

I realize that there are some in America who believe that only Americans can fight, that only Americans are the soldiers who can win freedom, but we find opposed to Americans those who do not believe in the ideals of America.

I think we should be willing, that we should be ready, that we should be able, to take the people of all these nations into this battle, so that we could convince the world that this was not a European or American battle, but that it was a world battle. Will the Senator comment on that?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I wholly agree with the objectives sought by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, but I should like to add a footnote. I agree that for the American people words can never be a substitute for deeds, and that our deeds must fit our words, and our words must fit our deeds. This is in line with the temperament of the American people. Nothing else is possible for us as an instrument of policy. Unhappily, however, the Soviet Union has mastered the technique of using words as a substitute for deeds, and this is one reason why our own deeds are no longer enough. Our deeds must be supplemented by an explanation. Otherwise, when we are in South Korea with the deeds, spending half a billion dollars trying to help the South Koreans create a successful democracy, while we are there on that kind of a peaceful policy—the Koreans and all Asiatics are told by the Soviet Union that we are there for exploitation, and millions believe it, including the fighting North Koreans.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am a great believer in the philosophy of the United Nations idea, but who from the United Nations, outside of citizens of the United States, are dying in Korea?

Mr. BENTON. I apologize to the Senator; I missed his question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask, what other nationals, what other class of people, whether British, French, or any other nationality, are dying in Korea, outside of the people of the United States, with Koreans themselves?

Mr. BENTON. I know no more about this than what I read in the papers, and what is known to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I have read that Australians and New Zealanders, for example, are prepared to participate, and I know other nations are considering a similar policy. I do not have information adequate to enable me to answer fully the question raised by the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The only difficulty I find with the United Nations is that they want us to join and do this and that and the other, but they are not willing to die, as American boys are dying in Korea.

Mr. BENTON. I, of course, have read in the newspapers that the British have had casualties; that the Australians have had casualties.

Mr. CHAVEZ. At a distance, while shooting from sea, but they are not on the land. The French have said they are not willing to go.

Mr. BENTON. I do not have information adequate to do justice to that question, Mr. President.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to my colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to comment very briefly upon the remarks made by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] when he said that deeds and not words were the things that would count in the world today. Of course, we must have deeds. The Senator and I realize that. When General Eisenhower was testifying the other day with respect to the resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Connecticut I am sure the Senator will remember that he said it was necessary, of course, to be armed and it was necessary that our economy remain sound. He said that and that alone, however, is not enough. He said that above all we had to have morale. Of course, morale is just another word expressing what people believe.

Mr. BENTON. General Eisenhower went so far as to state that the Marshall plan was aimed wholly at morale, and I am sure the Senator will recall his statement.

Mr. McMAHON. That is correct. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that Woodrow Wilson, in the First World War, did more to break German resistance by the proclamation of the Fourteen Points than perhaps many divisions of troops.

I remember so vividly reading recently what Tojo said in September of 1945, when he was interviewed and asked what had had the greatest effect in bringing about Japanese surrender. I think I quote him correctly when I say he replied that the fire raids were horrible, that the atomic bursts were catastrophic, but the thing which divided the imperial Japanese staff from the Japanese people was the millions of leaflets which were dropped to the Japanese telling them what our war aims were. I think that is worth reiterating at this time. It was the enunciating of the principles of the Atlantic Charter in the last World War that had such great effect in strengthening the people on our side.

We have always had the genius of having a moral position which matched our physical power. Today, above all times, when we have a moral position, it is essential that that moral position be stated to the world in no mistakable terms, because if it is so stated it will result in that morale which General Eisenhower talked about, and which will

make the host of freedom invincible. That is as I see the situation.

Mr. BENTON. I thank my distinguished colleague from Connecticut, who was one of the early Members of this body to see this issue, when we were working together while I was Assistant Secretary of State and he was a freshman in the Senate, as I am today.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me a moment further?

Mr. BENTON. Yes, I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. In April of 1948 I wrote an article for Collier's magazine, which I called Operation Freedom, which was inserted in the RECORD. I should like to insert it and will insert it, with the Senator's permission, in the record which he has made in favor of this resolution. I reread that article just recently. In it I pointed out that it was high time we began to push Operation Freedom with the Marshall plan and all the other things we have done since, the Atlantic Pact, and the implementation of both, and above all, our own rearmament. The Senator knows I have been for every one of those things. I believe we have not been as vigilant as we should have been, that we have not been industrious enough in going forward, but I think that error is about to be corrected, and, I hope, in time, by the implementation of the Senator's resolution.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to have the article referred to by my colleague inserted in the RECORD. I too have had the glad and happy feeling, when rereading an old magazine piece of mine, still to find it good, though written years before.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Like the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and other Senators, I too lay great stress on action. Action undoubtedly does in many instances speak louder than words. Therefore, as Senators know, I have favored and do now strongly favor the implementation of our military strength and that of our allies and friends in every way possible. I do not believe that the Congress of the United States or the people of the United States have any realization yet as to the great responsibility and the great burdens with which we will be faced during the coming months. So I shall favor any expenditures that may be necessary for the strengthening of our arms and the strengthening of the forces of our allies and friends who, like ourselves, are fighting in the cause of democracy and freedom.

There is no doubt, however, Mr. President, that the Soviet Union and her satellites have made great progress in deluding the people of the world, particularly the people of Asia. They have met with a considerable degree of success, in my opinion, in making people believe that we are the aggressors; that they are the ones who stand for democracy, freedom and security, and that we seek some selfish and material gain in

the undertaking on which we are embarked in Korea and elsewhere. In my opinion it is absolutely essential to use every means to combat that propaganda, and to make the people of Asia and of other parts of the world realize that we have no ulterior motive, that we have no selfish motive, that we are not aggressors, that we are fighting for the cause of the freedom of all liberty-loving people.

I can say, Mr. President, that even if we can in a military way, contain all the forces directed against us by the Soviet Union and her satellites which are now striving to destroy democracy, we still would require a plan of this kind to add and increase the good will of the other peoples of the world toward us. We still must prove to these people by our words, by our purposes, and by our acts that we have no ulterior motive, that we seek to help them, that we seek to preserve their liberties, that we seek to free those who are now under the heel of the tyrants—the leaders of the totalitarian states. So I strongly support what the Senator from Connecticut is doing. I am proud to be one of the cosponsors of his resolution, and I very much hope that its great purpose will be recognized and approved by this body.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the eminent Senator from New York. I commend to the Senate his brilliant statement made at the hearings last week.

I wish to comment further with respect to the testimony on the question of deeds and words, to show the great gaps which exist between our deeds and our words. I hope the Senate is mindful of the fact that we have put roughly \$500,000,000 into South Korea. Yet while we were putting half a billion dollars into South Korea on the economic front, we appropriated \$1,400,000 last year for information and educational work. This \$1,400,000 was regarded by the State Department as a large sum. I am told it was the largest sum the State Department had for any country.

The big broadcasting station at Pyongyang, the capital of North Korea, has a power estimated at 50,000 watts. It blanketed all Korea 24 hours a day with its barrage of lying Communist propaganda. On the other hand, the little South Korean station—and there are 20,000,000 people in South Korea, as against 8,000,000 in North Korea—could not generate more than three or four thousand watts of power.

The North Korean station boasted all day long about the hundreds of North Koreans who were being sent to Moscow for study and instruction, at the rate of 200 a day, at times. On the other hand, the United States, spending half a billion dollars, had funds only sufficient to send less than 20 Korean students to the United States.

The North Korean radio kept describing the hundreds of Communist cultural centers which had been set up in North Korea. On the other hand, the United States, spending half a billion dollars in economic aid, had only nine little information centers—to cover 20,000,000 per-

sons; and only one of those centers had any American personnel.

Scores of Communist books were translated into Korean. On the other hand, we could manage to translate only a few of our books into Korean.

Our motion picture equipment in Korea was old and worn out and insignificant.

Mr. President, I have this information from a cultural relations officer who returned from Seoul only 2 weeks ago.

I told Senator THOMAS' committee that I thought it was a fair metaphor, in connection with this particular area of our foreign policy, when I said that we would never think of matching little Willie Pep, the tiny boxing champion from Hartford, against Joe Louis, in the prize ring. Yet that is, in effect, exactly the way we have been conducting ourselves in this cold war, in operations in Korea. Indeed, I enormously compliment ourselves when I make the comparison to Willie Pep.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First, of all, Mr. President, I wish to say that the question of adequate coverage by the Voice of America, or otherwise, I think is of extreme importance. I think the Senator from Connecticut has accurately stated the situation which has prevailed in Korea and, as a matter of fact, the situation which prevails in other sections of the world.

To get back to the colloquy had a little earlier in the day between both the Senators from Connecticut and the Senator from Michigan, and in which the junior Senator from California participated, let me say that I was hopeful that the Senator from New York also would express his viewpoint on that matter. It seems to me that all of us have supported the United Nations and all of us have been hopeful that in that organization the world would establish a system of law and order which would preserve the peace of the world for this generation and future generations of Americans.

However, the point which I think needs to be emphasized here in the Senate, by Senators on both sides of the aisle, is that up until yesterday, at least, only one nation, aside from the United States, had offered to send ground troops into Korea in support of the United Nations resolution. That nation was the Republic of China. It is true that the United Kingdom has sent some ships, and some casualties have been suffered on those ships. It is true that Australia has sent some ships and some airplanes. It is true that Canada has sent some ships, that the Netherlands has sent part of its navy, and that New Zealand has offered to send part of its navy.

However, the only nation, other than the United States of America, which until yesterday, so far as I know—and I believe the statement is accurate—has offered to send its ground troops is the Republic of China, which offered to send three divisions of approximately 30,000 men, and some 20 C-46 airplanes.

My only point—and I think it needs to be emphasized—is that although all of us recognize the fact that there are only a few great nations in the world, yet it seems to me that regardless of how small any nation may be, even if it offers to send but a single battalion, even if—in the case of some of the smallest nations—it offers to send only a company or a regiment, as the case may be, if we are to have a system of international law and order, if all the nations are to assume their obligations in connection with the preservation of peace in the world, there is no member nation of the United Nations—regardless of how small or how large it may be—which does not owe a duty to the peace of the world to forthwith offer to send at least some ground troops in order to help preserve peace under the United Nations resolution. I do not believe the nations discharge their responsibility as members of the United Nations merely by voting for a resolution or by sitting on the sidelines and applauding the resolution which has been passed and the action which has been taken by relatively few of the member nations. There is no reason in the world why the United States and half a dozen other nations should assume the entire burden of this police action.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, of course, there are many gradations, as I am sure the distinguished junior Senator from California will agree, in connection with the discharge of responsibilities. All of us are glad that the nations voted as they did in support of the United Nations resolution; but I wholly concur that it is eminently to be desired that other countries join us and furnish, within their means and resources, troops to serve alongside our troops in Korea. I urge, however, that we seek their participation not only from the point of view of military assistance, but also from the point of view of the very important and symbolic psychological values which would be involved in such participation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the Senator from Connecticut. I did not mean to interrupt his very able address.

However, inasmuch as he was discussing the psychological aspects of the situation, it seemed to me important to say that if there were that type of contribution, I think it would clearly appear all over the world as concrete evidence that men of all the free nations of the world were willing, if necessary, to sacrifice their lives as well as their property in defense of the maintenance of a free world of freemen.

Mr. BENTON. I agree wholly with the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. President, I have listed the first of my six points. I have five other points, which I should like to present very briefly, to serve as examples of the kind of thinking which I believe is needed in connection with our foreign policy.

My second point is that we can assume that the Voice of America will do its best

to tell this story straight—both behind the iron curtain and in front of it—and that the British Broadcasting Corp. is doing the same. However, we are now facing a crucial emergency and it calls for quick, bold action. Unhappily, as General Sarnoff pointed out at the hearings, our radio facilities are pitifully and tragically weak, or are lacking entirely in many areas of the world. If the United Nations or the United States cannot get adequate free time on the existing domestic standard-band radio stations of the various nations to supplement these facilities—and this will show the Senator from California that I want the cooperation of the other nations, not only through the United Nations but with the United States on every front—then I want to have the money to be able to buy radio time if such time can be purchased and will give us the coverage we need. I feel that the Congress should provide this money. For example, let us take the powerful long-wave radio station at Luxemburg. That station alone can add greatly to the strength of our voice in Europe. Along the lines suggested by General Eisenhower, I submit that plenty of talent is available to produce highly effective radio programs.

My second suggestion is a stop gap measure only—a way to get more broadcasting quickly—while we proceed with the development of our own facilities.

My third suggestion, Mr. President, I picked up from reading the newspapers covering Mr. Samuel Goldwyn's return from Europe. Some of the Senators may have noticed that he called upon the United States to spend \$1,000,000,000 to combat Russian lies. Perhaps, if he is asked to do so, Mr. Goldwyn will undertake to produce a documentary motion picture presenting the true facts about the North Korean aggression, not only to be shown in the commercial theaters all over the world, but to be shown to organized groups in every accessible country, and by projection trucks to every accessible village square in the world. Of course, Mr. President, I used Mr. Goldwyn's name in a symbolic sense; I use it because he is thinking about the problem, and wants something done about it. My point is that in this supreme crisis, we should immediately mobilize the creative genius of our motion-picture industry to the constructive use in this international crisis of this most powerful medium of communication. The motion picture is, to all of us who have worked closely with it, admittedly and by far the greatest potential means by which ideas can be quickly and forcibly communicated. Not only do we need the one picture made by Mr. Goldwyn or by anyone else, but in this area we need a new motion picture every week, and with a real system of weekly distribution.

My fourth idea, Mr. President, is that there should be an enormous increase in the use of leaflets and similar printed matter used in psychological warfare and which proved so effective during the war, as has been described by the senior Senator from Connecticut.

These psychological-warfare techniques used by ourselves and our allies in Japan and elsewhere during the war have been used against us in Korea by the Communist propagandists and have been used with crushing impact.

Let me show the Senate some of the examples of this Communist propaganda which is being spread everywhere and with telling effect in South Korea. I have here on the floor a number of illustrative pamphlets, booklets, and comic strips used by the Communists and made available to me through the State Department. In them we see the techniques which we ourselves have mastered in this country in our comic strips and in our comic books. All of us with children know the impact and appeal of these comic books. Here we have the Communists using this combination of pictures and words that can be understood even by people who cannot read. And what do we have on the cover of this sample I have here before me? Here is a giant man with dollar signs for his belt and a greedy look. Fawning on him, this little knee-high figure down at the bottom, is Syngman Rhee, who, again and again, in these pictures, is shown as the tool of self-seeking American capitalism.

Here in this picture we have the American soldiers shooting little babies, and so forth.

Here are some cartoons. Here we have the virtuous North Koreans holding up a banner labeled "Motherland—Unification—Complete Independence," and here we have portrayed the South Korean stooges, with the military officer behind, representing Japan or the United States, forcing these reluctant South Koreans forward to shoot at the innocent North Koreans.

Here is another. This shows the arm of Uncle Sam behind Syngman Rhee, who is shown stealing the crops from under the feet of the Korean farmers. This cartoon is entitled "Farmers, Don't Be Robbed of Even One Grain Which You Harvested With Your Bloody Perspiration."

Here is the moral. At the very time that we are putting a half billion dollars into South Korea for economic rehabilitation, we are being portrayed as robbing the farmers of South Korea for our own gain.

Mr. President, I have also brought here a batch of unusual booklets to illustrate to the Senate the skill with which the Communists concentrate their evil talent on propaganda. These are not booklets to be read by any South Korean or North Korean. No, these are booklets to be read by U. S. S. R. propagandists in North and South Korea. Here are handbooks on propaganda which the Communists take into Korea, with which to train their agents. Here is one labeled "Propaganda Material for the Compulsory Education of Primary School Children." As we know, that is where the Communists start—with the children—pumping them full of hate for the United States.

Now, of course, I feel that we should develop in simple, easy-to-read form our own printed material, and should distribute it widely. That has been advo-

cated by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and by many other Senators on the floor of the Senate, again and again. But we have not given the State Department the money or the appropriations with which to carry through on this manifestly needed activity.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Touching the last point raised by the Senator, with respect to the Voice of America, I first want to commend the Senator upon what he is attempting to do here. One of the things which the Senator from Illinois has been primarily interested in ever since the Voice of America was set up, was this: It seemed to me, in view of the unusual amount of money which Russia was spending in propagandizing all the satellite nations, as well as other nations throughout Europe and Asia, that we ought to do something there to counteract that offensive. I have at all times struggled for appropriations which would meet that particular situation. The State Department has been denied by the Congress of the United States sufficient funds to do any kind of job whatever. I do hope that this is an awakening to the value of the Voice of America. Simply because there were a few little things which happened with respect to the Voice of America that were not quite in keeping with what certain Members of the Senate thought was right, on that basis appropriations were denied for a mighty worthy cause, and we are today suffering as a result of it.

Mr. BENTON. I thank the majority leader for that comment. Of course, I well remember, in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses, the leadership which the distinguished Senator from Illinois took in this field, when it was so little understood and when it met with so much resistance—how, again and again, he took the floor here in the Senate and, but for his efforts, I have no means of knowing that our program would have survived as it has to this day.

I have two further quick examples, Mr. President, to complete my six points and to illustrate the kinds of things we can do at once if we, here in Congress, agree on the urgency which faces us with respect to this program.

My fifth point: I feel there should be a tremendous and immediate expansion of exchange of leaders in many fields of life in the United Nations countries and those in the critical areas, particularly in southeast Asia. My own background in this kind of activity, Mr. President, dates to my association with Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, who came to Washington 2 years before our entry into World War II, and who pioneered in this field in relation to Latin America. There is a great deal of evidence that Mr. Rockefeller's program was enormously effective in Latin America. We need a revival of that program on a vast scale, on a world scale, today.

We have an excellent illustration of exchange of personnel in the ECA technical-assistance program. But there

were only 350 or 400 people—some small number of that kind—who were brought into this country last year on the ECA technical-assistance program. The ECA program should be enormously expanded, as I have advocated previously on the floor of the Senate.

I am talking here about leaders—present leaders who can be immediately effective when they return home—and not only businessmen and technicians but also journalists and, notably, labor leaders—all drawn from the many and diverse national strains, colors, and creeds, which have combined their talents to build the New World we know and cherish.

Mr. President, my last point, my sixth illustration or example, deals with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. I feel that the State Department should ask UNESCO at once to develop those of its projects which can have immediate effectiveness, in line with UNESCO's charter and basic aims on the cause of world peace. The Senator from California has given support to this kind of approach to the problem in his earlier comments on the floor.

We in the United States should be prepared to finance those UNESCO projects which have the leadership and which have suitable objectives. I cited, in Florence, Italy, at the UNESCO conference 3 or 4 weeks ago, when I was a consultant at that conference, the problems of education in Germany and in Japan, as illustrations of what UNESCO could tackle, and on a significant scale.

Surely it is as suitable for the United States to finance UNESCO projects, in what I have called a point 5 program, as it is for us to finance the United Nations on point 4.

Dr. Stoddard, the world famous psychologist who is president of the University of Illinois, and chairman of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, was a brilliant witness before the Thomas Committee, and gave many illustrations which helped to indicate how UNESCO can become far more effective in the cause of world peace if it has the money and the leadership. Mr. President, I have completed my six illustrations.

I should now like to remind the Senate that Secretary Acheson advised the Thomas Committee that President Truman will shortly send to Congress a message requesting substantial new appropriations—for a great campaign of truth. I know how these appropriation proposals are developed. It takes months and months and months—taking them through the State Department, through the Bureau of the Budget, through the White House, through the offices and the Appropriations Committees here on the Hill.

Much of the thinking in connection with this proposal traces back many months. It takes months to get it where it is. In the meantime, these hearings of last week and the urgency of the North Korean crisis make the issue much more apparent to us.

I understand the proposal of the President will be particularly directed to the areas of the world which are now under immediate and critical pressure by the Soviet forces and their satellites.

The Smith-Mundt Act, sponsored by two distinguished Members of the Senate with whom I worked in connection with the passage of the act, affords all the legislative authorization needed for a greatly expanded appropriation and program.

The President's new program will largely cover appropriations for long-range efforts for new facilities and transmitters, and similar investments, such as the building of great new radio facilities which require months or even years to work out. However, the President's proposal, I am told, will also support the immediate expansion of existing programs and the greater utilization of existing transmitters.

Such an expanded program is bound to present challenging problems in personnel, in organization, and in new techniques to be adapted to the changing situation throughout the world. It will demand seemingly large expenditures, but these expenditures to prevent the spread of communism will seem small in comparison with the appropriations which must be made to combat that menace once it has gained its foothold by subversion and propaganda. They are indeed tiny as compared with the money invested in other areas of our foreign policy.

A few days ago the junior Senator from Massachusetts proposed a two billion dollar increase in the arms program for Europe alone, and today one of the most distinguished and revered Members of this body said to me that he expected the armed services would request, before the end of the year, an additional \$5,000,000,000 in appropriations.

That is the way in which we are talking about billions of dollars in the field of armaments, and they are the sums we must keep in mind when we consider this relatively tiny sum in the field of ideas.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would it be fair to sum up the argument of the distinguished Senator by saying that he believes and I believe that we should do everything possible in a military way in times of crisis, but we shall not accomplish the full objective of our efforts unless we do something at the same time to try to tell people what our purposes are in helping them and educating them to the point of view of what we believe is a more peaceful world which will give greater security to them as well as to ourselves?

Mr. BENTON. That is a perfect summary. It is not only the summary of the distinguished Senator, or my summary; it is the summary of General Marshall, General Eisenhower, and General Bedell Smith. General Smith confessed to the committee that not too many years ago he had not recognized the importance of this area. Indeed, he said that when he was in a key role

in London during the war, he looked on the men who came in to work on propaganda and morale as crackpots whom he unhappily and unfortunately had to put up with. But his feeling changed, and fast, and greatly, as did that of General Marshall and General Eisenhower—if on their part they had ever showed such an attitude.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I shall be through in a moment, but I shall be glad to yield at once to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I admire the statement of the Senator from Connecticut. I think he is making a wonderful contribution. I also admire the contribution made by the Senator from Massachusetts. But I should like to ask the Senator what nation other than the United States is trying to contribute something to carry out the program.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, if we had had a program in this area 5 years ago, and had consistently adhered to it during the past 5 years, it is my conviction that there would now be much more eagerness and much more vitality in the actions and attitudes of other countries throughout the world than the Senator from New Mexico thinks he is witnessing as he observes current events.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I observe current events, I see American boys dying, but I do not see anything being contributed in order to carry out the laudable and noble ideals which the Senator is talking about. I am sorry to say that.

Mr. BENTON. If we do not see contributions from other nations, I regret it as much as does the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. But it is also true that the world looks to us for leadership. It takes time to get followers. It is true that we are not in South Korea fighting for the South Koreans; we are there fighting for the United Nations and for the concept of world peace represented by the United Nations. If other nations are not equally quick to do that, in some cases it may be because they have feared that leadership will not be forthcoming from the United States. We have this penalty of leadership, as we conduct our policies in today's world.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think we have the noblest and the most laudable record of ideals in trying to bring about peace in the world.

Mr. BENTON. Unhappily, many people throughout the world do not agree with the Senator or with me on that subject. I agree with the Senator, but many people in the world do not agree with the Senator. That is our dilemma.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. I am not worried about those who do not agree with it. I am worried about the ones who are supposed to agree with it, the ones we have helped. I am not worried about Soviet Russia or her satellites. We never could get them to agree. But there is no particular reason why the ones we have saved, the ones for whom Americans by the thousands have died in order to bring about liberty, should not agree with it. That is what I am complaining about. I am not complaining of the sacrifice. I think it is worth it.

Mr. BENTON. I am not going to say that your complaint is in any way illegitimate. I do not have the necessary facts as to what is now going on in this area with which adequately to reassure the Senator from New Mexico. I hope such facts will be forthcoming.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I hope the facts will be forthcoming, because up to this time the fact actually exists that the only ones dying in Korea are American boys, and the fact exists that England and France are not going to send their boys into Korea because they might accidentally get killed.

Mr. BENTON. I do not know whether the distinguished Senator was on the floor when the Senator from California pointed out that there are ships and airplanes and men from other nations, but there are no ground troops.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The ground troops are the ones who receive white crosses.

Mr. BENTON. There have been casualties already among English troops, and, I gather from the comments of the Senator from California, among other troops as well.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator from Connecticut will be so kind, the point I am trying to make is that I think the effort is worth it. Irrespective of the crying mother of the boy who died in Korea, I think it is still worth it for society and for civilization. However, it does get irritating at times that we unselfishly do all these things, that we contribute the money, contribute the groceries, contribute the food, contribute the guns, contribute this, contribute that, contribute everything else, and we are the only ones who do the dying.

Mr. BENTON. It is also a very unhappy fact when we think of the many American boys who died out in the south Pacific during the last war only to have the Russian propaganda machine make tens of millions of people in Asia feel that it was the Russian troops who won the war, who were the conquerors of Japan, and the real victors in the war. In the Far East that is the Russian propaganda line. I regret the situation described by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. However, it does not in any way contradict the need I am trying to set before the Senate in my remarks this afternoon.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut. I agree with him completely and entirely. Neither are we going to contradict the Russian propaganda by helping the French kill Indo-Chinese people in Indochina. We are not going to contradict that fact no matter what happens, if liberty is worth while, if peace is worth while, if freedom of action is worth while. It could happen in Hong Kong, Singapore, Gibraltar, or even in Malta.

Mr. BENTON. As my concluding comment, Mr. President, I hope that before Congress adjourns we shall have established an emergency budget and appropriation in this area of far greater magnitude than the one I understand is now under contemplation by the State Department and the President.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. In furtherance of the question recently asked of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, I should like to ask him whether it is not the Senator's belief, which I do not believe he has expressed fully yet, that someone must pioneer in any field in order to sell others on the idea and convince them that it is worth while. If we pioneer this field and accomplish some results in getting truths to people who heretofore have been hearing nothing but untruths, other peace-loving nations in the United Nations will in time join in the same effort. Is that the Senator's idea?

Mr. BENTON. That is not only my idea, but I see no alternative to the idea of giving hope to the world over a period not only of years but of decades, the hope that by achieving world understanding we can create an atmosphere in which the chance of peace will grow greater and the chance of war will diminish. That is the hope to hold out to the peoples of the world. It is not a certain hope, but it is the only hope. We must hold out to the world the hope of smaller armaments and less tension, the hope of greater understanding, and the hope of maximizing the chance for peace and minimizing the risk of war. We must pursue this hope, and pursue it vigorously.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not the Senator's idea that due to the position we now hold in world affairs we are the only nation which can pioneer the campaign against the untruths being spread by the satellite nations of Russia and by Russia itself?

Mr. BENTON. We are the only nation which has the resources with which to do the job that needs to be done.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct. We are the only ones who can pioneer the subject.

Mr. BENTON. Today Britain and France are doing more in the line of broadcasting than we are. Russia is doing between four and five times, measured in hours per week, more than the United States is doing. General Sarnoff testified, as the record shows, that the Russians are putting on over 800 hours of broadcasting per week—and in every language of the world. We follow along with one-hundred-eighty-odd hours per week. That is some twenty-odd percent of the Russian volume. Our United States facilities have never matched the British radio facilities.

We are also below the French in programming hours.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that we should be the leader, though we must encourage other countries which believe in freedom to do all they can. We have not been the leader. I agree with him that we should be out in the forefront. It is for that reason that I am addressing the Senate today. The urgency is now such that the matter cannot be longer or safely postponed.

The sums involved, though large by peacetime standards, are small in contrast to the great gains and goals which may be achieved. No one knows whether the North Koreans would have attacked

if we had done the right kind of job in this field. No man knows whether our Armed Forces would feel warranted in demanding a far larger military budget, as we head toward this crisis, if we had done the job here which we could have done and at relatively small expense. The expenditure of several hundred million dollars over a period of years is small indeed in this great area, in contrast to our investment of tens of billions on armament and the other facets of our foreign policy. It is tiny indeed if it will surmount the crisis described by Ambassador Dulles. Indeed, as I have said, such sums would be small if the chances were only 1 in 5 that Ambassador Dulles is correct in his analysis. He does not have to be right. Let us just give him one chance in ten of being right, and we would be negligent indeed if we did not move ahead aggressively and at once in this area. Of course I think the chances are better than 1 in 5. I agree with Ambassador Dulles and congratulate him on his patriotic candor.

What I am discussing today is thus as urgent as any matter before the Congress or before the American people.

Further, Mr. President, here is an area in which we can act. Here is an area in which we can do something, and we can do it fast. This fact in itself should give new hope to our people, and new hope, in my judgment, to the people of the world.

Mr. President, I should like to insert at this point in my remarks the lead editorial in the Washington Post of this morning. It bears directly on the subject I have been discussing. The Washington Post has run many distinguished and able editorials over a long period of years, showing great insight in this field, and this is an excellent example of this insight.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR OF THE MIND

We are glad to note the report that the State Department is about to accept the challenge of Communist propaganda and ask for \$100,000,000 to conduct its foreign information and education program. It is about time. The value of the information program is one aspect of foreign policy upon which there has come to be general agreement. If the administration had not been overly timid in asking for the funds necessary to do an all-out job there might have been less quibbling over pennies in Congress.

It will be necessary, of course, to expand the program constructively and not indiscriminately. Propaganda is a job that requires skill, not mere verbiage. Nevertheless, there are many outlets which have not been fully utilized. For example, radio programs to some areas are pitifully inadequate; they could be greatly improved by more transmitters and continuous broadcasts. More use might be made of existing national facilities in some countries. Just as important is expansion of the libraries which have become small outposts of America, along with more films and more personal contacts. The export of American talent is in itself a medium of propaganda. There is need to try new and unorthodox methods. Nor are iron curtain countries the only important focal points. It is imperative to get the truth across to friends in the free world, especially to countries such as India and Indonesia and in the Middle East. Latin

America, too, has been largely neglected in what Senator McMAHON recently termed the "whisper of America."

More than a national program is involved. A coordinated international propaganda effort, as we remarked the other day, is one of the measures on which the free world can get together in furtherance of what President Gonzales Videla of Chile described as a "democratic international." The free world has joined in a common effort against the Communist aggression in Korea. But it would be a mistake to think that it will remain united automatically in the face of the Communist distortions for 24 hours a day. Neutrality is the aim of the Kremlin's propagandists, and they seek to achieve it by implanting the little doubts which pave the way for the big lies. The poisoning of men's minds, of course, is one of the most effective methods of warfare.

It has been observed that actions speak louder than words, and this may be true as respects the short-sighted cut in point 4 funds by the Senate Appropriations Committee. But it is also true that the best-intentioned actions can be hidden or misconstrued unless people are constantly informed about them; indeed, there is a big job just in counteracting the ingrained misconceptions about this country. But above all, the information program must serve as the medium for explaining those decisions on policy and principle which are so subject to Communist distortion. In other words, the "truth offensive" is the best tool for making American—and free world—purposes perpetually and unmistakably clear.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, General Eisenhower has rightly called the program I am stressing today democracy's T-bomb.

I hope every Senator will read his testimony and that of Secretary Marshall, Secretary Acheson, Mr. Baruch, and the many distinguished witnesses who appeared in the hearings before Senator THOMAS' committee. I do not feel that any impartial or objective person can read these hearings without discovering that we have in this new field a weapon of enormous potential strength. The situation in Korea now should make it clear to all of us that this is a weapon which we dare no longer suppress or deny. For as Wallace Carroll who served so brilliantly in the OWI has well said, the forces of freedom no longer have a choice. With him I agree: We must persuade—or perish.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first of all I should like to pay appropriate tribute to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] for the splendid proposal which he has offered and to which he has given such inspiration and direction. There is no doubt that we have been sadly lacking in the field of informational services. I know and understand that the Senator from Connecticut would include in this great program of public information, not merely dissemination of radio broadcasts, but also creation of information centers throughout the world, the exchange of students, the exchange of scientific, social, and political information, so that the true picture and the true story of America and democratic living could be made available to the peoples of the world.

Mr. President, I sometimes feel that we may have been telling an all too grandiose story of the so-called better

things of life instead of portraying the true picture of the way the American family, worker, businessman, and teacher lives. We ought to tell the story as it is. We ought to tell the peoples of the world that we are not a miracle people, mysterious, or unusual. We ought to tell them that because we have been able to create a society in which we have protected individual rights, recognized the fraternity and equality of mankind, and accepted the doctrine that certain truths are self-evident, we have been able to release to the fullest the capacities and capabilities of men and women from all over the world in the building of a new society and a new order in the United States and on the great North American Continent.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BENTON. I pointed out to Senator THOMAS' committee that these great self-evident truths of our information policy are not self-propagating. They are self-evident, but they are not self-propagating. What we need is every device or technique for propagating them, to give hope to the people of the world everywhere.

The greatest of all devices to persuade people is face-to-face contact. The radio is merely a substitute for face-to-face contact. That is why the proper exchange of personnel between countries is the most effective insofar as those people whom it reaches and whom it affects. This cannot be done quickly, however, or ever done on a broad enough scale and so we must use printed matter, photographs, radio, and the like.

Mr. President, I merely wanted to re-enforce what the Senator is saying.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. As he has pointed out on other occasions, it is almost ironical that a Nation which prides itself upon its great ability to dramatize its ability to achieve the spectacular, should be in a position where it is running a poor fourth of fifth in the competition of ideas and in the competition of public information.

The Senator from Connecticut has truly challenged the thinking of every thinking person by his proposal. It is a great testimonial to him that men of the caliber of General Marshall, General Eisenhower, Mr. Dulles, the great statesmen, Mr. Baruch, and others, have seen fit to come before the committee on their own and to testify in behalf of his proposal.

Mr. President, my remarks today are directed in part to the proposal of the Senator from Connecticut. In a more direct reference to one aspect of the appropriation bill which I know will be given discussion later, namely, the point 4 program, I have taken this opportunity to address the Senate on the issue of the point 4 program and the appropriation because I had heard that there might be a very severe limitation on debate in order to expedite the passage of the appropriation bill. I do feel, however, that the point 4 program having to do with technical, scientific assistance to the underdeveloped areas of the world is so important that every voice

needs to be raised in its support. I believe it ties right in with what the Senator from Connecticut has been discussing, and I think my remarks will point that out.

Mr. President, if the Senate were to refuse today to appropriate funds to provide ammunition for American soldiers fighting in Korea, that would be regarded as an act of incredible folly. Yet we are being asked to commit an equally unreasonable act in the vitally important battle for the support and allegiance of the peoples of the earth.

The action in Korea is the military phase of the world-wide conflict between freedom and tyranny, and it is of the greatest immediate importance. Sometimes I think we would be better off if we would describe this conflict as the conflict between freedom and tyranny. I repeat, the action in Korea is the military phase of the world-wide conflict between freedom and tyranny, and it is of the greatest immediate importance. Yet the other phases of the struggle—economic, moral, and psychological—are also crucially important. If we win the current battle in Korea and in the long run lose the support of the peoples of the world, we will surely be defeated in the end. I believe that is the thesis to which the Senator from Connecticut has been directing a great deal of his remarks.

A few days ago, in the caucus room of the Senate, the Secretary of State, his Republican adviser, Mr. Dulles, General Marshall, and General Eisenhower appeared to testify in the strongest terms for the need of a great intensification of the overseas propaganda efforts of this Government. All of these leaders vigorously supported the commendable resolution of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] in which 13 Senators have joined, for launching a Marshall plan of ideas which would convince other peoples of the rightness of our aims, and counteract the vicious and lying attacks of the Communists against this country and democracy in general.

At the same time these gentlemen were urging a more powerful, sustained effort to appeal to the peoples of the world, in another room in this same Capitol the Senate Appropriations Committee was cutting the heart out of the most persuasive and effective argument the United States has yet advanced to win the support of millions of people in other countries—I refer directly to the point 4 program—to assist the peoples of the underdeveloped areas to achieve success in their own efforts for better living conditions.

Permit me, Mr. President, to digress to point out that the Communist attack today is in the underdeveloped areas. The critical portion of the world today is in the poverty-stricken, fever-ridden areas of Asia, especially southeast Asia, where people are sick at heart, cynical, and bitter, where the Communists have been able to play upon the colonial exploitation of the years past. It is to this area that the point 4 program is directed as if it were a guided missile.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BENTON. Would the Senator care to comment on an aspect of the Communist propaganda we do not adequately appreciate in this country, which has an overwhelming effect in these backward areas, namely, that it addresses itself to the legitimate aspirations of the people themselves.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is so right.

Mr. BENTON. How seldom do we recognize that and face up to it. That is the reason why the propaganda hits so hard in these underdeveloped areas, and it is why those are the weak spots, in which the Communists find the attack easy and the opposition fading before them. This is why we are vulnerable in so many spots throughout the world today, and why the point 4 program is of such enormous importance as a symbol of our intentions and desires to assist these people toward attaining their own legitimate aspirations, helping with our engineers and machinery and not just with propaganda, with technical assistance and not just with words.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I had a pleasant experience this morning. The former Minister of Labor of the South Korean Government was my guest, and we had an opportunity to talk in the privacy of my office. That gentleman—educated, refined, cultured, here as a guest of the United States Department of State on a 90-day visit to the United States—told me the story of Communist propaganda in Korea. Every word the Senator from Connecticut has uttered is documented by the on-the-spot observations of the former Minister of Labor of the South Korean Government, Mr. Lee.

Mr. Lee told me that the Communists geared their propaganda to the desire of the peasants for land, for food, for education.

Mr. BENTON. Legitimate desires.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Legitimate desires, and of course once the Communist government took over in North Korea, these promises turned out to be false. But in the meantime these unhappy people were taken in, as it were—they were taken in as many an innocent American is sometimes fooled at the sideshow. It looks very good out in front, particularly when the ballyhoo artist is there talking it up, but when one gets into the show, he finds it is not what it is described to be on the outside.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. By way of preface, I have felt for a number of years that we have been very parsimonious in the whole program of information, and I have attempted on one or two occasions in the past to have the appropriation increased. I approved the effort to get a much larger appropriation, and I went before the Committee on Appropriations in behalf of the existing program, which started out with a budget recommendation of approximately \$36,500,000. The House cut it to \$34,000,000, and the Sen-

ate committee cut it to \$32,700,000. Although we are dealing with a very small amount, comparatively, I find it extremely difficult to have allowed the amount the budget has already approved. I intend to offer an amendment, when we reach the item, to get the appropriation back to the budget figure. I should like to raise it to 50 or 60 million, but I thought we should get at least what the budget approved.

The Committee on Appropriations has been extremely unsympathetic to this program ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. That is what has been bothering me about the whole program. I think we have been very remiss with respect to the amount of money we have spent in the field of information and exchange of students. We have had authority for it. We have authority for it now. In my opinion the authority under the Smith-Mundt Act is quite broad enough to do everything that can be done under the point 4 program, but we cannot get the money in the committee and in the Congress. I hope the Senator from Minnesota can do something toward aiding us to secure a little money for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas. Long before I came to the United States Senate I had heard of the splendid work and leadership of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas in the field of foreign policy, and particularly in the field of public information and education. I can assure him that if he places an amendment before the Senate to augment the appropriation at least up to the suggestion of the Bureau of the Budget he will have all the support that one United States Senator can offer him, and he will have my vote. The program which the Senator from Arkansas initiated years ago is one, as he says, which is under way. It is authorized. It is operating. It has paid great dividends. If we had a measuring rod with which to calculate just how much had been done by the exchange of students, and by the information services, I think we would find that these programs have built great good will for democracy and for the American people.

The point 4 program has already made great headway—it has done so even before it has been formally put into operation—in winning the support of other peoples, which is essential if we are to repulse the all-out offensive of communism against the democratic way of life. Mr. President, let us make no mistake about it; we need the support of these other peoples. The United States of America cannot stand alone in the world against the Soviet Union and her satellites. We need the support of these other peoples. Our very existence as a free and independent Nation may ultimately depend on whether we or the Soviet Union win them to our side. True, we have the support of the majority of the nations in the battle for Korea, but there may be other Koreas before the widespread, deep-rooted Communist conspiracy to blot freedom and democracy from the face of the earth has been finally defeated. In fact, I think all reasonable people believe we are going

to have other Koreas. The battle for Korea is only a skirmish in what is likely to be a long-drawn-out battle for the world. Certainly every American citizen ought to prepare himself psychologically and in every other way for what is going to be a long-drawn-out struggle in our generation and maybe in generations to come, as to whether this will be a world governed by the despots of tyranny or whether this will be a world in which the principles of freedom survive and in which its banners will remain unfurled.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENSON] has demonstrated courage and vision by his proposal of "a Marshall plan of ideas." I join with others in vigorously supporting his measure. I am sorry he has left the floor for the moment. I am sure the Senator from Connecticut would be the first to recognize that any expansion of our educational, informational, radio, and news services for the dissemination of democratic ideas will be fortified a thousandfold if we can tell the world of our deeds that carry out our ideals. The emphasis today needs to be placed upon deeds, programs, accomplishments. Then we should strengthen our informational and educational services to tell the true story.

As the Senator from Connecticut pointed out, the Koreans were not even told about the tremendous amount of help we gave to them. The story was never told in such vivid terms that the average Korean listening at his little radio or in the public square would know the full truth of the contribution of America to the independence and freedom of the South Korean people.

The people of the world are dizzy and confused by the propaganda barrage of the east and the west. I think we ought to put it down now once and for all that we can never outpromise the Communists. It is foreign to our nature to be so irresponsible. We can, however, utilize the resources at our command and by our own deeds prove to the peoples of the world that democracy is a realistic, practical answer to the perplexing problems which beset mankind.

Technological and scientific assistance in combatting malaria, in overcoming tuberculosis, in improving the use of the land and the development of new crops—these are things that people can understand. They do not require any interpretation. These are problems that strike powerful blows in the cause of freedom, in the struggle against communism.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The amount which was requested for the point 4 program, as I recall, was \$35,000,000, was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. And the Appropriations Committee cut that amount to \$20,000,000?

Mr. HUMPHREY. To \$10,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. To \$10,000,000. In other words, the small sum of \$35,000,000 was requested by the President of the United States with respect to point 4, in order to point the way to something really worth while for the future of this coun-

try; yet the Appropriations Committee denied the President that small amount, when billions of dollars are being appropriated for other purposes.

I simply cannot understand how the Appropriations Committee could slash \$25,000,000 from the small request of \$35,000,000 to carry out the point 4 program. Before the debate is concluded I hope someone will explain why that was done. I will say, however, it cannot be explained to my satisfaction. I care not whether evidence on that point was presented before the committee; I care not whether there was anything other than the President's message—and that we know about—before the committee. We all know what point 4 means. We all know what the objectives of point 4 are. Certainly \$35,000,000 was a small sum indeed with which to start the program, with which to do something which in the future might be of tremendous constructive help to this Nation. At this particular time, when, as the Senator said, the Communists, through their propaganda methods, through their lying methods, are giving democracy a real test, we, so to speak, take the wrong horn of the dilemma and retreat, rather than go forward with the point 4 program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois has surely stated the issue in concise and pertinent terms. I am very grateful and thankful to him for having done so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With respect to the request for \$35,000,000, I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that \$7,600,000 was appropriated under the Smith-Mundt Act, under the Fulbright Act, and under the item for the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, out of \$8,100,000, which, as I recall, was requested originally by the Bureau of the Budget. After deducting the \$8,100,000, leaving \$26,900,000, the Senate Appropriations Committee in its wisdom cut it down to \$10,000,000. I personally do not approve of that, and I have, together with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] prepared an amendment which is now on the desks of Members of the Senate, to increase the \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000.

I personally believe in the principles of the point 4 program. Whether the amount for that program should be \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000 in addition to the amount provided under the Smith-Mundt Act and under the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, is a question of judgment and is a question of a relatively small amount.

The reason which I think influenced the majority of the members of the Appropriations Committee—and I do not speak for them because I was in the minority—was that there was not sufficient justification before the Senate Appropriations Committee for the amount requested. I believe it would be extremely helpful to have, and, as one Senator, I certainly am going to try to have a better justification on the floor of the Senate than was presented in the Senate Appropriations Committee for that amount.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; but first I wish to thank the Senator from Massachusetts for what he has said.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for giving me an opportunity to make the statement, and I hope he will support me in my amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation in regard to this item. It applies not only to the cutting of appropriations for point 4, but to the cutting of the appropriations for the existing program. The action of the committee was to recommend a cut, under the budget request for funds for the existing program, which was \$36,600,000. The House cut that amount to \$34,000,000; and the Senate committee has voted to cut that amount by another \$1,300,000.

I can see no justification for such action. Every detail was presented to the committee on regard to what the money would be used for. Nine nations, in addition to the ones participating in this program last year, are now participating in it; and that fact would justify a considerable increase in the appropriation. Furthermore, there is all the justification now being presented by the Senator from Minnesota and by other Senators who have spoken about this matter. Yet the Appropriations Committee quibbled over \$1,300,000, voted to cut the appropriation for this item more than the House cut it. The committee has done that now for more than 2 years running. That action by the committee indicates that it has no real concern with this program. The committee voted to cut the appropriations for this item more than that 2 years ago, even although the program is designed for the same objective as that of the point 4 program, as the Senator knows.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may be confused in regard to what the Senator from Arkansas has said, but I believe we are talking about the same thing. Of course, one is the appropriation item for information and educational activity, which was approximately \$36,000,000. The House cut that item to \$34,000,000; but now the final result, on the basis of the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee, is an item of \$32,700,000. Included in that item is the \$7,600,000 for the Smith-Mundt Act program and the program in connection with the Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That \$7,600,000 will be moved over to and included in the amount appropriated for the so-called point 4 program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. The attempt is to take it out of the existing program and mix it up with the other one. In effect, there would be no improvement at all. By legerdemain it would be moved out of the existing Voice of America program and would be moved into the program for point 4. I assume that the committee has voted to do so on the basis

of the belief that there will be some backing or some votes on the floor of the Senate for such action.

The point is that no real progress at all will be made as a result of such procedure. Why the Appropriations Committee voted to cut the item by \$1,300,000 after the item was reduced by the House of Representatives is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am extremely happy to witness the rightful indignation of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, I am indignant. The committee has acted in this way for 3 years. Such action on the part of the committee is nothing new. The committee always has tried to emasculate the program so far as it could do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say that I do not like to stand here and be criticized, seemingly, as having tried to decrease the funds available for this program, when the fact is that I am one of those who take the same view the Senator from Arkansas takes. I merely wish to say that the State Department did not present its case very well in its testimony before the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly I presented my case fairly well.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to compliment the Senator from Massachusetts for being on the correct side, except I point out that his amendment does not go so far as it should. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts and other Senators will vote to increase the amount available for this purpose.

It seems to me that when we are asking for \$35,000,000 for this program, as the Senator from Arkansas said a while ago, it is tweedle-dee and tweedle-dum for the Appropriations Committee to vote to strike a million and a quarter dollars from this item. Why the committee should vote to take such action is difficult for me to understand. However, perhaps I understand it correctly; in other words, as the Senator from Arkansas has said, over all these years the committee has attempted to emasculate the appropriations for this program, although this is the program which today is advising people everywhere in the world that we have been proceeding with the proper purposes. In fact, if we had spent more money for these educational programs, perhaps we would not be in our present position.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Illinois for his observations. He has presented the case forcefully.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suppose the Senator can yield only for a question. However, in the light of the observations made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and by the dis-

tinguished Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, if the Senator from Arkansas is talking about the justification for appropriations for the point 4 program, that is one thing, of course. If he is talking about the justification for the requested appropriation of funds for the Fulbright student-exchange program, that is another thing.

I happen to be a member of the Appropriations Committee; and at the committee hearings I listened to the testimony and the presentation given by Mr. Thorp in regard to the point 4 program. I am satisfied that the other members of the Appropriations Committee will bear me out when I say that Mr. Thorp did not at all justify this appropriation. He did not present a thing, not a solitary case, in justification of the appropriation called for by the budget.

Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, to the fact that there was an absolute failure of justification, regardless of whether we believe in the merits or in the demerits of the program. If Senators will read the testimony in the hearings in that connection, I am sure all Senators will agree with me on that point. No justification at all was given.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me say that it is my purpose to give the justification.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the Senator will do so. After all, if there is to be any effort on the floor of the Senate to increase the amount of the appropriation for this item, and to do so on a fair basis, certainly such justification should be presented to the Senate; and, if possible, new evidence should be presented on the floor of the Senate, because in my opinion the committee hearings contain no justification at all to warrant an appropriation of \$35,000,000, \$8,000,000 of which, as the Senator from Massachusetts already has said, has already been provided, and as to that much of the item there was no objection at all.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If there is no justification at all, as the Senator from Nebraska has just said, why should anything at all be provided for this purpose? Yet the committee has voted to provide some funds.

Mr. WHERRY. Well, Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Nebraska not to interrupt me. The Senator from Minnesota has yielded to me, and I should like to make my statement without interruption.

Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska constantly says that in the committee record there is no justification at all for such an appropriation. Yet arbitrarily, apparently, the committee has voted to reduce the item from \$35,000,000 to \$10,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield, to permit me to make an observation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the majority leader is entirely correct; in other words, why do we provide anything at all for this item? I think there was a failure to justify the appropriation of a single dollar or a single dime for this purpose. Of course, the question of whether we believe or do not believe in the merits or demerits of the point 4 program is another matter; but I say to the Senator from Arkansas, who sincerely believes in this program, and who is joined in that belief by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, that the merits of the program are an entirely different matter. I am merely saying that if the Senator expects to justify even the appropriation of \$10,000,000, or whatever amount the Senate may finally decide upon, to my mind additional testimony will be required; and I believe that it should be brought to the attention of the Members of the Senate generally, because in my personal opinion there has been absolutely no justification for the appropriation of this money.

The fact is that Mr. Thorp went to the United Nations and made commitments without any authority at all for doing so. If it had not been for that, there would not be even the slightest justification for even the appropriation of \$10,000,000.

So I say to the distinguished Senator, with all due respect for his sincerity in this matter, which I grant—and also I grant the sincerity of all other Senators who believe in the point 4 program—that there should be more evidence to justify this appropriation item than that which was offered by Mr. Thorp in regard to this particular phase of the point 4 program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall make several comments about what I believe to be the approach made by representatives of the State Department in their appearance before the Appropriations Committee; and I hope my comments will be worthy of the attention of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, of course I always listen with great interest to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I merely wish to say that I did not hear all the testimony in the committee regarding the point 4 program, but I did appear before the subcommittee presided over by the Senator from Nevada, when it was considering the Smith-Mundt program, namely, the regular information program under the Smith-Mundt Act and the program which I sponsor. There is in the record in that connection very excellent testimony. I myself testified, as also did Mr. Johnstone, Mr. Sargeant, and Mr. Barrett. The Budget Bureau approved the item. It has been thoroughly gone over. The program has been in operation for a number of years. Yet the Appropriations Committee voted to cut the item by \$1,300,000 below the cut the House of Representatives already had made. In

my opinion there was no lack of justification for the appropriation requested, but the action taken was simply an attempt to cut down the activities which already have been established.

The effect of the action of the committee, if supported by the Senate as a whole, would be to restrict the activities, and to do so more than they were restricted last year, in the case of the only program for this purpose which now is in existence. While I am sympathetic to and will support point 4, I still say, as I did before, when we had the question under consideration, that it is possible to do, and there is being done on a small scale, exactly, under the Smith-Mundt resolution, what can be done under the point 4 program.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not on the subcommittee which handled the appropriations for the State Department. I think most of the appropriations about which the distinguished Senator is talking, relative to the Fulbright resolution, are carried in that appropriation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I only heard the evidence on the particular matter about which the Senator is talking when he himself appeared before the full committee when it was considering the matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to correct the Senator on that point. That is not the testimony to which I am referring. I went before the subcommittee. I did not anticipate, before the full committee, that the idea that anyone who does not appeal to us is a Communist had become so thoroughly spread about in the Senate. I am checking upon that matter very carefully at the moment. That was not at all my testimony to which I am referring, and which is in the printed record.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield this time, after which I shall continue my remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. I was not on the Foreign Relations Committee, and therefore did not hear the Senator when he testified before the subcommittee. I only heard him testify before the full Committee on Appropriations, which considered the subcommittee's report on the State Department appropriations, which contained the recommendations about which the distinguished Senator is talking.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what I am complaining about. I think it is very short-sighted.

Mr. WHERRY. I followed the recommendation of the Senate committee, because the subcommittee said the members prepared the best bill they could, after giving it full consideration. Naturally, when one is not in a position to go into all the ramifications of appropriations, it is necessary to be guided by the recommendations of the subcommittee. I quite generally follow the recommendations of a subcommittee.

I did not want to discuss this issue and I am only talking about the point 4 program. I am not stating on the floor of

the Senate that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas did not present a full case to the subcommittee. The only testimony I heard him give was some of the testimony before the full committee, and that developed into an argument regarding one professor who came here, who was a Communist, and another question of whether any of the students had been properly screened, and what not. To be perfectly frank, the impression I got was that certainly more screening was needed. But I am not complaining about the merits of the Fulbright exchange legislation.

Neither did I hear the testimony before the subcommittee. But I did hear the testimony about point 4. I wanted the Senator to know that. I went into it very thoroughly, and my opinion is, if the Senator will read the record, that there is not a Senator who can approve an appropriation of \$35,000,000 on the evidence which was submitted, regardless of the merits of the undertaking. After all, that is the job of a member of the Appropriations Committee, whether he agrees with an authorization bill or not. I have always taken the position that, once Congress approves an authorization, then my job is to see to it that it is justified, whether I voted for the authorization or not. On that basis alone, I judged Mr. Thorp's testimony, and I submit to the distinguished Senator that in my humble opinion there was no justification. There was not even justification for the \$10,000,000, if you please.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota will try to complete his remarks. I am very grateful for the observations which have been made and the debate which has been carried on, because I believe that it has been helpful in promoting a proper understanding of what has happened in the Appropriations Committee, particularly the remarks which have been directed to the informational and educational program. I shall direct some of my remarks toward the comments and observations of the distinguished minority leader, and I surely am grateful for his participation, because it is true that there was inadequate representation before the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am going to make that point later on in my address. I believe it is our job here, now, on the Senate floor, to dig out the evidence we need, and to support this program. That is why I wish to make these comments today. These are but preliminary remarks. Others will have much more information to offer.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Minnesota will yield for a brief remark?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to include in my colloquy, if the Senator does not mind, a reference to page 295 of the report on the pending bill, to which the Senator has no doubt already called attention, and which thoroughly explains the \$10,000,000 appropriation and also the \$8,100,000 item about which the Senator from Massachusetts was talking, and about which there was no argument, the Senator will understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy to have yielded for that purpose.

Mr. President, I was saying a moment ago that technological and scientific assistance in combating diseases, such as malaria, in overcoming tuberculosis, in improving the use of land and the development of new crops, strikes a powerful blow in the struggle against communism. These programs are understandable to the people, and, I repeat, they strike mighty blows in our struggle against communism. When we take these programs and discuss them, when we talk about these projects and programs through our informational, educational, and radio and press services, we reveal a telling story, we present a meaningful story to the people of the lands where the technological and scientific programs have been used. I think it is imperative that, as we talk about information—and I know my good friend from Connecticut will agree with me—as we talk about public information, radio and news publicity and educational programs, that we remember that hungry, weak, unemployed, distraught, cynical, sick people just are not revived or rehabilitated by a soothing voice on the air. We must have something to talk about, and what we need to talk about in these areas of the underdeveloped parts of the world, where the people are underprivileged, where they have been under the colonial yoke of exploitation, where they have never had a break in life—what we ought to be telling them is the accomplishments which have been made available under the technological, scientific assistance program.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. I am dreadfully sorry I am unable to remain to hear the remainder of this very interesting and instructive argument by the Senator from Minnesota. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], before the Thomas subcommittee, last week, testified that he felt that this program should be increased to \$100,000,000?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am aware of that, and I would say that the Senator from Oregon is not being a bit extravagant in his remarks. I think he is being quite practical. I make this observation, and I think it is one anyone would make if he has ever had the misfortune of being a little bit hungry. Hungry people want food, not advice; they want something to eat. Impoverished people want an opportunity to earn a living, not somebody to talk to them. Unemployed people want work. The point 4 program of technological and scientific assistance attacks these social and economic evils at the source of contamination, namely, in the local environment of every country where economic and political chaos consumes the population.

This is a program through which the United Nations agencies, the United States Government, and the other governments participating joined together. It is a self-help program. It is not charity. It is not work relief. It is not

a hand-out. It is not a gift. It is a program dedicated to utilizing the manpower and the physical and natural resources that are available, so that these can be created into constructive, good products and services for the benefit of the people in the Nation.

The Voice of America and the Marshall plan of ideas can and will be effective only when we have the right to things to talk about. I know that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] has told us again and again that we have failed to tell our story about some of the good things that we have done—and we have done much good. There are yet other things to be done. We need to be as bold and as courageous in our struggle against poverty, ill health, the general breakdown of economic and social conditions as we are in our military efforts in combating world aggression. Our radio and publicity efforts, telling about the wonders of democracy, can breed a cynical despair in the hearts of the underprivileged people in the underdeveloped areas, if these people never have the opportunity to apply the wonders of science and technology to their own lives, their own soil, their own interests, and their own institutions.

If one wants to lose a friend, here is one way to do it—just go around and tell people how well off you are; just go around telling your poor neighbors what a fine home you have, what a fine automobile, what a fine job, what a good income, when the friend or neighbor is without a home, without an automobile, without an income, and without a job.

That is the quickest and surest way in the world to make a real enemy. The cynical attitude grows into bitterness and jealousy.

The point 4 program is an effort to help people to help themselves to make something out of their lives. It appears to me that the best publicity and propaganda for democracy is the application of scientific and technological knowledge to the economic and social structure of the underdeveloped areas.

The appalling contrast between these concurrent actions in the Capitol last week, Mr. President, is enough to shock us into asking ourselves some blunt and forthright questions. Are we really in earnest about winning the support of other peoples or are we just trying to kid them and ourselves? If we really want to win their support, how do we think it can be done? Can it be done with words alone or does it require more and more deeds—deeds that will have meaning to other peoples as well as to ourselves? Are we so blind that we refuse to recognize the true value of this incomparable instrument we already hold in our hand—so unwise that we are ready to cast it aside without even putting it to use? Are we true to ourselves when we readily vote billions for necessary military expenditures and refuse to spend a few million to help construct the equally essential economic and spiritual bases of democracy in the world?

Let us be charitable and assume that a clear understanding is lacking of the connection between point 4 and the battle of Korea—between point 4 and

other battles it may prevent if it is put to full and effective use in time. Just what is the significance and the value of point 4 in this world-wide struggle in which we are engaged?

I think all of us concede, Mr. President, the vital importance of winning the understanding and active support of the peoples of the world for the cause of freedom and democracy if that cause is to triumph. How can this be done? We must realize that words alone will not suffice to touch the hearts and win the minds of mankind. We must understand that millions of people throughout the world do not live as we do—that theirs is an existence made almost intolerable by pitiless poverty, disease, and ignorance. We must also realize—contrary to the smug belief in some quarters that these people live in such conditions because they choose to—that they are aware of the subhuman existence to which they are condemned and are resentful of it.

These are the people to whom the Communists insistently promise a better life if only they will throw in their lot with communism.

We should know by this time that the Communists have been able to make great strides by their appeal to the misery of the people. We ought to know that much of the Communist aggression has not been by the force of marching men, but by the tragedy of the breakdown of social and economic society. We know that their promises are false. We see every day that communism actually offers nothing but slavery, with not even better living conditions to compensate for the loss of freedom. But the millions to whom the Communists make their promises do not know this, or, at least, they did not know it early enough.

How can we convince them that the promises of communism are false and the ways of democracy are better? We cannot convince them by words alone—we cannot outpromise and outlie the Communists, even if we tried. Our most convincing argument must be directed to the human needs; to put it more bluntly, to the pits of their stomachs—where there is an aching void instead of satisfying food—where there is a vacuum which the Communists try to fill with Communist promises and slogans and doctrines, just as they try to fill political vacuums with Communist power.

On many occasions, Mr. President, I have mentioned on the floor of the Senate that one of the places where Communist ideology is working overtime and with feverish effort is the Republic of India. That great Republic has sought in the past 7 or 8 months to procure grain to feed the hungry millions. We can talk to those people about democracy all we want to, but what they want is something to eat. When they see that we have food in surplus, that we even destroy it, as they are told by the Communists; when they see that we have to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars even to store this food when they would like to buy it, it really gives the Communists something to talk about. Everything we can do in Indonesia, every-

thing we can do in southern Asia, Burma, Thailand, Indochina, to raise the living standards of the people through their own efforts, through the use of knowledge and information, through the transfer of experts to those nations to help the people, will do more to beat down communism than will all the pamphlets we can possibly send there. People have got to be pretty hungry before they will eat pamphlets. A hungry man is an available person for the Communist line.

What can we offer these people that is more convincing than Communist propaganda—that will really fill their stomachs, that will really alleviate their misery, that will really give them new decency and dignity, to which even the lowliest aspire? We can give them, Mr. President, the most irrefutable kind of proof that democracy is immeasurably superior to communism—demonstrable proof in the form of the methods, the skills and the knowledge that have enabled us to attain in this country the high standard of living that is the envy of the world. We can make this demonstration in a form that can be understood and appreciated by the humblest peasants and workers in every country—tangible, effective advice and assistance that will enable them by their own efforts to raise themselves and their families to a new level of well-being. What better answer can there be to communism?

This is the most effective answer to the false promises of communism, Mr. President, because it is the stuff of life. It makes itself felt in the daily lives of the masses of people, because it deals with the things in which they are most vitally and immediately concerned—more food to eat, more clothing to wear, better shelter for their households, better health for their families, and better opportunities for their children.

This is what point 4 means. This is what point 4 can accomplish. How do we know? Because we have tried this method for 10 years at least, and have proved that it works. We have proved that it is practical, it is effective, it is inexpensive, and it convinces the people whom it benefits both of the friendship of the United States and of the efficacy of democratic principles.

During World War II, the technical assistance program carried on by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs was one of the most effective instrumentalities for gaining support of the United States in the Latin-American countries. American agricultural experts showed their farmers how to grow more food to offset the reduction of imports caused by the war; American doctors and engineers improved the health and sanitation of thousands of workers producing war materials. By the end of the war surveys indicated that 25,000,000 Latin Americans had benefited from these efforts. This work was known and appreciated by the people of those countries, as well as by their governments.

Since then, this program has been continued on a reduced scale by the institute, while a parallel program of 26

United States agencies under the leadership of the State Department has been in continuous operation for 11 years. At the beginning, the United States put up most of the money for the health and sanitation, agricultural and educational programs, now the Latin-American countries put up \$3 to every \$1 spent by the United States.

After the Institute of Inter-American Affairs had participated in technical-assistance projects in Costa Rica for 5 years the president of that country in 1947, Jose Figueres, dedicated a local office of the joint agricultural service. He emphasized the cooperative nature of the work, and smilingly told his audience: "This is the Yankee imperialism you have heard so much about."

That is the kind of testimonial we want from peoples in other lands.

In the capital of Chile the Institute of Inter-American Affairs helped install a sewerage system that serves 200,000 people in a quarter of the city inhabited by workers and their families. The project not only provided sanitation for people among whom the Communists had been very active, but also made possible the cultivation of crops on 100,000 acres formerly unsuitable for food production because the irrigation ditches were polluted by sewage. When the project was completed the people of the district, of their own accord, arranged a public ceremony at which they sang the Star-Spangled Banner and dedicated a marble marker expressing their gratitude to the United States.

Believe me, that kind of gratitude is hard to find, and demonstrations like that are few and far between, when we are merely exporting arms or talking in terms of a direct-relief program. Here these people helped themselves. They were grateful for the assistance they received in their self-help program.

In Ceylon a representative of the United States Bureau of Reclamation is advising the Government on the construction of a large dam that will provide irrigation for enough land to feed half a million people. In the same country the World Health Organization assisted in an intensive campaign that entirely eliminated malaria at a cost of 20 cents per capita. They have eliminated malaria, the dread disease of the tropics, in the country of Ceylon at the cost of 20 cents per person. By way of comparison, it has been estimated that the direct cost of malaria for every person who has the disease in India is \$2 a year.

One American agricultural expert in Guatemala has shown Latin-American coffee growers how they can double or triple their yield without increasing acreage, simply by selecting high-yielding strains of coffee trees. Another American technician helped save Brazil's citrus industry by finding the cause of a ruinous plant disease, at a cost of \$30,000.

These instances are only a few of hundreds that could be cited. The fact is that the point 4 principle has been proved time and again: It is inexpensive, it is practical, it is effective in persuad-

ing the people among whom it is applied of the good intentions of the United States and the benefits of the democratic way of life.

I want to say right now that I think that kind of program will do more to save the world from aggressive, militaristic communism than any pamphlet, radio broadcast, or feature movie, because when we get right down to it the people's of the world turn to a foreign ideology or subversive doctrine, and turn away from principles of human freedom, only when they are sick, down and out, without property, and without a chance to make something out of their lives.

We have only to apply this principle on a much broader scale, as President Truman has suggested, to have an unbeatable weapon against communism.

We frequently hear anguished outcries from leading Americans including Members of Congress, about the dangers of communism, and demands for positive, imaginative, appealing measures to counter the threat of communism. Well, here it is. What could be more positive, constructive, dynamic than point 4?

The trouble is that many Members of Congress, many officials of the Government, do not know a good thing when they see it. Even the State Department, as I pointed out to the minority leader, has been entirely too slow and reticent in realizing the enormous potentialities of point 4, and too timid to put it to full use. That seems to be the trouble with our Foreign Service officers. They are afflicted with timidity and caution. They are always far behind the people. You can bet your bottom dollar that if our positions were reversed, and the Russians possessed the tremendous advantage that our technological resources give us, they would be using it to the hilt all over the world against us. Here we have in our hands the best imaginable weapon against communism, and we do not have the gumption and the sagacity to use it.

The American people are far ahead of the Government in realizing the great potentialities of point 4. There is tremendous interest and enthusiasm all over the country for this program, especially among people who understand it best. Let me quote a statement. It comes from a highly respected American citizen.

I quote:

It is our firm belief that the interests of the United States will best be served by helping nations and peoples to help themselves. It is in our interest to help the distressed attain their needs so that they will have the physical strength to defend and carry forward their intellectual, moral and spiritual freedom.

Thus, by helping others to help themselves we will aid them in achieving independence from domination of any kind. * * * Our interests and the best interest of the people throughout the world are inseparable, and thus in reality we serve our own best interest by helping others achieve strength and health, opportunity and freedom through rising standards of living.

The sooner all of us recognize the fact that the welfare of the world is indivisible and that our freedom and the freedom of other nations are inseparable, the sooner we will be able to face with all our force the gigantic task that exists today, the task of

raising the standards of living of peoples of all lands.

That statement, Members of the Senate, was not made by an official of this Government, a visionary planner, a college professor, or even a Democrat. It was made by one of the foremost industrialists and one of the foremost financiers in this country, Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller.

What then is the source of the opposition to point 4? It can hardly be based upon the amount of money involved since only a total of \$35,000,000 was authorized for point 4 whereas we are appropriating approximately \$3,000,000,000 for direct ECA assistance and about a billion and a quarter for additional military assistance. There is little doubt but what we will appropriate even more in view of the dire and critical international situation.

It is interesting for me to observe that every time Senators are asked, if more money should be needed in the international situation because of the Korean struggle would it be forthcoming, that to a man we say, "Of course it will." We say to the President, "Send down your requests. They will be voted immediately." I want to state as loudly as I can that we cannot whip communism with arms alone. If we alone are in an arms race with world communism, we are licked right now. They will bleed us white. What we must recognize is that we need allies, and the friendship, understanding, and devotion of millions and millions of people who are being sucked into the Communist orbit. If the Congress of the United States persists in ignoring this program and only spends money in a great armaments race, we have lost all hope of being able to maintain a free world.

The opposition to point 4 cannot be based upon any claim that it is new or a theoretical matter. This program has been operating in limited areas for several years and it has operated successfully. It has operated to the satisfaction of the peoples receiving the aid and our own country that has given the aid.

The opposition to point 4 surely cannot be based upon the assertion that this is some new untried venture within the framework of the United Nations. The programs of world health, food, and agriculture and other related UN agencies are directed toward similar ends. We have joined in these agencies in full knowledge of their work and objectives.

What then is the basis for the opposition? Are the American people to believe that the opposition is one based upon economy? That will hardly stand the test of public scrutiny when the limited sum of \$35,000,000 is requested. Compare this small sum to the military expenditures.

Are the American people to believe that the curtailment of appropriations for the point 4 program is primarily a political move because it was proclaimed and has been vigorously championed by President Truman? I am sure that this is not and will not be the intention of the Senate. I am confident that party politics does not control in the field of foreign policy.

We in the Congress must keep pace with the American people in their understanding of the political, social, and economic conditions which provide a fertile soil for communism. The American people know that communism grows and expands where there is sickness, hunger, and poverty. The American people know that where men and women enjoy some of the good things of life, that communism finds it most difficult to make inroads, and the American people have a right to expect the same kind of intelligence and competent observation on the part of their representatives in the Congress.

The American people are a generous people. They want our country to share its scientific and technological knowledge with our friends. The American people expect their Congress which represents them to translate their wholesome desire "to share" into public law. Our people are crying out in desperation for a Congress to be as positive in its search for peace as it is in its willingness to meet the armed force of communism by military strength.

Let no one forget that for a moment. There is sadness in the hearts of millions of Americans, and they are looking to the Congress for some guidance, not merely on appropriations for new bombs, which we must have because of the sad, sick, and sorry world in which we live, but they are looking to the Congress for some light and some leadership to get at and to destroy the sources of contamination, of communism, wherever we find them. The way we do that is in the economic, social, and political areas, not in the military alone.

Let there be no misunderstanding of my words. The people of this Nation recognize that our struggle with communism is twofold. It is one of meeting the Communist ideology by democratic ideas and democratic performance. It is the other of meeting the brutal military power of Communist conspiracy by a united, strong, and prepared nation. Our people, the people of America, expect the Congress to interpret their ideas and their wishes into public policy.

The Congress and the American people have rallied almost unanimously in support of the President's courageous decision on Korea. A drastic cut in point 4 funds at this time would mean that we are ready to follow him when he stakes the fate of the Nation on military action to check aggression, but we refuse to follow his lead in a long-range effort to prevent future Koreas. It would mean that we actively seek the support of other nations when we are directly engaged in military action in which our national prestige and security are involved, but we tell them they can shift for themselves, can go their own way, as far as their own welfare is concerned.

Only 4 weeks ago the United Nations held a conference to raise funds for its expanded technical assistance program, which was inspired by President Truman's initiative in proposing point 4. This conference was held only after Congress had authorized \$35,000,000 for technical assistance and specified that part of this amount could be used in pro-

grams conducted by international agencies. This Government pledged \$12,000,000 to the United Nations program, and on that understanding, 49 other countries pledged \$8,000,000 more.

A drastic cut in the point 4 appropriation, as proposed by the Appropriations Committee, would make it necessary for this Government, at this critical hour in world history, at a time when the United Nations has stood with us and we have stood with them, to renege on at least part of its pledge to the United Nations. This would hamper, if not cripple, the United Nations program of technical assistance. Moreover, it would embarrass not only the President and our representatives in the United Nations, but it would also seriously damage the prestige of the United States itself.

Such a result could only be interpreted throughout the world, at a time when the free world is striving to achieve solidarity under the banner of the United Nations, as a vote of "no confidence" by the United States in the economic and social activities of the UN.

Communism is an international conspiracy. That is what communism is, an international conspiracy. It is a philosophy that has military adherents and supporters in many lands. International communism is directed by the evil, and, may I say, very clever, men of the Kremlin. Its center of power is the Soviet Union. Yet the military aggression that we see in Korea and the aggression that we saw in Czechoslovakia were not the direct product of an attack by Russian soldiers. We see a new form of aggression. We see an international army, an international program, an international philosophy, which repudiates the whole structure of international law based upon territorial integrity and freedom, and national independence.

We see Koreans attack Korea for Russian Communist purposes. We see Czechoslovaks destroy the independence of Czechoslovakia as a part of the master plan of the Kremlin. We see Chinese Communists destroy independent China to fulfill the plan of the Communist leaders. We see Communist Indochinese attacking and ravaging their land as a part of the evil plot of the international Communist movement. We watched the Communists of France and of Italy—yes, of every land—do the bidding and the work of their masters in the Soviet Union. Time-honored principles of national pride and national patriotism and devotion have been cast away by this evil insidious philosophy of international communism.

What does this tell us? Surely it tells us that no one nation alone can successfully meet the attack of an international movement that has its slaves, its dupes, and its servants in every land.

One hundred and fifty million Americans cannot meet the attack of 800,000,000 enslaved Communist-controlled people. It is impossible, unless we want to get ourselves down into the pitiful condition in which their slaves and dupes find themselves. So it resolves itself into finding friends, and building for ourselves and our principles an international organization.

I was very much pleased to see the editorial in the Washington Post of today, which stated that the former President of Chile, Gonzalez-Videla, when he came to Washington, suggested the creation of a democratic international to stop the spread of the international Communists. What a wonderful idea, a democratic international to stop the spread of international communism. If the Communists can pick us off one at a time, that is what they are going to do. Surely we have discovered that the one instrument through which we can work so as to have a great, united international movement dedicated to democratic humane and decent purposes, is the United Nations.

The very obvious fact that Communists have but one loyalty, namely, the loyalty to a totalitarian philosophy with its prophets of doom working from behind the walls of the Kremlin, should make it crystal clear to all freedom-loving people that if we are to counter-attack, if we are to meet this menace and destroy its effectiveness, we too must have an international movement, an international forum, an international government to carry forth our program of freedom and democracy, and to implement our ideas. Here again it seems as if divine providence is on our side. This Nation has been blessed many times by the good fortune, I am sure, of having divine care and counsel.

Fortunately, a great international instrument of law and order is available. That international body finds itself revealed in the United Nations. The United Nations is now a working instrumentality to preserve international law. This great international organization into which we should be directing this point 4 funds, to give it life and to give it something with which to work, was inspired by the ideals of Woodrow Wilson. He was the great philosopher of our time, of our century, in the cause of international order and world peace. The UN was also given guidance by the late President Franklin Roosevelt. We are its creators, and must be its staunch defenders.

The declaration of the United Nations was written in this Capital and subscribed to by 26 nations on January 1, 1942. The preliminary proposals for the creation of a great international organization, later to become the United Nations, were written at Dumbarton Oaks right here in the Nation's Capital. The conference that drew the Charter of the United Nations was held in the great city of San Francisco, in the United States of America, as I said, it appears to me that divine providence has given to us and to every freedom-loving people the tools and the weapons to meet the evil philosophy of Communist totalitarianism. The free people of the world have a charter to fight for and to work for. The free people of the world have an instrument of law and order that they can use. We here in America above all others should be able to understand the importance of working through the United Nations and of strengthening its agencies.

I plead for the kind of understanding that will save us from the peril which will be upon us if we do not act in concert with freedom-loving peoples.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a series of editorials pertaining to American participation in the United Nations.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

WAR OF WORDS

Acheson and Dulles, Marshall and Eisenhower—all four spoke up forcefully Wednesday in behalf of an expansion of our information program. They pointed to the immense resources that the Russians are throwing into the battle of words over Korea. Actions are said to speak louder than words, but one of the wonders of the twentieth century is that they don't. Our actions in Korea are pure enough, and the actions of the aggressor that we are coping with are just the opposite; but let us remember that millions of people depend not upon unadulterated sources of news, but upon words whispered across the diameter of the earth by men who not only have the resources but are supreme technicians in the art of bamboozling and befuddling.

To be sure, 43 nations have testified to our virtue by supporting our action against the aggressor, and you would think that this fact would in itself be eloquent enough. But the testimony is that it isn't. Thus the great need from all these supporting nations is that they shall mobilize their communication resources to spell out their support of the sanctions undertaken in Korea. They should be asked to join with us and the United Nations Organization at Lake Success in revealing the true position. They all have facilities of communication. All of them have their own peculiar audiences in which what they say is predominantly influential, and some of these go beyond their frontiers. In the present crisis, certainly, national propaganda should be secondary and the first item in the 43 nations' program should be an explanation of why they demand a cease-fire and a withdrawal in Korea.

Parallel propaganda is something for which this newspaper has long pleaded as the bounden duty of all nations who prize their liberty. The last occasion was when President Gonzales Videla of Chile came to Washington. The Chilean suggested the creation of a democratic international to stop the spread of international communism. The idea had merit, but this newspaper observed that, without benefit of new machinery, there was something that the free nations could do right away, and that was to unite their propaganda resources in behalf of the free way of life. There is now a specific occasion for uniting propaganda on the specific issue of the struggle upon which the free world is engaged.

Propaganda is a device in which the United States is deficient, and this is curious, for the United States has made an art of advertising and salesmanship and public relations. The deficiency is due to disinterest—expressed in a budget of only \$34,000,000, a sum which, moreover, includes items that do not properly belong to an information budget. The amount is less than that spent by the British, let alone the Russians. Yet no country needs to spread the light about itself and its situation more than this country; for no country has been more defamed and maligned, and no country is more responsible for defending the peace. In India, for instance, the picture conjured up of America by all classes of society up to the top level of sophistication is a curious sort of Wall Street-Holly-

wood amalgam. Million of people in out-of-the-way places, as the result of the long start of the Russians and the American neglect, speak the Muscovite patter about America, and thus the Russians may be in a better position than we realize of making their own barefaced aggression seem like innocent self-defense in the minds of the world's guileless.

[From the Washington Post of July 9, 1950]

AGENT OF THE UN

The only legal problem that has given United Nations officials any real concern in connection with the UN policy in Korea has been successfully worked out in the Security Council's resolution asking the United States to designate the commander of the anti-aggression forces. Some experts on the UN Charter had feared that it would be difficult to carry out military police action in Korea without activating the Military Staff Committee on which the Soviet Union is represented. The Charter provides that the Military Staff Committee shall be responsible under the Council "for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council." But the Charter has proved to be flexible. Unity of command is being achieved without any reference to the Military Staff Committee.

It was obvious at the outbreak of the fighting that the Security Council could not itself put down the aggression of the North Koreans. No troops had been placed at its disposal, as contemplated by the Charter. But the Council could and did act under article 39 of chapter VII. This article directs the Council to determine the existence of any breach of the peace or act of aggression and to "make recommendations * * * to maintain or restore international peace and security." The Council took such steps in its resolutions of June 25 and 27. On Friday it took the additional step of "recommending" that all members responding to its call place their forces at the disposal of a unified command under direct control of the United States. In other words, the Council gave its blessing to the practical measures already taken by the nations co-operating in this joint undertaking.

Use of the United Nations flag, along with the national flags of the nations resisting this aggression, was also authorized. The United Nations is as much committed as if forces directly under its command had gone into action. We think the Council is to be highly commended both for shouldering the responsibility laid upon it by the Charter and for working out a practical means of making its will effective. No doubt the logic of events drove it to the conclusion that the anti-aggression forces in Korea should be placed directly under American command. But the initiative came from the British and French rather than the American delegates. And since 45 of the 59 members of the United Nations have approved the use of armed forces in Korea since the United States took the lead in supplying men and equipment, it may be assumed that the arrangement meets with general satisfaction.

The most heartening fact about the Korean episode thus far is the courageous and forthright manner in which the Security Council has responded to the challenge of armed aggression. The dramatic manner in which it has emerged from its moribund state has been tonic to the entire free world. In our enthusiasm for what the Council is now doing, however, it is well to remember that it was able to act in this emergency only because of the Russian boycott of the UN in violation of article 28. The Soviet's incredible blunder in absenting itself from the Council has resulted in a demonstration of unity against aggression that scarcely seemed possible a few weeks ago. The disturbing thought is that the Council's spurt

of activity could be squelched overnight by the return of a Soviet delegate to the Council. Of course, Russia could not stall the forces that have been put into motion. But her veto could prevent the Council from taking any further action to counteract the present or future acts of aggression. That possibility must be giving the jubilant statesmen at Lake Success more worry than is apparent in any of their current statements.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 8, 1950]

UNDER ONE FLAG FOR ONE PURPOSE

By a 7 to 0 decision—with India, Egypt, and Yugoslavia abstaining—the Security Council of the United Nations now has taken another historic step to emphasize that the effort to repel the Red invasion of Southern Korea in an effort being made not by our country alone but by the UN as a whole.

As far as specific action is concerned, the Council's new resolution paves the way, first of all, for a unified command of the military forces which numerous members have provided to help the Council carry out its decisions of June 25 and 27—decisions aimed at forcing the Northern Korean invaders to withdraw to the thirty-eighth parallel. The command is to be under the United States—the chief power involved—and the top commander is to be an American, General MacArthur.

In addition to this move—which is essential to the efficient use of the multinational forces available—the Council has decreed that the new unified command may at its discretion fly the flag of the United Nations, concurrently with the flags of the various participating powers, during military operations in Korea. Nothing could better symbolize or dramatize the fact that those operations—legally, morally and militarily—are not a one-country enterprise but the enterprise of the overwhelming majority of the UN.

Never before in history has there been anything quite like this—never such a unified command over a great company of nations fighting together under one flag for the sole purpose of putting an end to criminal aggression. Here is the nearest approach the world has yet made to a concrete, flesh-and-blood realization of the international police force called for by the UN charter. Though it can accomplish no overnight miracles, the development is potentially a thing of first importance. Certainly, in an immediate sense, it can do much to counter the Kremlin's propaganda effort to blame the Korean war on American "imperialists."

In effect, moreover, this latest of the Security Council's history-making actions serves as a stern rebuff to the Soviet Union's continuing attempt—made once again in the note protesting against our naval blockade of Korea—to depict the Council as a kind of outlaw violating the Charter and operating as the tool of "imperialistic" America. With more than two-thirds of the UN against it, the Kremlin must fully realize that this particular phase of its propaganda is a complete dud in the free world.

All of which suggests that the Russians, now that they have virtually branded the United Nations as a criminal, may formally withdraw from it. Whether they do or not, however, its course is set and determined in Korea: Flying its own flag, it proposes, regardless of grave risks, to do everything possible to beat back the aggressor. The Council has made that much very clear.

[From the New York Times of July 7, 1950]

WE NEED ALL OF POINT 4

President Truman's point 4 program for providing technical aid to underdeveloped countries ought to appeal to anybody with an economical drop of blood in his veins. In

contrast with the billions spent or to be spent for Marshall-plan aid or the military-aid program, point 4 needed only millions. Mr. Truman had asked for \$45,000,000 for the 1951 fiscal year, or about 30 cents per capita for the United States population. Subsequently, in bills pending in both Houses of Congress, the 30 cents was whittled down to about 23 cents. Yesterday it was reported that the Senate Appropriations Committee had cut the figure at least tentatively to as low as 7 cents per capita. Is 7 cents as much as each of us would like to spend on this really very magnificent enterprise?

Point 4 contemplates technical aid to United Nations and other agencies, national and international, in the fields of health, agriculture, education and industry. In his address at the American Newspaper Guild convention on June 29 Mr. Truman gave some instances of what technical aid could do. It could clear the malarial mosquito out of a rich farming area in northern India which otherwise was being abandoned. It could bring pure water to an area in Iran. It could stimulate the production of lumber, rice, palm oil, and cocoa in Liberia. It could be supplemented by investments made through the World Bank, the Export-Import Bank and private agencies. The whole program is extremely elastic in that it might mobilize all sorts of public and private agencies at relatively little expense to the public agencies.

The point 4 program will not win a war or a police action in Korea. It might, however, over a period of years, alleviate the conditions that aid the Communists to penetrate the Far East and other relatively undeveloped regions. It might demonstrate against the flood of Communist propaganda that mid-century capitalism is energetic, intelligent and humane. We hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee and its opposite numbers in the House will realize these facts in time and will not commit the egregious error of trying to remake the world with a handful of pennies.

[From the Washington Post of July 9, 1950]

FUTILITY ON POINT 4

It is hard to imagine a worse time for the kind of narrow-mindedness shown by the Senate Appropriations Committee in its decision announced yesterday to cut point 4 funds in half. If the cut should be sustained by the Senate, it would mean that the United States could conduct practically no independent program of technical assistance over large areas of the world at the very time that the Russians are doing their utmost to exploit discontent. It would be tantamount to telling India, for example, that in return for her support on Korea we would eliminate the technical aid on which she has been counting heavily.

Of the President's original request for \$45,000,000 for 1951, the Senate authorized thirty-five million. The Appropriations Committee, however, slashed this to seventeen and six-tenths million, including seven and six-tenths million for existing programs under the Institute of Inter-American Affairs and the Smith-Mundt Act. This leaves ten million. Yet the United States already is committed to furnish \$12,500,000 to the United Nations technical assistance program for the period ending December 31, 1951. Even if ECA appropriations might be squeezed to provide technical help for colonial Africa and southeast Asia under the general area of China authorization, there would be no such funds for India, Pakistan and the Middle East. Yet it is precisely in those areas where this most enlightened form of help, the stimulation for self-help, is most vitally needed.

The administration must bear some responsibility for the bungling manner in which the whole point 4 program has been

handled since its inception 18 months ago. But point 4 is more than an administration proposal; it is an American answer to a desperate need. Yet the Appropriations Committee seemed to retain a preconceived hostility toward the program, except for the protests of one or two members. Assistant Secretary of State Thorp, for example, was browbeaten almost from the moment he set foot in the committee room, and was never allowed to complete his prepared statement.

One would think that the parallel with our world information program, which most legislators now recognize to be inadequate, would be strikingly clear. It costs a lot more to fight communism after the fact than to prevent it from taking hold in the first place. In justice to this country's interest in the world struggle, the Senate should take a sounder view of what is meant by real economy than its short-sighted committee has done. As Senator Lodge said in commenting on the information program, it is American deeds that count. "Isn't it true," he asked, "that a doctor going into a fever-ridden area is our best story?"

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 7, 1950]

MAKING IT POINTLESS

We hope it is only a rumor. It is one of those things that certainly ought not to be so.

But there is a report that the Senate Appropriations Committee has voted to reduce the initial appropriation for the point 4 program from the \$35,000,000 Congress authorized to a misely \$10,000,000.

This, for a world-wide program of technical assistance to economically backward countries, would make point 4 practically pointless.

To scuttle one of the few affirmative contributions America can make toward a betterment of world living standards would be the height of crass stupidity and political pettifoggery.

The United States is spending nearly \$14,500,000,000 a year on its own military budget, plus additional costs for the fighting in Korea and a possible 70-group air force.

It authorized last year more than \$1,000,000,000 of arms aid to western Europe. It spent \$345,000,000 to help win a civil war in Greece, and since has furnished \$375,000,000 worth of arms to that country and Turkey.

How much is the United States willing to spend to help improve the opportunities of world neighbors whose economic level is pathetically and irritatingly lower than its own?

Is it true, as its enemies say, that all America cares about is armed might and exploitation?

No, it is not; and \$35,000,000 under present circumstances is small earnest to give of a deeper and more benevolent interest.

The \$35,000,000 which both houses of Congress have authorized for this purpose is less than the cost, tag on 4 hours of World War II.

That is a small enough effort toward kindling hope in the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the recent developments in Korea have again demonstrated the importance of this great body, the United Nations. We did not hesitate to promptly reply to the resolution of the Security Council. We did not hesitate to offer all possible assistance to restore peace and order in Korea. We did not bicker and quibble over a few dollars when the Security Council asked for assistance to enforce its resolution. We answered the call.

Mr. President, I did not see any resolution come from the Appropriations

Committee which said, "Now take it easy. Do not spend too much on gasoline. Let us not be spending too much now for airplanes or for munitions." Not on your life. Every person, as he should, every Senator, every member of the Government, rallied as one to see to it that every available bit of equipment and material was there to do the job.

The United Nations has asked for assistance in another effort—a fight against poverty, misery, unemployment, disease, and malnutrition. The members of the United Nations believe that this war against communism is a two-fold thing, not just one. They not only have adopted a resolution to restore the peace in Korea which we quickly supported as we should have. The United Nations also has taken another action. The United Nations has asked for assistance to combat poverty, misery, unemployment, disease, and malnutrition. It seems to me that both these statements of policy are of great importance. We have committed ourselves to aid that noble struggle. I cannot believe that we will hesitate to fulfill our obligations in the field. I cannot believe that we will fail to give support that is expected of us in this other area of our struggle against the forces of evil.

A further consideration is that a virtual repudiation of the point 4 program at a time when the United States is taking military action in Korea and Congress is voting the full amount requested for military assistance would encourage the belief—already strong in many parts of the world—that we choose to emphasize military force in preference to constructive and humanitarian measures.

As for the harmful psychological effects throughout the world if the committee's recommendation is allowed to stand, here is what an American Ambassador, in Washington for consultation—this Ambassador returned from one of the underdeveloped areas—said:

I am embarrassed to return to my post next week. I dread facing the president of that country after this reported vote in the Senate committee. We have not made any commitments under the point 4 program, but that program has become a world-wide symbol. It is regarded as an American proposal that everyone roll up his sleeves and work on the problems of hunger and sickness. Now the reported action of the Senate committee seems to say we really did not mean it. No action by the United States could be better calculated to injure our prestige abroad.

By merely proposing point 4, before it goes into effect, this Government has forged an anti-Communist weapon of the utmost importance. It has brought hope to millions of human beings formerly without hope—and hope is a force more powerful than guns, more precious than gold. We have created hope that lifts up the hearts of these people and encourages them to hold up their heads.

We have had plenty of illustrations in history of men and women who had hope, who had a sense of dignity and self-respect, who were valient soldiers even without adequate weapons. We have in recent months had plenty of illustration of the will to fight, the will to

resist, just as we had in World War II when the British stood alone in the Battle of Britain, without the great air fleets and air armadas, without the great weapons of modern war. But they resisted because they had something to fight for and to die for. People need hope—they need to feel that life is worth great sacrifices.

If this hope is now disappointed, we will not only have destroyed the great potential good of point 4 in the future; we will have destroyed much good will and replaced it with resentment toward us and resignation to the encroachment of communism. We will have shamefully bungled one of the best chances we have of promoting peace, freedom, and democracy.

I protest with all the vigor at my command, Mr. President, at this shortsighted attempt to wreck this constructive program which means so much toward winning the peoples of the world to the cause of freedom and democracy.

I say right now that I would feel very derelict to my responsibility and duty if on the one hand I, as a member of this great body, having voted for selective service, having voted for military preparation, were to turn my head and not be willing even to try to take a forward step in eradicating those conditions of confusion and chaos and discontent that make it necessary for boys 19 and 20 years of age, to be sent thousands of miles away from home in battle. I urge the Senate to approve the full \$35,000,000 authorized for point 4, which is the very minimum required to achieve substantial results.

I want to commend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for his amendment which would raise the amount to \$20,000,000. But let no one try to tell me that we cannot spend \$35,000,000 in the cause of food, shelter, better lands, and health and education in this world.

Korea is a solemn warning that we need to win the masses of the people to our side. With this warning clearly before us, this attempt to butcher the point 4 program in the name of economy is a self-defeating luxury which this Nation and the free world simply cannot afford.

We are fighting the Communists in Korea with our right arm—our military arm. I submit this is certainly no time to cut our left arm off at the elbow—the point 4 arm for fighting Communists in other parts of the world.

Mr. President, let us move ahead with the point 4 program as we have with ECA, as we have with military assistance. Let us have the same unanimity of effort. If there ever was a measure that will affect the thinking of men in the world it is the amendment of the point 4 program. Everyone is going to watch what we do with respect to it. Let us act with boldness. Imagine what it would look like not only to the world but to all soul-searching decent Americans, if we were to reject one of the most humanitarian, effective, constructive approaches toward eradicating the cause of discontent and communism, namely, the point 4 program.

I appeal to my colleagues to join with me in a full measure of support for the full appropriation for the point 4 program

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3876) to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas.

AMERICAN CASUALTIES IN KOREA—RAY RICHARDS AND ERNIE PEELER

Mr. DONNELL obtained the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Casualty lists are now coming in from Korea. I note with sorrow that my good friend, Ray Richards, is listed among those who have given their lives in Korea.

Ray Richards, a newspaperman who served here in Washington, was not only an indefatigable gatherer of news but an expert on the Far East, and enlightenment could be obtained by talking with him on that subject.

He was born 56 years ago in Minot, N. Dak. He went to the Oklahoma A. & M. College, and then became a newspaperman, serving in many capacities. As I knew him in Washington, he was with the Hearst newspapers or with the International News Service.

I realize, as I know the Senate realizes, the great value of those who go forth to bring us the news—I refer not only to the newspaper reporters but also to the photographers—so that we may have first-hand knowledge about conditions on the battlefield. These men go on the battlefield, not with guns or other weapons in their hands but with pencils or cameras, so that they may inform their country, and, in fact, the entire world, about what occurs there. It was in that service that my good friend, Ray Richards, gave his life.

Mr. President, I also find that Corp. Ernie Peeler is listed in the same newspaper item as having lost his life. He was one of the editors of the Tokyo Stars and Stripes, a United States service newspaper.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the Associated Press dispatch from Tokyo in regard to the death of these two men.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO UNITED STATES CORRESPONDENTS KILLED AT FRONT-LINE POST IN KOREA—RAY RICHARDS, FORMER HEARST BUREAU CHIEF HERE, REPORTED SLAIN

TOKYO, July 11.—Two American correspondents were killed on the Korean war front yesterday.

A regimental adjutant reported their deaths to field headquarters.

Presumably they were Ray Richards, correspondent for the Hearst newspapers, and Corp. Ernie Peeler of the Tokyo Stars and Stripes.

International News Service here was informed that the report came from a regimental adjutant identified as Captain Downey.

(Mr. Richards, 56, was chief of the Hearst Newspapers Bureau in Washington from 1944 to 1948, when he went to Greece to do a special series on guerrilla warfare there. He came to Washington in 1942 and made his home at the Wardman Park Hotel.)

(In September of 1949 he returned to Washington briefly, then went to Korea as an adviser to Dr. Syngman Rhee, President of South Korea. He joined the staff of International News Service at the outbreak of the Korean war.)

(The INS bureau in Washington said his daughter, Dejon Richards, a student at Duke University, is en route to San Francisco now and had planned to join her father in Tokyo for a month's visit.)

The Army reported the bodies were not recovered because fighting still raged around the outpost where the newsmen were killed.

Mr. Richards and Corporal Peeler had been reported missing since Sunday night, when they went forward to observe results of the first American around-the-clock bombings.

Corporal Peeler was a newspaperman in San Bernardino, Calif., before entering Army service.

Mr. Richards had been covering wars off and on since he served, as he termed it, as a photographer's assistant in the Francisco Villa campaign on the Mexican border. He was then with a Denver newspaper, which he told fellow newsmen was the old Republican.

He worked subsequently on the west coast and in Hawaii, Tokyo, Manila, and Shanghai.

After World War II he reported hostilities in Manchuria and Greece. He returned to Tokyo some months ago and was among the first correspondents to reach South Korea after the fighting started.

Meager reports said he and Corporal Peeler were at a front-line outpost when Communist forces overran it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, these two newspapermen died in the service of their country, as men from all the States are now dying in the service of our country. We hope and we pray that these men and all the men who will die in this conflict will not die in vain, but that from them and from the taking of their lives there will arise liberty for more people in the world.

STRIKES ON RAILROADS

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, as bearing on the importance of the enactment into law of Senate bill 3463, which, if enacted, would make unlawful any strike or any lock-out by a carrier arising out of or in connection with any dispute falling within the purview of the Railway Labor Act, it is my desire to submit certain facts and views.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday there appears a copy of an article appearing in the Washington Post of yesterday. The article is entitled "Wage Dispute Still Unsettled; Army Running Rock Island Railroad as Strike Ends by Court Order."

Earlier we had learned of the fact that as to the other four railroads involved in the strike—in all, five western and midwestern railroads—there had been a termination of the strike, arising out of the announcement by the President which was given attention by the strikers.

As to the Rock Island Railroad, it will be recalled that there was a refusal on the part of the labor union to halt the strike, and that it was only by virtue of a temporary order issued by a Federal court one night recently that the strike

against the Rock Island Railroad was halted.

Mr. President, as the matter now stands, therefore, these five railroads are, I assume, to a greater or lesser extent—possibly almost entirely, I trust—again in operation.

There is an interesting attribute of human nature which seems to be inherent in Senators as well as in other persons, namely, that upon the passage of a crisis there is a tendency to cease efforts to remedy the conditions out of which the crisis grew. That situation is well expressed by a writer in the Detroit News of July 4, in an editorial in which the following is stated:

Whenever transport strikes occur, Congress talks about finding a way of keeping the men on the job; but the minute they are settled it relapses into apathy.

Mr. President, I hope it is not true in this instance that Congress is lapsing into apathy because of the halting of this particular strike. We have had too many illustrations within recent years—yes, even within recent months—of the fact that railroad strikes at times strike at the very national welfare and almost the national existence, if you please. We have had too many such illustrations to justify any lapsing into apathy on our part because of the fact that this particular strike no longer is in progress.

Mr. President, in a moment I shall call attention to the fact, as set forth in the article appearing yesterday in the Washington Post, that the wage dispute still is unsettled as to the Rock Island Railroad. I shall have a few words to say as to the present situation in that regard.

A moment ago I referred to an article appearing in the Detroit News, and I read an apt sentence appearing in that article. Let me read two other sentences, preceding the one I read, to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate:

The commentator therefore asserts what he has so often said before—that some way must be found to prevent transport strikes. They are already guarded against by law; but once the legal barriers have been cleared, strikes occur, and may grow, as this one—

He was referring to the switchmen's strike—

threatens to do, into a national calamity if other unions take similar action.

What is the situation confronting the American people at the moment upon the immediate horizon in the railroad industry? Although this particular strike has been halted, let me call the attention of the Senate to the fact, as set forth in an article in today's Chicago Sun-Times, that—

Meanwhile, the Rock Island, strike-bound for 14 days, was back to normal operation Monday under Army supervision.

Then there is a subhead, followed by further text, reading as follows:

SEEK COURT TEST

Spokesmen for the switchmen said no attempt will be made to negotiate with the road until it has been determined whether the Federal court's no-strike injunction issued Saturday is legal.

In this connection I call attention again to the headline of the article in

the Washington Post, to which I referred a moment ago, namely:

Wage Dispute Still Unsettled.

I return now to the article appearing in today's Chicago Sun-Times:

A hearing has been set for July 17 in Buffalo, N. Y., headquarters of the union.

Union officials said if the court finds the injunction invalid, the strike will be resumed. If not, the union said it will seek the "best settlement" possible without a strike.

I am not criticizing the union for following through on the court action; but the point I make is that the condition under which the strike has been halted does not mean that there has been a settlement of the controversy in regard to the Rock Island Railroad system, the great 8,000-mile railroad system which, incidentally, traverses the State in which resides the distinguished present occupant of the chair [Mr. SCHOEPPFEL], and of which he was governor. We do not know whether it will be settled. If the court's action was valid, it would appear that it has been subject only to future negotiations for the best settlement possible without a strike. If the court's action should be proved to have been invalid, then, according to this article in the Chicago Sun-Times, the strike will be resumed.

But, Mr. President, that is not the most ominous cloud in the present railroad sky. This same article from the Chicago Sun-Times is headed—and it is today's newspaper—"Weigh new rail strike of 250,000." I wish to read a portion of this article:

Leaders of the conductors and trainmen's unions met here—

That is, in Chicago—

Monday to discuss whether to pull their 250,000 men out this weekend on a strike against 100 railroads.

A joint committee of 250 general chairmen of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and the Order of Railway Conductors gathered at the Congress Hotel to debate their next move.

A spokesman for the conductors said the court order sending A. F. of L. switchmen back to work on the Rock Island Railroad and Federal seizure of the road has not made any difference in our thinking.

W. E. B. Chase, vice president of the trainmen, said no decision would be reached until after another joint session Tuesday.

The two A. F. of L. unions technically are free to go on strike Saturday when the cooling-off period under the Railway Labor Act ends.

So, this is a possibility which may ripen into an actual strike within the next few days. Today is July 11, and they are free to strike, so this article tells us, on Saturday of this week.

The Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., published yesterday, likewise comments on this situation in an Associated Press article. I do not mean this is an editorial; it is a news article by the Associated Press, set forth in the Evening Star of yesterday. It is from Chicago, and it is headed "New rail strike threat rises as court forces switchmen to return." The article reads:

CHICAGO, July 10.—With one major rail walkout ended, the Nation faced possibility of another today.

character, a bill which will impose controls on American industry and business at a time when the Nation stands, perhaps, upon the threshold of dangers greater than we have ever before known, and yet the bill has been reported to the Senate without a single hearing, without having allowed anyone an opportunity to offer amendments, and without any recommendation of the committee which considered it. This is contrary to the custom and the rules respecting all proposed legislation. Never before during my tenure in the Senate has a bill of this magnitude been brought before the Senate and seriously proposed to the American people, far-reaching as it is in its effect, without permitting those who would be affected by it an opportunity to come before a committee and enjoy the right of petition which the Constitution of the United States seeks to assure to all our citizens.

The procedure today, Mr. President, is not only political, but it strikes at the very fundamentals of the rights of free men, by distorting the system of parliamentary procedure of the Senate in order to bring before the Senate and to push through without allowing us to debate the issue, a bill which is, perhaps, as controversial as is any other issue before the American people.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois made the emotional appeal that men of all colors, of all creeds, and of all races are dying today in Korea. I do not dispute that. He says that unless we pass legislation of this kind we are furnishing an argument to the Communist philosophy which threatens to engulf the entire world, including our own beloved country. That may have an appeal to the emotions, but it does not address itself to common sense. Carried to its last analysis it might be inferred that upon their return the boys who are going overseas to fight should be given absolutely equal economic status in this Nation. The effect of such argument is to say, "Let us introduce a bill to divide up equally all the wealth and all the blessings of the United States equally among all our people."

I submit, in all seriousness, Mr. President, that we cannot reach any other conclusion if we follow to its logical end the argument of the Senator from Illinois.

No, Mr. President; men are fighting and dying in Korea in order to preserve the institutions of free men. The hallmark of the American system of free enterprise is the right to own and control property. If we pass a bill of this kind which permits a Federal agent to take over the property of men, which they have accumulated through their own efforts, and tell them who shall operate the property, not only whom they shall employ, but whom they shall promote, who shall manage the property—indeed, he might go even further than that and say who shall sit upon the board of directors of an institution—we shall be striking down the American system just as though we were supporting the entire Communist philosophy.

It is most unfortunate that this bill had to be brought forward again. The Senator from Illinois several weeks ago made a motion to proceed to its consideration. Notice was served repeatedly by the majority leader and the minority leader as to the time the vote would be taken. All Senators were apprised of the fact that the vote would be taken. Indeed, under the very nature of the cloture rule, every Senator has 48 hours' notice as to when a vote will be had. There is practically no place in the world today from which Washington cannot be reached within a period of 48 hours. Notice was served and a vote was had. The bill was laid aside. Now another motion has been made to proceed to its consideration. In the interim no hearings were held on the bill. The time was not utilized to give the American people an opportunity to express their opinion. It was not used, Mr. President, to permit Members of the Senate to present amendments to the committee so that they might be carefully considered. Instead, we are presented again with this naked bill containing many pages of language capable, in many instances, of devious construction, which was reported by the committee without consideration, without hearings, and without offering an opportunity to consider amendments.

Mr. President, we are right back where we were before, so far as the merits of the measure are concerned.

I am aware of some of the forces behind this bill. I realize that they are strong enough and possess the political power to bring it up again within a few days if they see fit to do so. I know that if we remain in session for as long as 3 or 4 weeks, and if some persons in this country wish to have another cloture vote upon this compulsory, jail-sentence FEPC bill, we shall undoubtedly have another cloture vote.

The political implications involved should not blind us to the fact that all the procedure which has been followed in connection with the bill is in derogation of our parliamentary system. It is calculated to take away the rights of free men, not only with respect to this proposed legislation, abolishing, as it does, the right of trial by jury, giving to little Federal bureaucrats greater power than that which has ever before been enjoyed by them, even in time of war, but it will interfere with our industrial system and cause unspeakable confusion at the very time when we are likely to be called upon for greater production of arms and implements to defend America. All these considerations, Mr. President, will be waved aside if the minority groups behind this bill come forward and demand another opportunity for another vote.

No reason has been offered to cause those who oppose the bill to relax their efforts. The proponents present no reason whatever for any man to change his vote. Instead, Mr. President, present circumstances appeal to the judgment of those who in good faith voted for cloture in the past. There is today sound reasons for them to change their position and say that this fiasco should end, that this travesty upon the Congress of

the United States and our parliamentary system should no longer continue. A majority of the Members of the Senate should rise up and vote against this second motion for cloture in order that we may not be bedeviled with similar procedure throughout the remainder of the calendar year 1950 when so many dangers threaten our country and our people.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I congratulate the junior Senator from Oregon both for his decision to vote for cloture, and for his suggestions regarding necessary future procedure for the application of cloture to shut off debate and to bring civil rights legislation to a vote.

I listened to the moving address—not an emotional address—of the majority leader, and I cannot see how any Senator can fail to be convinced by the statements made by the majority leader.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia referred to the majority leader's address as an emotional appeal, and made the statement that what we are trying to do is to hamstring industry, commerce, and the capitalistic system.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I attributed no such purpose to anyone. I said that was my opinion of the effect of it.

Mr. LEHMAN. If I may continue, I should like to say to the Senator from Georgia that what is being done here today in the Senate and what has been done is to say to many of the men who are fighting on the battlefields of Korea—Negroes, and members of other minority races, "You are good enough to fight for your country, you are good enough to risk your lives; you are good enough to die, but if by good fortune you come back safely, you are going to be second class citizens again, without the rights which other American citizens possess." This fight for equality in employment, education, civil and political activities must go on. In this good fight, I am proud to be on the side of democracy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, all time for debate has expired.

The Chair lays before the Senate the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] to proceed to consider S. 1728, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion or national origin. Under the rule, the clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Lehman
Anderson	Graham	Lodge
Benton	Green	Long
Brewster	Gurney	Lucas
Bricker	Hayden	McCarran
Bridges	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Butler	Hickenlooper	McClellan
Byrd	Hill	McFarland
Capehart	Hoey	McKellar
Chapman	Holland	McMahon
Chavez	Humphrey	Magnuson
Connally	Hunt	Malone
Cordon	Ives	Martin
Donnell	Jenner	Maybank
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Millikin
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Eaton	Kefauver	Murray
Ellender	Kem	Myers
Ferguson	Kerr	Neely
Flanders	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Frear	Knowland	Robertson
Fulbright	Langer	Russell
George	Leahy	Saltonstall

Schoeppel
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Sparkman
Stennis
Taft

Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah
Thye
Tydings
Vandenberg
Watkins

Wherry
Willey
Williams
Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close? Under the rule, the Secretary will call the roll. Those who are in favor of the motion will answer "yea" when their names are called. Those who are opposed to the motion will answer "nay" when their names are called.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CHAPMAN. My colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] is absent by leave of the Senate. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is absent by leave of the Senate. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been in attendance at the sessions of the International Labor Organization at Geneva, Switzerland, as a delegate representing the United States.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPER] is absent because of the death of Judge Curtis Waller, a personal friend, whose funeral is being held today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—55

Aiken	Humphrey	Myers
Anderson	Hunt	Neely
Benton	Ives	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Jenner	Saltonstall
Bricker	Kem	Schoeppel
Butler	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Cordon	Leahy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Douglas	Lodge	Thye
Dworshak	Lucas	Tydings
Ferguson	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Flanders	McMahon	Watkins
Frear	Magnuson	Wherry
Gillette	Martin	Willey
Green	Millikin	Williams
Hendrickson	Morse	
Hickenlooper	Murray	

NAYS—33

Bridges	Hayden	McClellan
Byrd	Hill	McFarland
Chapman	Hoyt	McKellar
Connally	Holland	Malone
Eastland	Johnson, Colo.	Maybank
Eaton	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Fulbright	Kefauver	Russell
George	Kerr	Sparkman
Graham	Long	Stennis
Gurney	McCarran	Young

NOT VOTING—8

Cain	O'Connor	Tobey
Darby	Pepper	Withers
Downey	Taylor	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fewer than the required number of 64 Senators having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion just voted upon be withdrawn, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 7786, the appropriation bill which the Senate has heretofore been considering.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE and Mr. IVES addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that the previous agreement entered into, to lay aside temporarily the motion to take up Senate bill 1728 and proceed to the consideration of the appropriation bill, remains in effect.

Mr. LUCAS. Then I withdraw the request I have made.

Mr. RUSSELL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The pending question then, after the conclusion of the appropriation bill, would be the motion of the Senator from Illinois?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there has been some discussion among Senators on both sides of the aisle, members of the Committee on Appropriations and others, as to the possibility of obtaining a unanimous consent agreement to expedite the debate upon the amendments to the appropriation bill and the bill itself. No definite arrangement has been made, but I should like to explore the situation to ascertain whether it may not be possible to obtain a unanimous consent agreement that 5 or 10 minutes be allowed each Senator on each amendment. If we could agree to limit the debate to 10 minutes upon any amendment for any individual Senator who desired to speak, I am sure we could move along expeditiously in the consideration of the appropriation bill. I wonder if the Senator from Nebraska, the distinguished minority leader, has any ideas along that line.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I assure the majority leader that there is no disposition on this side of the aisle to hold up debate on the amendments. However, I am wondering if the distinguished majority leader will not withhold the request until the conclusion of the debate today, for the reason that some of the amendments which are to be offered have not yet been presented, and it might be that as to one or two of those amendments additional time might

be required. I will say to the distinguished majority leader, however, that after today we will see if there is not a possibility of working out some kind of an agreement which will be acceptable. I do not wish to go on record as saying that it can be done, but I feel it is impossible to do it until after today's debate. Then we will see if some arrangement cannot be worked out.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. I understand the situation, and I will not proceed with the matter any further at present.

In view of the fact that nearly all Senators are present at this time, I should like to announce that immediately following the disposition of the appropriation bill we will proceed to a call of the calendar, for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning where we left off at the last call.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On the calendar there are several bills, including two or three maritime bills, which were called the last time and went over on objection. I wonder if there would be objection to going back to those measures, if no objection were interposed.

Mr. LUCAS. I believe the Senate would be rather lenient in the case of any bill which has heretofore been objected to, and it is now found that the Senator sponsoring the bill is in a position to iron out the differences which existed. If objection is not further interposed, I would have no hesitancy returning to such bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

THE CLOSURE RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I did not reply to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] prior to 1 o'clock because of the fact that the Senate was scheduled to vote at that hour, and I considered it only fair that other Members of the Senate be allowed to speak on the then pending subject matter, especially in view of the fact that the junior Senator from Oregon had spoken once during the debate, as the Senator from Nebraska pointed out. However, I do not want the RECORD of today to close without showing the position of the junior Senator from Oregon on the various arguments advanced by the Senator from Nebraska.

It is well known, I think, that the Senator from Nebraska and the junior Senator from Oregon differ fundamentally on the entire approach to the question of cloture. If we needed evidence as to the unworkability of the present cloture rule, which is the product of the so-called Wherry resolution, the vote just taken in the Senate supplies such convincing evidence. We had a very minor question before the Senate, so far as the civil-rights program is concerned. We had truly only a procedural question, a parliamentary question before the Senate—a very simple question, Mr. President, as to whether or not the Senate of the

way intend to rule upon the point raised by the Senator from Michigan that the Secretary of Agriculture might have violated section 201 of Title XVIII of the United States Code, but he expressed the belief that that was a matter which would properly come under the Department of Justice, rather than under the Comptroller General's Office.

He also makes it clear that in making a ruling that there was no provision of law which would enable him to disallow the expenses of those four thousand-odd committeemen who had been invited to the meeting, "That does not necessarily mean, of course, that I approve of the meeting or the way in which it was conducted. As you know, I have no authority to disallow or withhold credit for payments because they may have been made extravagantly or unwisely."

He also holds that even though the Secretary of Agriculture may have violated the criminal code, the committeemen could not be held responsible for that.

In an effort finally to make this whole situation a bit clearer, I ask that these three letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, June 20, 1950.

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: Reference is made to your letters of April 12 and May 19, 1950, relative to the meeting of the Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, at St. Paul, Minn., on April 3 and 4, 1950.

There is attached for your information a copy of the report of investigation of the matter made by the General Accounting Office which, by Office letter of today, was furnished the chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities at his request. Also, attached is a copy of Secretary Brannan's address as made available by him and of his report to this Office relative to the said meeting.

With regard to whether the salary and expenses of the community committeemen attending the meeting may properly be allowed, the Secretary of Agriculture, by section 388 of the act of February 16, 1938, 52 Stat. 68, 7 U. S. C. 1388, is directed to utilize State, county, and local committees as established by 16 U. S. C. 590h (b), and the programs of the Production and Marketing Administration are largely administered through such committeemen. As you know the said committeemen are not regular Government employees but farmers elected to assist in carrying out the agricultural programs. To effectively carry out their duties, of course, they must be trained as to their functions and related problems and the regulations of the Department of Agriculture (par. 713.37, Regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture Governing PMA County and Community Committees) provide for meetings "when necessary to the successful administration of the program." The salary and travel expenses of the community committeemen appear to have been in accordance with rates duly established by competent authority under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Also, the said salary and expenses appear to constitute administrative expenses incurred by the county committeemen in cooperating in the carry-

ing out of the production-and-marketing program which the Secretary of Agriculture by section 388 (b) of the act of February 16, 1938, 7 U. S. C. 1388b, is authorized and directed to pay out of funds made available for such program. The meeting considered as a whole appears to have familiarized such committeemen with the workings of the program, and it is believed that the salary and expenses of the community committeemen are properly authorized to be paid as administrative expenses of the county committee under section 388 (b) of the said act. While the said section of law makes provision for payment of the administrative expenses of the county committee, the salary and expenses of the community committeemen who assist the county committees in carrying out the program appear properly to be for consideration as an administrative expense of the county committee which is payable in the same way as would other administrative expenses of this county committee such as stenographic services, their own compensation and expenses, and the like.

I trust that what is set forth above and the attached material will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,
LINDSAY WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
AND FORESTRY,
July 6, 1950.

HON. LINDSAY WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WARREN: I want to thank you for your letter of June 20 and also for the material enclosed relating to the meeting of the Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, at St. Paul, Minn., on April 3 and 4, 1950.

However, I must say that I am pretty much disappointed and disturbed in your report as submitted. In effect, you almost give the PMA a clean bill of health in connection with this meeting.

The crux of the issue raised by me in connection with this meeting was whether or not the expenses and salary of community committeemen could be paid in connection with their attendance at the second day of St. Paul meeting for the purpose of hearing political speeches.

Senator FERGUSON made the point that Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan violated section 201 of title 18 of the United States Code by making a speech intended to influence legislation. In other words, instead of discussing the PMA program as now authorized by law, he made a plea for the adoption of the so-called Brannan plan. Certainly, this plea for the Brannan plan could have been made for no other purpose than the influencing of proposed legislation.

So far as I can see, you have not made any finding as to whether the Secretary violated section 201 of the law in making such a speech. Possibly you do not consider this as coming under your jurisdiction.

However, as to the specific point I made, you state that "said committeemen are not regular Government employees but farmers elected to assist in carrying out the agricultural programs. To effectively carry out their duties, of course, they must be trained as to their functions and related problems and the regulations of the Department of Agriculture (paragraph 713.37, 'Regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture Governing PMA County and Commodity Committees') provide for meetings 'when necessary to the successful administration of the program.'

"The salary and travel expenses of the community committeemen appear to have been in accordance with rates duly established by competent authority under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Also, the said salary and expenses appear to constitute administrative expenses incurred by the county committeemen in cooperating in the carrying out of the Production and Marketing program which the Secretary of Agriculture by section 388 (b) of the act of February 16, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1388b), is authorized and directed to pay out of funds made available for such program."

You have ignored the fact that the community committeemen were not even invited to attend the first day of the meeting on April 3 which was publicized by the PMA as the day on which county committeemen would "make plans for the year's conservation work and to consider administrative details of the price-support and crop-insurance programs."

It was made clear in the PMA news releases that the county committeemen would "be joined by community committeemen for the second day's session in the auditorium arena." I have searched the record carefully and I cannot find any statement or announcement whatsoever that the second day's meeting would be devoted to, or was actually devoted to, anything but speeches. These speeches were not billed as discussions of programs now on the statute books; they were listed in such vague terms as "messages of vital importance to people interested in agriculture."

Besides Secretary Brannan, other speakers at the second day of the conference mentioned were Dr. Dewey Anderson, executive director of Public Affairs Institute, who was there to discuss the President's point 4 program; and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who did not discuss the PMA program at all.

I cannot see how you can justify paying community committeemen for attending the second day of the St. Paul meeting on the ground that community committeemen can attend meetings "when necessary to the successful administration of the program." I don't see how even Secretary Brannan's discussion of the proposed Brannan plan has anything to do with the successful administration of the program now on the statute books, which is the only program community or county committeemen have any responsibility for administering.

You also hold that—

"The salary and expenses of the community committeemen who assist the county committees in carrying out the program appear properly to be for consideration as an administrative expense of the county committee which is payable in the same way as would other administrative expenses of this county committee such as stenographic services, their own compensation and expenses and the like."

According to this interpretation, the county committee can hire anyone to attend any meeting for any purpose. I am sure most county committees would not willingly and knowingly do this, but this, nevertheless, is the import of your interpretation.

I want to make it clear that I am not blaming the committeemen for what took place in connection with the St. Paul meeting. It is their superiors whom I hold responsible.

I am keenly disturbed by your report which so obviously evaded the points raised by Senator FERGUSON and myself.

By determining that the 4,256 community committeemen could legally be paid salary and expenses to the second day of the St. Paul conference, I fear you have cleared the way for the expenditure of large sums of PMA funds for political purposes.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senator.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, July 7, 1950.

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I have received your letter of July 6, 1950, with further reference to the meeting of the Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, at St. Paul, Minn., on April 3 and 4, 1950.

It was somewhat distressing to me to learn that you did not consider my letter of June 20, 1950, as completely responsive to your letters of April 12 and May 19 and I wish to assure you there was certainly no intention on my part to be evasive or to indicate any personal approval of the meeting. My effective jurisdiction in the matter was considered to relate solely to the bare legal question involved—the availability of appropriated funds for the payments to community committeemen—and it was thought that the conclusion that the appropriation was available sufficiently answered your letters to the extent it was within my authority to do so.

For the reasons stated in my letter of June 20, 1950, there appears to be no proper legal basis for the General Accounting Office to disallow credit for the payments made to community committeemen for attendance at the second day of the meeting. Community committeemen are provided for by law, they are authorized to participate in the agricultural programs, they are authorized to attend meetings in relation thereto, and appropriated funds are available for expenses incurred in that connection. That does not necessarily mean, of course, that I approve of the meeting or the way in which it was conducted. As you know, I have no authority to disallow or withhold credit for payments because they may have been made extravagantly or unwisely or because the benefits received may not have been as great as might be expected or desired. I have no authority to administer the agricultural programs or to substitute my judgment for the judgment of the officials charged with such responsibility.

The conclusion that community committeemen may be paid in connection with attendance at meetings was not intended to convey the impression that county committees "can hire anyone to attend any meeting for any purpose," and I assure you that the county committees have no such authority and the said conclusion will not be so applied in the audit here of accounts and claims.

It will be noted that section 201 of title 18, United States Code (now sec. 1913, title 18) contains penal provisions for violations thereof which are not within my authority to enforce. The fine and imprisonment provisions thereof are criminal in nature and could be enforced only through judicial action. And should that take place, it probably would afford no basis for disallowing credit for the payments made to the community committeemen. They were paid for attending the meeting and not for attempting to influence anyone.

It is hoped that the foregoing will satisfactorily explain the position of the General Accounting Office in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in discussing the appropriation bill I do not desire to take very much time, but I discover in the Department of Agriculture

appropriation covered in the report on page 90, a provision for the activities under the Research and Marketing Act, 1946. In the House bill an appropriation of \$11,000,000 was made, but the Senate committee recommended that \$6,000,000 be allowed, and that \$5,000,000 be taken from this item and transferred to the Office of Experiment Stations.

I have tried to find in the statements or in the bill or somewhere else an explanation as to why that should have been done. On page 97 I find the very brief statement given there from which I read:

The increase recommended by the committee in this item is to conform to the distribution of section 9 funds from the item for Research and Marketing Act of 1946 in the amount of \$5,000,000—

And so forth. That is about the only explanation given.

I turn then to page 106, and I find under the heading "Decreases" that appropriation for the Research and Marketing Act has been decreased \$5,000,000, and a statement as to why it is made.

Mr. President, I hope the Committee on Appropriations is prepared to withstand a point of order against this item, because in my opinion it represents an attempt on the part of the Appropriations Committee to change and to repeal by its action portions of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

I think I understand the reason for it, but I believe it is nonetheless regrettable. I hope the Members of the Senate, before they vote on this item, if they have a chance to vote on it, if the point of order is not found to be good, will read Public Law 733 of the Seventy-fifth Congress again. This is the law known as the Hope-Flannagan Act, or the Flannagan-Hope Act—it has been labeled both ways—named for the majority and minority ranking members of the House Committee on Agriculture in 1946. They both introduced individual bills, and those two bills were consolidated, and the bill passed providing for research and marketing in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask at this point that section 1 of that act may be printed in the RECORD because it states the purpose of the legislation.

There being no objection, section 1 of the act was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote the efficient production and utilization of products of the soil as essential to the health and welfare of our people and to promote a sound and prosperous agriculture and rural life as indispensable to the maintenance of maximum employment and national prosperity. It is also the intent of Congress to assure agriculture a position in research equal to that of industry which will aid in maintaining an equitable balance between agriculture and other sections of our economy. For the attainment of these objectives, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to conduct and to stimulate research into the laws and principles underlying the basic problems of agriculture in its broadest aspects, including but not limited to: Research relating to the improvement of the quality of, and the development of new and improved methods of the production,

marketing, distribution, processing, and utilization of plant and animal commodities at all stages from the original producer through to the ultimate consumer; research into the problems of human nutrition and the nutritive value of agricultural commodities, with particular reference to their content of vitamins, minerals, amino and fatty acids, and all other constituents that may be found necessary for the health of the consumer and to the gains or losses in nutritive value that may take place at any stage in their production, distribution, processing, and preparation for use by the consumer; research relating to the development of present, new, and extended uses and markets for agricultural commodities and byproducts as food or in commerce, manufacture, or trade, both at home and abroad, with particular reference to those foods and fibers for which our capacity to produce exceeds or may exceed existing economic demand; research to encourage the discovery, introduction, and breeding of new and useful agricultural crops, plants, and animals, both foreign and native, particularly for those crops and plants which may be adapted to utilization in chemical and manufacturing industries; research relating to new and more profitable uses for our resources of agricultural manpower, soils, plants, animals, and equipment than those to which they are now, or may hereafter be, devoted; research relating to the conservation, development, and use of land, forest, and water resources for agricultural purposes; research relating to the design, development, and the more efficient and satisfactory use of farm buildings, farm homes, farm machinery, including the application of electricity and other forms of power; research relating to the diversification of farm enterprises, both as to the type of commodities produced, and as to the types of operations performed, on the individual farm; research relating to any other laws and principles that may contribute to the establishment and maintenance of a permanent and effective agricultural industry including such investigations as have for their purpose the development and improvement of the rural home and rural life, and the maximum contribution by agriculture to the welfare of the consumer and the maintenance of maximum employment and national prosperity; and such other researches or experiments bearing on the agricultural industry or on rural homes of the United States as may in each case be deemed advisable, having due regard to the varying conditions and needs of Puerto Rico, the respective States, and Territories. In effectuating the purposes of this section, maximum use shall be made of existing research facilities owned or controlled by the Federal Government or by State agricultural experiment stations and of the facilities of the Federal and State extension services. Research authorized under this section shall be in addition to research provided for under existing law (but both activities shall be coordinated so far as practicable).

Mr. ANDERSON. In that connection, section 9 and section 10 were changed in the bill to give additional sums for new types of studies looking toward the better marketing of agricultural products and toward the utilization of farm crops. This had been the subject of long, long study. It was not something which was hastily drawn out of a hat and presented to the Congress. As a matter of fact the Department of Agriculture had caused a survey to be made of every type of agricultural experimental work, research work, that was going on in the whole United States, and after that survey was completed, it required months of time of an entire staff even to correlate all

the facts brought to light as to the type of research being done by private and public institutions in the United States. When all that work was done and when the results of the correlation were apparent to the Department of Agriculture, it was seen that there was need for a tremendous amount of work by the Department of Agriculture itself both by experimentation which it might carry on and by experimentation which it might farm out to the agricultural colleges and to private research organizations if agricultural crops were properly to be utilized. As I said, that was not hastily done. It required months of work. Then finally upon the basis of all that research a bill was prepared and presented to the Congress.

Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a pamphlet entitled "The Agricultural Research and Marketing Act of 1946—A Consideration of Basic Objectives and Procedures," which was issued by the Agricultural Committee on National Policy of the National Planning Association. It is strange that a publication of this nature could be issued and the act praised highly by everyone in the United States who was concerned with the Department of Agriculture, and that then a committee of the Congress should wipe out that work in a moment by a provision in the agricultural appropriation bill. It was not done solely by the Senate committee. The House committee took care of the changes in section 10 (a) and (b). Then the Senate committee took care of the provisions in section 9. I submit that those two things added together have pretty effectively scuttled the research provisions of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

It seems to me it would have been much better if it was desired to repeal the act, to have raised the question on the floor by submitting a bill for that purpose and having it referred to the Committee on Agriculture in the House or the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the Senate. I hope at this stage, instead of reading it, because the hour is already late, that I may have permission to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement on the act itself, its purposes and provisions, not prepared by me, but prepared by the Agricultural Committee on National Policy of the National Planning Association. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The agricultural colleges have been engaged in research almost since their beginning some 85 years ago. Much of their study has been on technological problems such as the improvement of varieties, animal breeding and feeding, soil management, disease and pest control and so on—in other words, on ways of improving and cheapening production.

The results achieved have been enormous, though for the most part not sensational. Since agriculture is a competitive industry, a good part of the benefits has been widely diffused among the Nation's population in the form of more abundant, cheaper, and better products.

In recent decades, however, farming has become more highly commercial. It requires larger investments, borrows more money, ships its products greater distances, and produces more specialties. It is concerned with a vast array of economic relationships many of which involve closely related technological problems. This shift from relative self-sufficiency and largely local markets to broad national and international markets has made necessary more study of market organization, of problems of packing, storing, shipping, and selling, and of competitive relations with other areas.

New uses of agricultural products and new outlets for them have also become more important, and the problems of oversupply and undersupply and of stabilizing prices and incomes have come into prominence. There is, furthermore, a growing recognition of the importance to agriculture of nonfarm incomes and buying power and of general national policies relating to credit, taxation, transportation, labor, and international trade.

The act of 1946 is clearly intended as a major step in the evolutionary process of providing for agriculture a research arm comparable to those available to many non-agricultural industries. This process began with the Hatch Act of 1887 and was extended by the Adams Act of 1906. In 1925, through the Purnell Act, and again in 1935, through the Bankhead-Jones Act, the Congress not only increased the funds for agricultural research but broadened the directives under which it was to be carried on. The act of 1946 represents a more vigorous and comprehensive attempt to create a larger and better balanced program of agricultural research. Its major emphasis is on economic problems, particularly those relating to marketing. There is clear recognition, however, of the need for continuing and strengthening the work on technological problems. The specific directives for research on marketing and economic problems should not be interpreted as deemphasis on technological research, but rather as an effort to strengthen an underdeveloped phase of the research program.

No industry, of course, can afford to ignore researches looking to improved and more efficient production, to the maintenance of its basic resources, and to the elimination of physical losses and wastages. Agriculture's efforts to solve problems of these types should be continued vigorously and effectively.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate long. I merely have made this statement on the floor today because the matter referred to will come up tomorrow, I assume, when the item in question is reached. I think it is extremely unfortunate that there is not a better explanation for the action of the committee. I called officials of the Department of Agriculture and tried to find out what the reason was for the change, and the answer I received was that it was proposed to simplify the appropriation structure. That is a simple explanation, but it actually is a device whereby the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 is repealed without a moment's hearing, without an opportunity for anyone who worked for its enactment to appear before a committee and discuss it. I hope that something better than that will be presented as a reason for the action which has been taken by the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Sena-

tor from New Mexico yield to his colleague for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I was going to suggest to my colleague that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee dealing with this matter is the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I am sorry that he was not present at the moment my colleague made his remarks. I am sure the Senator from Georgia will be able to explain to my colleague and to the Senate the provisions to which my colleague has referred to. I see the Senator from Georgia has now come onto the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Georgia is now on the floor. I may say that I recognize the section in question was handled by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and I can testify from my experience that the Department of Agriculture has no greater friend in the Congress than the Senator from Georgia. I do not believe that he is quite sure as to why the change is being made. I think it is somewhat important that we take a very good look at it. It is easy to say that we simply take the money from one place and transfer it to the same group without it going through the Research and Marketing Administration. But the very reason why it was given to the Research and Marketing Administration was that it was determined that there might be projects which the country at large decided were necessary for an over-all study of the problem and that the work should be planned in the Department of Agriculture, and then farmed out to the agricultural colleges and experiment stations. The action taken by the committee completely reverses that, and puts it directly into the hands of the office of the experiment station the distribution and handling of these funds. I say that a long, long fight was made on this question, and I think it is a shame to lose the result of that struggle by such a provision as that contained in the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from New Mexico know whether this provision was approved or protested by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe the distinguished Senator from Georgia can tell the Senator about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may say that this provision was inserted in the bill at the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture. The House had made a transfer of other research funds, not of course to the same purpose as proposed in this connection, but the department suggested that the amendment be included in the bill. They stated to the committee that it would simplify their bookkeeping procedures, and that it would not adversely affect the research program. I have requested of the Department a full statement of their position on this matter, and I will have it here tomorrow before the item is reached in the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from Georgia satisfied that it will not adversely affect the research program?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am, of course, relying on the statement of the Department to that effect.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Georgia and, I expect the Senator from New Mexico, will agree that greater controls are no substitute for research and marketing investigation. I may say that if the Department suggested it, it might be in line with the policy of those who constantly emphasize a desire for more controls rather than for more research. It has appeared to me ever since the bill was passed that the Department has never put its heart into conducting the research and marketing work of the Department as the Congress had intended.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there is no question that the results of all these research items have been disappointing to those of us who sponsored the original research bill. I would not confine that observation to the production and marketing end.

Mr. AIKEN. I would not, either.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would say that the entire research program, for which Congress has made perhaps too liberal a provision, has been disappointing to me.

Of course sometimes we have given the Department, at its request, money which it should not have had because it did not have available programs on which to expend the funds; and that has resulted in haphazard activities.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Department has requested the funds.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. Of course, we have provided advisory committees and other committees to assist in the program.

On the other hand, it has been in effect for only a few years, and perhaps I have expected too much of it by this time. However, the results have been disappointing to me.

Mr. President, I would be the last man to wish to injure any phase of the program under the Agricultural Act of 1946, of course.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that it has been very disappointing to me that the only solution which has been proposed for some of the problems has been that of providing more Government controls.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not understand that the question of more Government controls is involved in this amendment, although that may be the case. I am not in a position to say as to that.

However, I understood that it was merely a matter of simplifying the book-keeping and of making more easy the administration, without attempting in any way to change the intent of Congress under that act, when it was passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I would be very happy if anyone could point out that that is the situation.

I simply point out the fact that the House has voted to merge the funds under sections 10 (a) and 10 (b), and the Senate Appropriations Committee has voted to transfer the funds under section 9. That matter is one over which we fought for months, namely, the question of whether it was better to appropriate

the funds directly to the experiment stations or to appropriate them directly to the Department of Agriculture itself, so that it could apportion the funds in any way it saw fit to do.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate in regard to this matter, except to point out that in the Department of Agriculture there are rooms full of surveys for the better utilization of agricultural products; there are charts and plans and studies, which have been made for 50 years, in regard to how to better utilize agricultural products.

However, when the surveys were made by the various interested groups, they discovered that it does not do any good to talk about the better utilization of an agricultural product unless those handling the program are prepared to make contracts with certain persons or firms to try to use the product. We found that it was one thing to say that cotton should be used for insulation, for instance, but quite another thing to persuade a company to use cotton for insulation; and we found that sometimes it was necessary to subsidize for a while the attempts to use a certain product in a new way, until such uses became established.

For instance, we found that sometimes a manufacturing company would have millions of dollars available to put to use in research in connection with the development of a synthetic product to be used as a substitute for cotton and in the adaptation of that synthetic product to various uses, whereas the cotton farmers did not have any research organization or facilities by which to compete with such efforts to substitute the synthetic product for cotton itself.

So Congress has realized that research is most important to the proper use of the various agricultural products. On that basis, the act was passed in 1946, and efforts have been made to start the research work.

I can say frankly that there are in the Department of Agriculture agencies which resisted when attempts were made to take away from them the research work they long had handled; and those agencies were not happy when an attempt was made to set up a research and marketing section.

Now we find the fruits of their efforts, when the funds under sections 10 (a) and 10 (b) have been voted by the House to be transferred, and when, now, the funds under section 9 are proposed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations to be transferred. I do not think that should be done. I think this matter is most important and most serious to the country as a whole. I think it is important that we have a chance to better utilize agricultural products. We should realize that we are faced with the fact that if these appropriations are reduced this year, possibly these agencies will not be able to do the necessary work in future years.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is not the situation the Senator has been discussing quite similar to the situation in connection with silver? In other words, the silver pro-

ducers have set up committees to find new markets for silver. Is not that situation similar to the one in this case?

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course it is. We had hoped that we would be able to make great savings, as a result of the proper utilization and development of this research program. For instance, there is a field in which cotton can be used in the manufacture of fine bond paper. However, no paper manufacturer will begin to do so at once; it is necessary to supply cotton to him free for a certain period of time, and perhaps to subsidize him to a limited extent in connection with such a development; and then, finally, he will reach the point where he will use cotton for that purpose. The Department has done precisely that, and I think it has acted wisely in trying to find new uses for cotton and other products.

Cotton is not the only product for which attempts have been made to find new uses, but similar attempts have been made in regard to other products and commodities.

Certainly in that connection the various producers need the combined resources of the Department of Agriculture, it seems to me.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to call particular attention to wheat straw, flax straw, and corn, which the Senator has mentioned. It seems to me that in that connection there is a chance to bring about very great developments.

I should like to ask the Senator whether the committee was apprised of these facts before it took the action it did take.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know. The best person to whom the Senator can address that question is the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

My understanding is that the matter was presented by the Department of Agriculture as a means of simplifying its budgetary and accounting procedures. I have tried to say that the Department has no finer friend than the Senator from Georgia. I know that from my experience as Secretary of Agriculture; and I know that if the matter had been properly presented to the committee, it would have been carefully considered.

It may be that there is nothing to the present proposal other than an attempt to bring about a change in the budgetary and accounting procedures. However, I do not so understand the proposal; it seems to me that it certainly smacks of the battle which we had for a long time regarding whether the Department of Agriculture itself should direct the research or whether it should turn the research funds over to the experiment stations and let them direct the research.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield to permit me to do so. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether the committee considered this matter?

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee considered it. No objection was raised, from any source, to the provision of the

House provision which consolidated the funds authorized in regard to research and administration.

The Department said it would apply the same rules to the transfer of the funds, as authorized in section 9 or section 9 (a), I believe, of the original act, with assurances that in no wise would that affect the research work, but merely would be a simplification of the procedures.

A few minutes ago I stated that I had requested from the Department a full and complete statement of the effect of the amendment, from its standpoint, and a statement regarding what it proposed to do under the amendment, if the amendment is agreed to and goes into effect. I hope to have that information available tomorrow, when this title of the bill will be reached.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask a further question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly, if I now have the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I am quite sure the Senator is familiar, as is the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], with the situation in the Northwest, where literally hundreds of thousands of tons of wheat straw are burned each year. Great stacks of wheat straw are piled up and burned. I have always thought it was a terrific loss to the country that the wheat straw was not used beneficially in industry.

Of course it took us many years to find ways to utilize the flax straw. I remember, as I am sure my colleague the Senator from Minnesota does, the days when flax straw was burned, just as today wheat straw is burned, all over the Northwest.

I should like to bring to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Georgia the question of finding some use for wheat straw, so that when similar questions arise before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, he will have that particular subject in mind, because it seems to me that instead of permitting this tremendous waste to continue—and, so far as I know, it occurs only in the United States and in Canada—somehow, somewhere, such straw should be utilized, and the marketing division should find some way of utilizing it.

Mr. RUSSELL. It seems to me that that is certainly a proper matter of research. I have had a hobby of my own of research along similar lines for the past 10 years. It has always disturbed me greatly to know that one-fourth of all our timber was discarded in the form of sawdust and waste. It has always seemed to me to be almost a criminal waste, when we know that we are cutting down our forest resources every year and that the production is not keeping pace with the rate of consumption, particularly during the war years. So, for years I urged the Department of Agriculture, through the Forestry Products Laboratory, to make intensive surveys to ascertain if some feasible use could not be made of sawdust and shavings and materials of that kind which are now burned at tens of thousands of sawmills

and planing mills throughout the country. Some little research has been done along that line. I shall be glad to do whatever I can in assisting the Senator to have some research done in connection with wheat straw.

Mr. LANGER. During the war there was an admitted shortage of paper, as the Senator knows.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. The question arose as to whether certain kinds of timber could be used for the manufacture of paper pulp. Finally, as the Senator knows, we spent a great deal of money in Canada for paper to be shipped into the United States. The prices doubled, trebled, and rose even higher. It seems to me that the attention of the marketing division should be called to the fact that wheat and oat straw makes excellent paper. Whether the cost is prohibitive I think is something that should be ascertained.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be happy to see research done along that line. I am sure the Senator knows that we also make paper from pine pulp.

Mr. LANGER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from North Dakota also knows that tens of millions of tons of sawdust, slabs, and shavings from pine lumber have been burned. During my lifetime I have observed a great deal of it. But, thus far, very little research has been done toward the utilization of such material either in the production of paper or for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER. I remember that one of the most eloquent arguments ever heard upon this floor was made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia on the very matter which he is now discussing, about the waste of stumpage, I think it was called, at that time.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. I thank the Senator. We have been too prodigal with the blessings of Providence in this country. We have been wasteful since the inception of civilization on this continent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire whether the Senator from Louisiana expects to get a vote on his amendment this afternoon?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; immediately following the obtaining of a quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. Have the arguments been concluded?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire to discuss the amendment, and I am pretty sure the ranking Republican member of the Senate Building Commission, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], will want 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the opinion of the Chair, the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of

the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, is the pending business.

Mr. LUCAS. Is that under the unanimous-consent agreement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is under the unanimous consent that was granted yesterday to lay aside temporarily the motion of the Senator from Illinois and to proceed to the consideration of that bill.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Illinois should demand the regular order, that would, as I understand, place the so-called FEPC bill before the Senate again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would place before the Senate the motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of that bill.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I meant. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order being demanded, the question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois—

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the demand of the Senator open to objection?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that, if the Senator from Illinois demands the regular order, there is no way of preventing it, is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. Any Senator has the right to demand the regular order. Does the Senator from Illinois demand the regular order?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois demands the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Mr. LUCAS. No—

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the pending motion.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is that the motion be brought before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And it is now before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Then I withdraw the demand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator withdraws the demand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Just a moment. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is that open to objection?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not. Any Senator may withdraw a demand that he makes.

Mr. LUCAS. I now move that we proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other

purposes. This is the bill we have been considering.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to proceed to the consideration of the appropriation bill is debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. In order that I may know what is before the Senate, was it the intention to replace the appropriation bill as the pending business, which was taken up by unanimous consent?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that there was some misunderstanding as to what the parliamentary situation was. The Senator will recall that, earlier in the day, immediately following the vote upon the cloture motion, I asked unanimous consent to withdraw the motion for the consideration of the FEPC bill, and to move to resume consideration of House bill 7786. The Vice President, at that time, held that that was unnecessary, that the bill H. R. 7786 was the pending business and that it would be necessary to wait until we finished with the appropriation bill before I could request the withdrawal of my motion, unless we returned to the regular order. That is the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. That clarifies the parliamentary situation. So that the pending motion would make the appropriation bill the unfinished business. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. There was some question as to whether that was the case, and that is why I raised the question. That is all there is to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield the floor?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator withhold the suggestion for a moment, to enable me to obtain a leave of absence?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] addressed the Chair before any other Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was on the verge of recognizing the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, to be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate tomorrow, Friday, and on Saturday,

if there should be a session on that day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words on the new Senate Office Building.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me suggest that the Senator can say it after we have a quorum call.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has not been recognized for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire cannot yield for that purpose without losing the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire was recognized, and he has the floor, if he wishes to proceed.

Mr. BRIDGES. I realize that, and I intend to proceed, but I thought I could yield for that purpose. I am sorry if I cannot.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield for a quorum call without losing the floor, except by unanimous consent. If he wishes to ask unanimous consent that he may yield for that purpose, the Chair will put the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Hampshire may yield to the Senator from Louisiana for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, without prejudice to his right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I renew my suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana makes the point that a quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Lodge
Anderson	Graham	Long
Brewster	Green	Lucas
Bricker	Gurney	McCarran
Bridges	Hayden	McCarthy
Butler	Hendrickson	McClellan
Capehart	Hickenlooper	McFarland
Chapman	Hill	McKellar
Chavez	Hoey	McMahon
Connally	Holland	Magnuson
Cordon	Humphrey	Malone
Donnell	Ives	Martin
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Maybank
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Eaton	Kefauver	Murray
Ellender	Kem	Myers
Ferguson	Kerr	Neely
Flanders	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Frear	Knowland	Robertson
Fulbright	Langer	Russell

Saltonstall	Stennis	Watkins
Schoeppel	Taft	Wherry
Smith, Maine	Thomas, Okla.	Wiley
Smith, N. J.	Thomas, Utah	Williams
Sparkman	Thye	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the question before the Senate is the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to eliminate the so-called new Senate Office Building from the legislative chapter of the appropriation bill. The pros and cons of the argument for the new Senate Office Building are known to every Senator. For many years Senators have been complaining that the space available to them is not sufficient to enable them to perform their work efficiently. As a result in 1947 the Eightieth Congress made an authorization for the initiation of a study for a new Senate Office Building. The story of the new Senate Office Building dates from that period.

Following the creation of the Senate Office Building Commission various steps were taken. Finally a site was selected on First Street, in the rear of the present Senate Office Building. Architects were employed, plans drawn, the land purchased, and the old buildings on the land removed. The land is now either unused or used in part as a parking lot. During this period Senator after Senator has gone to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, first to former Senator Brooks and now to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. They have cried on their shoulders for more space, which they said they must have in order to make available reasonable working conditions for their staffs.

The issue is before us, Mr. President. There is nothing to be gained by discussing the subject further. Every Senator knows whether he is in favor of the construction of a new Senate Office Building. The proposal is to provide \$10,000,000 in order to go ahead with the work. Some Senators who now object raised no question when we spent \$65,000,000 to construct a building for the United Nations, \$20,000,000 for a Court building only two or three blocks from the Senate Office Building, and approximately \$23,000,000 for a new building for the General Accounting Office. If a Senator wants to be consistent, and therefore is against the construction of a new Senate Office Building, that is one thing. However, when we have gone ahead and furnished new buildings for various departments and divisions of the Government, and we fail to recognize or lack the courage to recognize the necessity of providing adequate quarters and efficient working space for our employees, it seems to me we have reached a sad day in the United States Senate.

If I may do so, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Arizona. I should like to ask him if what I have stated regarding Senators making requests of him is not true?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is entirely true. I feel very strongly about the testimony given to me, not only by Senators but by members of their staffs.

They have been to me time and time again asking if some cubbyhole or some space somewhere could not be found in order to relieve the tremendous congestion in their offices. It seems to me that any Senator who, knowing the condition in his office and having made to me the representations which have been made, votes against the new Senate Office Building should go back to his office force and publicly confess to them that he knew what he was doing in making their working conditions hard. He would not suffer. He has four or five rooms in his office and he has a room of his own into which no one comes unless he sends for him. However, when he steps out of that room he steps into conditions which I think are utterly disgraceful. As a matter of record, we do not provide half the office space which is provided in other Government agencies.

Mr. President, confession is good for the soul, and any Senator who is opposed to a new office building should call the members of his force together and tell them that he did not have the political courage to vote for it because he feared that some political commentator on the radio or some columnist might comment on his having done something for himself and therefore he dodged the issue. As a matter of fact, it would not be for himself, but would give more room for his hard-pressed office force.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. This is a very unhappy moment for me. I occupy a three-room suite on the east side of the Senate Office Building, and because of the balcony there they are short rooms; they are much shorter than the average room. I am extremely crowded, and it is difficult for my clerks to work in the rooms I have. I would support the erection of a new Senate Office Building at this moment if we were not faced with a world crisis such as the one which confronts us, and such as we may expect in the next few weeks, or possibly many months.

In view of that situation I think our efforts should be—at least my effort will be—to back up the boys at the front and to spend money for military appropriations or anything else that is necessary. I cannot support a provision to appropriate funds to erect a new office building, and I shall go back to my office force and say, "In view of this, we are going to stay in these crowded quarters just so long as I am permitted to remain in Washington, and until the world situation improves we are going to put up with these quarters, even though they are inconvenient and uncomfortable."

I do not expect that I shall be given much consideration when I ask for additional space at some future time, in view of my remarks at this moment. But we are faced with a world situation that is most critical, and in view of that I shall not vote to appropriate funds to construct a new office building until the world crisis is past.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that he cannot yield to other Senators to make speeches.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Chair. I shall abide by his suggestion.

The Senator from Minnesota is a little aside from the point, because he knows, as well as I do, that there is not a Senator in this Chamber who does not desire to provide funds adequate for the support of the men who are fighting in the so-called Korean affair, if it is not to be called a war.

It was brought out on the Senate floor yesterday, clearly and unmistakably, I may say to the Senator from Minnesota, that if this situation should develop into a major crisis which would necessitate the use of scarce materials and labor, the President, under his power of allocation, and similar powers, could stop the construction of the building at a moment's notice, and we would expect him to do so. So, if Senators vote against the provision, they are merely delaying the construction of the building, while if we do proceed with it, and the emergency develops to a greater extent than is now apparent, I think the Senator's point can be well protected, for, as I have said, the President would have full authority, as a result of his power of allocation of materials, to stop the construction at a moment's notice, and I trust he would do so. I think that may answer the Senator's question.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator also recall that the chairman of the Senate Office Building Commission made a statement that the commission itself would not proceed with the construction of the building if it were found that the labor or the materials required competed with the war effort?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the building is to be constructed only if it does not compete in any way with the war effort.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, if the war blows over, then the building will be erected. If it does not blow over, the building will not be erected.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that the Senator from Vermont made the inquiry yesterday as to what the position of the Senate Office Building Commission would be in case of a war or anything that looked like a war, when materials would be necessary to carry on the war effort?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think he did.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And did not the chairman of the commission, speaking for the entire commission, which is composed, in addition to the chairman, of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], not only state that we would carry out our orders, but would also follow strictly the suggestion

made by the Committee on Appropriations when it practically unanimously inserted this item in the appropriation bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. This item is in chapter 2 of the appropriation bill, which is the legislative feature of the bill, and it comes directly after chapter 1, which is the District of Columbia part of the bill. Is it not a fact that when the Senate was in a sane and economical mood, it voted to give the District of Columbia \$12,000,000 of the taxpayers' money, but that when it comes to a question of providing space the whole Senate needs, Senators indicate a desire to save money?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct. I hope that any Senator who is opposed to this appropriation will be consistent. I expect that any Senator who opposes it will also oppose all the efforts to increase the nonessential appropriations in the bill. I expect he will oppose all new building projects, and I know many Senators who are opposing it have favored similar building projects in the executive department running into millions and millions of dollars.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations inserted in the bill these words which I call to the attention of the Senate:

After full discussion, the committee voted to request the Senate Office Building Commission to review forthwith the detailed plans of the proposed Senate Office Building with a view of simplifying the building to bring about savings, and with the expressed desire of the committee to make the new office building more of a working and utilitarian unit than the present plans contemplate. When this review is completed and the plans revised to meet the suggestions of the Commission, the construction is to go forward as expeditiously as is practicable in an effort to relieve the congestion and crowding that now exists in the offices of many Senators and in the space allotted to each committee of the Senate.

I now desire to ask the chairman of the commission whether or not he, as chairman of the commission, intends to carry out this instruction of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I believe it to be the duty of any commission, any creature of the Senate, to carry out the directions of the Senate. It was the suggestion of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that something be done about the construction of a new building. We have been waiting for many years in order to carry on, and nothing has been done. We have spent \$25,000 for plans alone, which will be wasted if we start anew.

Everyone admits the need of a new building. If Senators will look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday they will see letter after letter from Senators. I am curious to see how Senators will vote this afternoon, after writing those letters, in which they complained, and insisted they needed more space.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator correctly to say he is not going to have the plans revised and

is not going to follow the instructions of the committee read by the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New Mexico, as chairman of the commission, intends to follow that mandate, and review the plans.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in closing, I wish to say that the issue is clear. If Senators desire a new Senate Office Building, if they think they need more space to make their offices efficient, they should support the committee amendment. It is time for Senators to speak for themselves. The issue is clear.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to correct a statement made by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire when he stated that the purpose of my amendment was simply to strike from the bill all the language pertaining to the erection of a new Senate Office Building. I have offered a substitute which would strike all of said language and in addition would provide for an appropriation of \$10,000 for use by the Senate Office Building Commission to make new plans for the erection of a building that will be more in keeping with the actual needs of Senators. Should my amendment fail I will then move to strike from the bill all of the language pertaining to the erection of the new Senate Office Building. It is my considered judgment that under no circumstances should the proposed building be erected accordingly to the plans approved by the Commission and now in the possession of the Architect of the Capitol.

As I pointed out yesterday, the plans which have already been approved by the Commission cannot be changed to give us the kind of building which many of us think we should have. We want a utilitarian building, something that will be of service. One in which all of the available space will be utilized. We have no use for 18 large committee rooms, 2 special hearing rooms, an auditorium, 18 ante rooms for standing committees, a swimming pool, a garage to accommodate 200 cars, and many other extras that I pointed out in debate on yesterday.

I repeat, that under the law which I read yesterday it is provided that the building must be in substantial accordance with the plans and specifications prepared by the architects employed, and which have already been approved by the Senate Building Commission. I grant that a few changes could be made, but not to a degree that will make it possible to give us what we need. The architects took the position that to give us a utility building, the present plans would have to be scrapped. My amendment provides for an appropriation of \$10,000 so that the Commission can employ architects to plan a utility building and not a monumental building. Aside from that, the cost of a building to fill our needs could be constructed for about one-half of what the building in contemplation will cost. I hope my amendment will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], on page 23, beginning

with line 24, to strike out down to line 4, on page 24, and insert in lieu thereof certain new language.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been in attendance at the sessions of the International Labor Organization at Geneva, Switzerland, as a delegate representing the United States.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent because of the death of Judge Curtis Waller, a close personal friend, whose funeral is being held today.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The senior and junior Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—32

Byrd	Graham	Lucas
Connally	Hendrickson	McClellan
Cordon	Hoey	Maybank
Douglas	Holland	Robertson
Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Ferguson	Kem	Watkins
Flanders	Knowland	Wiley
Frear	Lodge	Williams
Fulbright	Long	

NAYS—46

Alken	Humphrey	Murray
Anderson	Ives	Myers
Brewster	Kefauver	Neely
Bricker	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Kilgore	Russell
Butler	Langer	Schoeppel
Chapman	McCarran	Smith, Maine
Chavez	McCarthy	Sparkman
Donnell	McFarland	Stennis
Eaton	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
George	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Green	Magnuson	Thye
Gurney	Malone	Wherry
Hayden	Martin	Young
Hickenlooper	Morse	
Hill	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—18

Benton	Hunt	Pepper
Cain	Jenner	Taylor
Capehart	Leahy	Tobey
Darby	Lehman	Tydings
Downey	Millikin	Vandenberg
Gillette	O'Connor	Withers

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, after submitting the amendment that was adversely voted upon, I was told by quite a few Senators that they were opposed to the appropriation of any money, whether it be for planning or for the actual construction of a building. So in order to bring the issues squarely before Senators as to whether or not we should appropriate any money at all, I now move to strike from the bill lines 22, 23, 24, and 25 on page 23, and through line 4 on page 24, and on that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is not in order. A vote on the committee amendment itself would have the same result.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

A negative amendment striking out a committee amendment is not in order, because the same result comes on the decision on the question of agreeing to the committee amendment itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I discussed my proposed amendment with the Parliamentarian, and I was told that a motion to strike out was in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the Senator did not take up the matter with him. The Chair's ruling is in accordance with the views of the Parliamentarian.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I took up the matter with the Assistant Parliamentarian who is sitting to the left, at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know just who that is.

At any rate, the Chair—not the Parliamentarian—is ruling on this matter.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, during the debate on yesterday and again today I took the position that I did not believe that the instructions of the committee incorporated in the report could be adhered to by the Commission. It will be recalled that the Appropriations Committee expressed the desire that the Building Commission make the new office building more of a working and utilitarian unit than the present plans contemplate. The reason for my position is that the law under which the building is to be erected specifically provides that it must be built in substantial accordance with preliminary plans already prepared and now in the possession of the Architect of the Capitol. If there is any substantial change from those plans—which I think will be necessary if we are to erect a utilitarian building—a question may arise as to whether those who contract to put up the building can be paid.

I wish to be perfectly fair. My proposed amendment to the pending committee amendment will make certain that the Commission can change the

present plans in any manner it sees fit. I may state further that the Commission could make new plans if it saw fit, in order to carry out the mandate of the Appropriations Committee. In short, Mr. President, my perfecting amendment would legalize what the Appropriations Committee sought to have the Building Commission do by incorporating in the report certain specific instructions.

The amendment which I submit to the committee amendment is as follows:

Provided, That notwithstanding the provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, requiring that the additional building authorized to be constructed thereunder for the use of the Senate be constructed in substantial accordance with preliminary plans prepared under authority of the act of July 11, 1947 (Public Law 169, 80th Cong.), such building may be constructed in accordance with such modifications or revisions of such plans, or with such new plans, as may be approved by the Senate Office Building Commission: *And provided further*, That the funds hereunder appropriated shall be available for use in the preparation of such plans.

I wish to make it clear, Mr. President, that even though my perfecting amendment is agreed to I shall continue my opposition to the pending amendment. I do not wish to detour the Senate. I have made my say. Now is not the time to construct a new Senate Office Building, especially one that is more ornamental than useful.

Mr. President, I submit the amendment to the committee amendment, and send it to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 24, after the figures "\$10,000,000," in line 4, it is proposed to insert the following before the period: "*Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, requiring that the additional building authorized to be constructed thereunder for the use of the Senate be constructed in substantial accordance with preliminary plans prepared under authority of the act of July 11, 1947 (Public Law 169, 80th Cong.), such building may be constructed in accordance with such modifications or revisions of such plans, or with such new plans, as may be approved by the Senate Office Building Commission: *And provided further*, That the funds hereunder appropriated shall be available for use in the preparation of such plans."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is this amendment to the committee amendment a proviso to be added at the end of the language now appearing in the bill, and not a substitute for it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that it is an addition to the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is the amendment offered to the commit-

tee amendment? If so, I understand that it is in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that it is an amendment to the committee amendment.

The question of whether it is in order is another matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I wish to say that as I view the matter, it is very unfortunate that this proposal is brought up when we are considering one of the most important bills ever before the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, we have a very serious matter before us. As I figured the situation yesterday and today, we are giving approximately 10 times as much attention to the building of a new Senate Office Building, at this time of emergency in our national and international affairs, as we are giving to the international affairs for which this bill will provide funds for the defense of our country. I am very sorry about that situation. However, it cannot be helped now, for this question is now before the Senate, and we must vote on it.

It seemed to me, after very careful consideration, that the position taken by the committee was the proper one, and that is why I voted for the amendment. Incidentally, let me say that quite a considerable sum of money—approximately \$850,000 I believe—already is available; and it is now proposed to provide \$10,000,000 more.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana desires to continue to press the perfecting amendment, I am willing to accept it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment on page 24, in line 4.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I dislike very much to rise in opposition to a measure which is needed in normal times, and which I have supported in the past, and which I shall expect to support in the future, at the proper time.

However, I think a set of circumstances completely out of the control of the distinguished chairman and other members of the Appropriations Committee has brought on a situation which entirely changes the picture, since this action was taken in the Appropriations Committee. Of course, that situation is the trouble existing in Korea and the other dangerous and difficult international complications which now confront us, and which of course involve and require heavy additional expenditures by our Government.

Before proceeding a little further, Mr. President, I wish to say that I am fully and completely in accord with the feeling of the committee that we should have this building, when we can have it, because it is needed; and I am entirely sympathetic with the attitude of the distinguished and patient senior Senator

from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who, I know, has had a great deal of trouble in finding space for the various Members of the Senate, including the Senator from Florida, who from time to time have tried to find additional space.

However, there is a time to do certain things and a time when they cannot be done.

I believe that the people of the United States are looking to the Senate today to see whether the Senate is going ahead now on a basis of business as usual, at a time when all of us realize the financial difficulties are tremendous, and when all expenditures of money which are made should be made on the basis of and against the background of the international situation.

Mr. President, a few moments ago my attention was called to certain items shown on the Associated Press ticker, indicating clearly that the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], in common with other Senators and Members of the House who have the heaviest responsibility on their shoulders in connection with planning for revenue, have been constrained to slow down, at least, in their announced program in connection with the revision of excise taxes and the raising of certain additional taxes, and have done so because of the international situation to which I have referred.

I quote briefly into the RECORD from the Associated Press ticker tape on that point; and, first, under a Washington date line:

Administration leaders were reported today to have decided to put aside the \$1,010,000,000 (b) excise-tax-slashing bill, pending developments from the Korean war.

The next item continues:

The report could not be officially confirmed immediately.

One source, who is familiar with tax matters, told a reporter the agreement was reached after conferences of leading congressional Democrats, with representatives of the administration.

The third item quotes our distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I read it as it appears on the ticker tape:

Chairman GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, of the Senate Finance Committee confirmed that the tax bill will be shelved momentarily when public hearings are completed on it tomorrow. But, GEORGE declined to say there would be no tax action at this session.

Asked about reports that the Treasury Department has withdrawn its support of the House-approved bill, in view of the possible military money needs in the resistance against Communist aggression in Korea, GEORGE said:

"I have no statement at all to make on that at this time. I suggest you confer with Mr. Snyder (Secretary of the Treasury)."

"The Finance Committee will continue its hearings on the tax bill tomorrow," GEORGE said, "and then will recess on this subject until the record is printed. This will take several days."

The original timetable called for the committee to prepare the tax bill next week for immediate Senate action.

Now, Mr. President and Senators, I heard the comment made by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona a while ago about what columnists may say—what columnists may say about the action of any Senator upon this floor on this matter. I have become quite used to having columnists say uncomplimentary things. I am not in the slightest concerned about what they may say, and I do not have great concern about what other Senators may say, if I have a deep conviction on a matter, as I have on this.

I think it would be a great mistake for the Senate to take the position that it would launch at this particular time a \$20,000,000 building program primarily for its own convenience and needs, which are certain, and which are definite, and which at the same time are the convenience and needs of the public whom we serve. But I think that the people of this Nation expect us to put first things first, and to quit this business-as-usual attitude toward appropriations, particularly toward appropriations of this kind. I think it is up to us, right now, and on this matter, to make it very clear that we do not feel that this is an appropriate time for the launching of this particular building. I want to say that I think we might as well realize that people reading the paper tomorrow will have, in columns side by side, these two items, if this amendment is voted down: First, an item stating that in this time of crisis, after 2 days of debate on a venture of this kind, the Senate, in its dignified and deliberate judgment, decided that this was an appropriate time to enter upon a \$20,000,000 building project for additional housing for itself. Second, in the other column and with much bolder headlines will be the story, disappointing to those thousands of people who are depending upon and hoping for some diminution of excise taxes, which so vitally affect their business—and of course citizens generally, the purchasing public, are looking at this matter also—will be the item that the financial situation is so critical on this particular date that those particular committees of Congress charged with the raising of appropriate finances for the handling of the grave problems of our Government and with preparing a tax bill have said that there is question enough about our financial condition that we are slowing down the time schedule of excise-tax reduction. When the question comes as to whether the Secretary of the Treasury himself has insisted that there be no reduction, our esteemed chairman of the Finance Committee has gravely suggested that he would prefer to have the question addressed to Mr. Snyder himself.

Now, Mr. President and Senators, I do not believe this is the time to launch this project. I think we have spent too much time on it already. I certainly do not intend to debate it at length now. But I do feel, and I feel very keenly, that we would be placing the Senate and the Congress in a most unfortunate position by the approval of this item, and would make it appear that we are in fact finding here at this date and at this particular time that "business as usual" is go-

ing on, and that we can properly start a building program of this kind.

So far as there having been any waste in the money that has been spent heretofore, I respectfully differ from those who say that there has been waste or would be waste if we did not proceed just now. I do not think there would be any loss because we have already bought and paid for the site of this proposed building: the site will be there, available for this building, when we can build. I do not think there will be any loss because we have already bought and paid for plans and specifications. I think those plans and specifications, or some modification of them, will be available when we are ready for them.

Mr. President and Senators, I strongly feel that this is not the time for us to embark upon this venture, and that we should strongly and quietly and quickly vote it down, and go on to more vital business of the Nation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, like the distinguished Senator from Florida, I hate to oppose a project which is needed, but, like him, I am going to vote against it. I believe that the need for additional space affects me as much as it does any other Senator. I have a staff of 27 people. I receive from 2,000 to 5,000 letters a day. I need much more space. But I want to say to you, Mr. President, and to my fellow Senators, that in my opinion this is not the time for the Congress of the United States to embark upon an expensive project of this sort, costing upward of \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000, when we know that in all probability we are going to require huge sums for the support of the operations now under way in Korea in a struggle which may spread to other parts of the world, a struggle in which men are dying. Many more, I am afraid, will die before it is all over. And so I urge the defeat of this amendment. I do it reluctantly, because I know the project is needed, and I have been in the habit of following the lead of my esteemed colleagues from Arizona and New Mexico, but I feel it my duty to urge the rejection of this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the Secretary will call the roll. Those who favor the committee amendment, as amended, will vote "yea" as their names are called. Those who oppose it will vote "nay."

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been in attendance at the sessions of the International Labor Organization at Geneva, Switzerland, as a delegate representing the United States.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent because of the death of Judge Curtis Waller, a close personal friend, whose funeral is being held today.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The senior and junior Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—35

Aiken	Humphrey	Morse
Anderson	Kefauver	Mundt
Bricker	Kerr	Murray
Bridges	Kilgore	Myers
Chapman	Langer	O'Mahoney
Chavez	McCarthy	Russell
Donnell	McFarland	Smith, Maine
Eaton	McMahon	Sparkman
Green	Magnuson	Stennis
Gurney	Malone	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Martin	Young
Hill	Millikin	

NAYS—42

Butler	Hendrickson	McClellan
Byrd	Hoey	Maybank
Connally	Holland	Neely
Cordon	Ives	Robertson
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Kem	Taft
Ferguson	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	Lehman	Thye
Frear	Lodge	Watkins
Fulbright	Long	Wherry
George	Lucas	Wiley
Graham	McCarran	Williams

NOT VOTING—19

Benton	Hickenlooper	Taylor
Brewster	Hunt	Tobey
Cain	Jenner	Tydings
Capehart	Leahy	Vandenberg
Darby	McKellar	Withers
Downey	O'Connor	
Gillette	Pepper	

So the committee amendment, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement with respect to the record vote just had on the appropriation for the new Senate Office Building. After the vote on the first Ellender amendment, and apparently shortly prior to the record vote on the committee amendment as amended, I was in the cloakroom adjoining the Senate Chamber. Apparently the bells did not ring in the cloakroom. I heard no bell. I am sorry to say that the pages did not come into the cloakroom, to say that a record vote was being taken. I walked into the Chamber just as the Chair was announcing the result of the record vote. I fail to understand why apparently, the bells did not ring in the cloakroom, where I was constantly, during the time of the record vote. I want

to make my position clear. I oppose the appropriation for the Senate Office Building at this time and I am opposed to the committee amendment as amended. Because of some inadvertence, or the failure of the bells to ring, or for some other reason, I was not notified of the record vote.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to say that I find myself in the same position in which the Senator from Iowa finds himself. I was called to the cloakroom and I was in conference in the cloakroom, within 10 feet of the Chamber. No bells rang. The Senator from Iowa and I came into the Chamber and discovered that the record vote had been taken. I would appreciate it if a check would be made to see whether the bells are ringing. I would have voted against the appropriation at this time. I simply wish to state my position for the RECORD.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, because of the eloquent pleas made for economy in certain sections by certain Senators, I desire to give notice that they will have an opportunity to vote for economy in connection with this bill, and it will be as to new projects, worthwhile projects. They will have an opportunity to vote for a 10-percent overall cut, of course, excluding appropriations for defense; but I hope the Senators who have so eloquently spoken against the construction of the new Senate Office Building will be consistent and will support the economy amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think we shall be in favor of economy from now on. I hope that when some committee reports in favor of constructing another \$25,000,000 building for some department in the city of Washington, economy-minded Senators will feel the same way, and I hope that those who want authorizations for \$80,000,000 or more, to bring water from my State to their States, will want to economize. We may as well start on that.

At this particular time, Mr. President, I should like to give notice that it is my purpose to move to reconsider the vote by which chapter 1 of the appropriation bill was approved on yesterday, namely, the vote by which an economy-minded Congress is giving the people of Washington \$12,000,000 out of the taxpayers' money, in these hard times, when we need money so much for other purposes.

I make the motion that the Senate reconsider the vote by which chapter 1 of the appropriation bill was approved.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I understood the distinguished Senator from New Mexico to say that he was only giving notice that he expected to move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have the statement read by the Official Reporter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senator from New Mexico concluded his statement by making the motion, and the question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from Tennessee to lay the motion of the Senator from New Mexico on the table.

Mr. ELLENDER and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (putting the question). In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators asked for a division.

On a division, Mr. McKELLAR's motion to lay on the table the motion of Mr. CHAVEZ was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if I may I should like to address a question to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I have been queried by several Senators within the past few minutes with respect to a hearing tomorrow morning before the Committee on Appropriations, because they had understood, as I understood, that the hearings on this bill before the Committee on Appropriations had been closed. We understood that the bill had been reported and therefore all hearings had been closed. I was surprised to hear that there would be a hearing tomorrow morning. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations what the situation is with respect to that subject.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to give the Senator from New Hampshire any information which I have in my possession. Some gentlemen connected with the National Guard and the Reserve Corps stated that they had not been treated fairly and wanted to talk to me personally about the matter. I told them that I thought it would be better for them to talk to the whole committee rather than to myself. I thought the committee was entitled to know what they have in mind. I told them to come before the committee tomorrow. I have asked the secretary of the committee to notify the other members of the committee, and he has done that.

Mr. BRIDGES. The hearing is not for the purpose of reopening hearings on this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. No. Not at all. I very much hope that nothing will be done to interfere with the action the committee has taken thus far and that we shall all stand by the committee when it comes to a vote tomorrow. This is a tremendous bill. I believe it is the largest single bill which has ever been reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may address an inquiry to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee stated that some men who were personally interested in the National Guard and in the Reserve Corps had come to him. I am not asking for their names. Can the Senator tell me whether they are from

the National Guard and the Reserve Corps?

Mr. McKELLAR. I so understood. I will get their names. I do not remember now.

Mr. WHERRY. Had the Senator heard them before?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not remember that we had heard them before.

Mr. BRIDGES. The hearings on this bill are closed? I assured those who made inquiry of me that we were not reopening any hearings.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are not reopening any hearings. However, I thought when a Government organization felt it had been unfairly treated by the committee, and appealed to me as chairman, that I should call the committee together. Every member will find that he has been asked to come to the committee room tomorrow.

Mr. BRIDGES. Are they the same persons who testified originally?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think not.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not quite see the point. I do not wish to embarrass the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will not embarrass me unless he states something which is not true, and he has not done that.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am merely asking the question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not sure, but perhaps what the Senator from Tennessee is talking about is with respect to a small appropriation for the Illinois National Guard, which they requested some time ago. In colloquy with the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], I stated that representatives of the Illinois National Guard had come to me some time ago and asked for a small additional appropriation. I forget what it was. I have not looked at my file. I thought I could offer an amendment from the floor, if I thought it was necessary. Then the Senator from Tennessee suggested that I come before the Committee on Appropriations in the morning. That may be the situation that we are talking about at this time. It has nothing to do with the National Guard so far as the present situation is concerned. These gentlemen came to me some 60 days ago. The Senator from Texas was talking about the National Guard being additionally equipped, and one thing or another, and he and I merely had this colloquy. That may be the situation.

Mr. BRIDGES. The point I wished to make was that when inquiry was made of me, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, I told those making the inquiry that the hearings had been closed and the bill was on the floor of the Senate. That is why I asked the question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say that I received the same inquiry. The House had raised the appropriation for the National Guard above the Budget Bureau's estimate. The item related to

drill pay, and other matters. The House had gone far above the Budget Bureau's estimate. I told the persons who made inquiry of me the same thing which the Senator from New Hampshire told them, namely, that the hearings had been closed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. THYE. When the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] was making his statement on the entire world situation I raised the question of the advisability of reducing the estimate submitted by the Bureau of the Budget for the National Guard by the sum of \$1,900,000. I also raised the question whether we should not increase the appropriation, as well as increase the appropriation for the aviation section of the National Guard. I was informed this afternoon that there would be an opportunity to appear before the Committee on Appropriations tomorrow morning at 10:30.

In order to inform and enlighten myself on the subject I called the former Adjutant General of the National Guard in Minnesota, General Walsh, who is now President of the National Guard Association of the United States, in an effort to obtain full information concerning the National Guard's anticipated needs in the near future. As I suggested this afternoon, in view of the fact that the Regular Army is being called into active service in the South Pacific, I felt we were weakening our own national security when the Regular Army was called to that duty and that we should be increasing the strength of the National Guard because of the national emergency.

I am very happy that the Committee on Appropriations is permitting the statement not only by me as of tomorrow, but is affording an opportunity possibly to file a statement concerning the whole question of the National Guard.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator from New Hampshire feel that if the National Guard as a unit, or if the Reserves, desire more money, they should proceed through the regular channels, and present the matter on a deficiency bill, or a supplemental bill, as is anticipated being done by the regular services?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do; that is the logical course to follow.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that for two services, the Air Force and the Navy, the Committee on Appropriations in this bill has given the amount the budget requested, and in the one service gave more, but in the Army \$200,000 less?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have before me the report which accompanies H. R. 7786, and if we look the report over we find in the chart on page 286 that the appropriation for the Army National Guard, 1950 act, is \$216,000,000; estimated, 1951, \$210,700,000. The House bill provided \$212,400,000. The amount recommended by the Senate committee was \$210,500,000,

or \$1,900,000 less than the amount in the House bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Minus \$200,000, just as I said to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. One million nine hundred thousand dollars under the House figure, and \$200,000 under the Budget Bureau's figure.

Mr. THYE. I agree; but the House allowed \$212,400,000, and at the time the House passed the bill they did not have confronting them the world situation which faces us today. They certainly were not confronted with the fact that the Regular Army was being called from the shores of the United States, thereby lessening our own national security, and that we are now dependent upon the National Guard to give us the internal security the Nation must have.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, and then I shall yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely desire to make clear that so far as the pending bill is concerned, the appropriation is only \$200,000 under the budget estimate. We cannot change the House figure except as we vote on the Senate bill, and then any amendment would have to go to conference. Is not that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. I am sure the Senator will agree that any Senator may offer an amendment, and trust and hope that he will be able to convince the Senate that his amendment should prevail. My only reason for entering into a discussion with the able junior Senator from Texas, when he was giving a report as he saw the situation as to our own security and the world crisis, was to compliment the able Senator. I stated at that time that it was my conviction that the National Guard should have more money, and that I hoped and intended to offer an amendment, before the appropriation bill was finally passed, trusting that I could convince the Senate that we need to appropriate more funds for the National Guard in order to strengthen our own internal security, inasmuch as our troops are leaving our shores and going to foreign service.

I am very thankful to the Committee on Appropriations for affording an opportunity tomorrow morning to appear before them and present arguments in the committee as to the need to increase the appropriation, both for the National Guard and the wing section of the National Guard.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say that I attended the hearings, and no one has a greater respect for General Walsh than I have, but I finally agreed with the Senator from Michigan that this matter should be handled in a supplemental bill. The question came up as to whether we should reduce the House ap-

propriation. We were interested in the Taber amendment, and that is why we voted in the subcommittee as we did.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may I have one moment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THYE. I wish to say, in behalf of General Walsh, the President of the National Guard Association, that General Walsh did not come to me originally; he was not initiating any action. I called General Walsh in order to get his opinion.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I never have suggested that General Walsh would do such a thing. I merely made the statement that some of those interested in the National Guard came to see me, and that my vote on the subcommittee was in keeping with the House provision rather than the Taber amendment, as the Senator from Michigan stated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, my only point in raising this question was that I wanted to make sure that the bill was not to be reopened. It was reported to the Senate. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is very sincere in what he says, and he should have a right to present his argument and his case. I think the place for the appropriation would be in the next supplemental bill. We have not had any request from the National Defense Department about this matter. Should they request what the Senator presents, or what the armed services may present, I think the appropriation should come in the supplemental bill which will follow this one shortly. My only point is as to the reopening of the bill, because if we reopen it as to one appropriation, we will be asked to reopen it as to a number of others.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have a very brief statement to make on the vote last cast for some new office space for Senators. I voted for the office space. Perhaps we do not need a new building. I do not suppose we would go ahead with any building if the war situation were such that it did not seem desirable or feasible. Some members of the Senate, who have not been here so long as some of the old timers, are very crowded for space. I resent anyone saying that the Senate of the United States voted for some extra space, when we must take into consideration the fact that Senators are crowded, that stenographers are sitting almost on top of each other, with files on top of them. I resent any implication that we are voting for extra space in troubled times merely because it is wanted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator who said that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The implication was that we might have done it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I made no such implication.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I got that implication from some of the debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator certainly did not get it from anything I said, because I know exactly what the situation is, but I do not think this is the time to remedy that situation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to make the statement that the business of the Senate, of course, is just as much public business at any time as is Pentagon Building business. It is business which must be taken care of, and during times of national stress it involves communications, letters to answer from people directly involved in any effort we may make at home or abroad. Some of us younger Senators who are in a crowded condition perhaps should not have voted for a new building or for some new space. If some quonset huts were put up on the lot which has been acquired we would be glad to have them, if thereby additional space would be provided. Probably the matter can be remedied without all this discussion about the conditions as they are.

On behalf of myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] I submit an amendment. I am sure I could get 15 or 20 other Senators to sponsor the amendment if we had time. There are many Senators who have plenty of space. That is well and good. I want them to have plenty of space. But some of us have a particular problem. I ask for immediate consideration of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

The Committee on Rules and Administration is hereby directed to reexamine and reallocate all Senate office space toward the end of a more equitable assignment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Committee amendments are now being considered, the Chair will say to the Senator from Washington. It is not in order to consider the Senator's amendment at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer it as an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no committee amendment pending at this time. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington on behalf of himself and the Senator from Minnesota may be printed and lie on the table until committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I offer the amendment then to appear on page 23, following line 21.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair state that the same rule as previously stated by the Chair still would apply.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then, Mr. President, I submit the amendment and ask that it may be printed and lie on the table. I hope all members of the Committee on Rules and Administration will have the opportunity to file by the clerk's desk and read the amendment because it represents a very serious plea on the part of some Senators who have much public business to transact, who are tremendously crowded and have less office space than some Senators who have rooms tucked away all over the Cap-

itol and in the Senate Office Building itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I now yield the floor, Mr. President. Before doing so, however, I should like to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, along the line suggested by the Senator from the State of Washington I should like to say that the fault is not at all with the Committee on Rules and Administration. The Senator from the State of Washington is just as correct as he can be. What can those in the Pentagon Building do that is more than the Senate of the United States can do? How can those in the Pentagon Building function adequately unless the Senate of the United States functions adequately? How can Senators be happy and work well unless they work in a happy atmosphere, with adequate space? How can we do more for the country in the emergency which is talked about so much, than by doing something for the Senate of the United States? Where can we do more than we can by providing adequate space for the Members of the Senate?

Mr. President, it appears that some want to blame the Committee on Rules and Administration. Let us blame ourselves alone. We do not seem to have enough intestinal fortitude. We are willing to present measures by the wholesale which cost the taxpayers much money, present measures which call for the appropriation in the future of millions upon millions of dollars. But when it comes to the question of doing something for the Senate itself, so its members can properly perform their work for the benefit of the taxpayer we love to talk about, whose patriotism and loyalty we love to extol, then it is something quite different. I believe the Senator from Washington is correct in the position he has taken.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has asked me to yield to him. I yield to him.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a point of order. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington still has the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understood the Senator from Washington said he yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He did so, but then almost immediately he yielded to the Senator from New Mexico before the Senator from California started to speak. The Chair will recognize the Senator from California as soon as the Senator from Washington yields the floor.

The Chair is informed that the Senator from Washington has now yielded the floor. The Chair now recognizes the the Senator from California.

DEATH OF RAY RICHARDS IN KOREA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, yesterday news came from Korea of the death of Ray Richards. I had seen Ray Richards when I was in the Far East last

November, both in Tokyo and in Seoul. Many Members of the Senate knew Ray Richards very well as a newspaper man who had long experience in Washington.

Ray Richards made the entire Pacific theater his beat. In the twenties he was with the Associated Press in Los Angeles, going from there to the Honolulu Star Bulletin. Then followed years of news coverage—in Japan for the Japan Advertiser—in China for Shanghai Sunday Post-Mercury and Shanghai Press, before returning to the United States in the mid-thirties, to work first on the San Francisco Examiner and later on the Los Angeles Examiner. During this period he made one more trip to the Orient covering various stages of Japanese aggression in north China. In 1938 he returned to the Los Angeles Examiner as day city editor; a position he occupied until he came to Washington shortly after Pearl Harbor.

Richards made two surveys of the Near East situation for the Hearst newspapers after the war. In 1946 he visited Greece and Turkey briefly during the height of Communist disturbances in the former country, following which he returned to his duties in Washington. He was a correspondent at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco, and in late 1947 and the first part of 1948 covered the Chinese Communist aggressions in north China. Again he returned to Washington to report efforts in Congress to strengthen our forces in the Pacific.

A year ago, convinced the key danger point in the Pacific to Communist attack was South Korea, he joined President Syngman Rhee of the South Korea Republic, whom he had known for years, as a press adviser. He returned to the role of correspondent for the Hearst newspapers and International News Service when the Korean Communists invaded and the South Korean Government fled the capital Seoul.

The news dispatches, as I said yesterday, told how Ray Richards, together with the other foreign war correspondents who are now in Korea, went out to see for himself and to report to the American people what was happening in that country during the war period.

During the period of World War II, Mr. President, many war correspondents connected with the newspapers and press associations also gave their lives for their country, in order to keep the American Republic and its people properly informed as to what was going on. While these men are not in the same category as members of our armed services, they nevertheless on numerous occasions have risked their lives in order to acquaint the American people with the facts. I believe the American people many times get their first information from the newspapers rather than from their Government, which is sometimes a little lax in telling them the cold hard facts of life. Many of the newspaper correspondents risk their lives. On occasion some of them have to give their lives in the performance of their duties. Ray Richards was one of them, and I know that all his friends, both in the fourth estate and those in

the Senate of the United States, will miss him from now on.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD following the speech by the Senator from California two telegrams which I sent to the family of Mr. Richards, whom I knew well, for I had worked with him on many occasions, and also to the press, on his passing away.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reports of the death of Ray Richards in Korea come as a distinct shock and give me a sense of personal loss. I knew Ray Richards well. He had a great understanding of the Pacific and its needs and problems; we had discussed them many times. It is no surprise to learn he was out there before there was a war on, as he had an instinct for activity in the Pacific. After World War II he took the greatest interest in my efforts to insure that we would have American bases in the Pacific. He knew the arguments behind my proposal for establishing a naval academy on the west coast and why it was needed. He was abreast or ahead of our demands for adequate defenses in Alaska and only a few months ago we were up to our necks in that fight, with Ray working to keep the American public informed of the progress. Even more recently he went through another round in the everlasting fight for a stronger Pacific, this time on Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood. Few knew China or Japan better, or understood the Pacific as well as did Ray Richards. He died as he lived, well out in front of the fight for American security.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator.

JULY 11, 1950.

Mr. EDWARD C. LAPPING,
The Hearst Newspapers,
Times-Herald Building,
Washington, D. C.:

With deepest regret have just heard reports of death of Ray Richards in Korea. On many occasions during years he served with Hearst newspapers I had come to know him as vigorous and accurate correspondent whose purpose was to keep public informed on vital public issues. In most recent months he was engaged in developing facts regarding Alaskan and Pacific defenses and Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood issues here in Washington, D. C. His loss will be keenly felt by those of us who knew him personally.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself completely with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. Of all the newspapermen with whom we associate here, certainly among those who are close friends of mine, I do not know of any man who did more for the Indian than did Ray Richards. He was one of my dear friends. He was born in Minot, N. Dak., 56 years ago. He was one of the outstanding citizens of North Dakota. He was a man of whom the people of North Dakota were inordinately proud.

Ray Richards made a thorough study of the Torres-Martinez, Navajo, and Hopi Indians. His death is a distinct loss to those of us who have been trying to better the condition of some 233,000 Indians. I know that as that fight goes on to better their conditions the Indians will realize that one of their very best friends has been taken from them.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there are only two more minor amendments to chapter 2 of the bill. I wonder whether they can be considered and acted upon now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 20, to insert:

INDEX-DIGEST OF THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the Librarian to edit and publish the index-digest of the publications of the Temporary National Economic Committee, including personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$18,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let us have a clear understanding of what the amendment does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know that, but I wish to have the amendment go over until tomorrow; I object to its present consideration.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Nation and State," which appeared in the Washington Post for July 11, 1950, in connection with the bill (S. 3147), to establish a national commission on intergovernmental relations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION AND STATE

None of the better-government bills drafted to carry out recommendations of the Hoover Commission has more far-reaching significance than Senator HUMPHREY's proposal to set up a national commission on intergovernmental relations. This measure came out of the Senate Committee on Expenditures recently and is awaiting action on the floor. It is cosponsored by 41 Senators. There should be no opposition to it, for its purpose is to set in motion a long-range study of that basic but controversial subject of the relationship between the States and the Federal Government.

The study would be made by a temporary bipartisan commission of seven members selected by the President on the basis of their knowledge and experience in the sphere of intergovernmental relations. Its scope would be broad enough to cover any problem concerning the distribution of functions and powers among the Federal, State, and local governments. But let no one suppose that it would be kept in the realm of political theory. It would deal with such practical and urgent questions as those arising out of grants-in-aid, intergovernmental tax immunities, and the competition of different governments for taxes from the same sources. It would explore the possibility of different governments sharing the receipts from certain taxes now commonly used.

In the background is the question of how far the Federal Government should go in absorbing the powers of the States and supplying them with revenue. We do not suppose that any commission can satisfactorily answer that question. The people will determine the division of power between national and local governments in accord with what they believe to be their current interest from decade to decade. But a well-chosen intergovernmental commission can bring to public attention the trends of recent years and point out the advantages and dangers of those trends. To our way of thinking the issue is not whether the national power should be enhanced at the expense of the States or whether the States should reclaim many of the functions they have lost, but how governments can best work together on the national and local levels to advance the general welfare. Accommodation will doubtless be the watchword of the commission if it is created, and that will mean accommodation of government to present-day requirements—not the reversion to any outmoded notion as to what Federal-State relations ought to be.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, July 13, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 12 (legislative day of July 1), 1950:

DEPUTY UNITED STATES SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE IN EUROPE

C. Tyler Wood, of the District of Columbia, to be deputy United States special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Oliver S. Powell, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of 14 years from February 1, 1938, vice Lawrence Clayton, deceased.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. John S. Seybold, Corps of Engineers, to serve as president and member of the California Debris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. Dwight F. Johns, to be relieved.

Lt. Col. Clarence C. Haug, Corps of Engineers, to serve as member and secretary of the California Debris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. Joseph S. Gorlinski, Corps of Engineers, to be relieved.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Thomas H. Roberts, of Rhode Island, to be United States district judge for the district of Puerto Rico, vice Hon. David Chavez, Jr., resigned.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Thomas A. Uzzell, Jr., to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina, vice David E. Henderson, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Donald A. Draughon, of Puerto Rico, to be United States marshal for the district of Puerto Rico. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires July 27, 1950.

Day address at the Milwaukee Auditorium last Saturday night.

WHAT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE OMITTED SAYING

First, let me say that we of Wisconsin are always sincerely happy to welcome distinguished officials of the executive branch to America's dairyland. I am sorry, however, that you did not use your visit to explain to the dairy farmers of Wisconsin why you have failed to lift a finger to prevent the fall in dairy returns by around 25 percent within the last year. I am sorry that you did not explain just how it was that (a) President Truman could campaign for office prior to the November 1948 election on the basis of promising to maintain farm income high, and (b) within 12 months thereafter how it was that the President could sit by with folded hands while the dairy farmers' prices dropped through the floor.

It is indeed to be regretted, too, that you did not explain why it was that Congressman RED MURRAY, Republican, of Wisconsin, and I had to practically pull the teeth of the Department of Agriculture to get you to support adequately manufactured dairy products at the time they were suffering particularly badly.

Oh, how much Wisconsin's 175,000 farms would have been interested in hearing from your lips your attempted explanation of why the Democratic administration has stabbed the dairy farmer in the back by overriding Republican opposition and passing the vicious oleo yellow color steal.

WISCONSIN IS WISE TO SMEAR ARTISTS

Be that as it may, we try to be courteous to out-of-State visitors who come to Wisconsin. However, when they come from the White House and the agencies on political smear missions, we have a habit of listening to them politely, but then doing exactly contrary to what they recommend.

Thus, in 1944, your undistinguished predecessor, Mr. Henry "kill-the-little-pigs" Wallace came to Wisconsin to attempt to smear me, as did Mr. Ickes, Mr. Wickard, and the then Senator, Mr. Truman. Your predecessors came, they saw, and they were conquered by the battling badgers. Yes, the Wisconsin voters listened to these visitors and then proceeded to reject completely what they had recommended. I believe very confidently that the same will occur this time.

A COINCIDENCE OF PARROTING

However, right now, I just want to point out one of the many misstatements which you made in the course of your address last Saturday. Let me point to you an interesting coincidence wherein the July 3 issue of the newspaper, the League Reporter, published by the American Federation of Labor, a deliberate distortion of facts similar to yours was printed. Sure enough, I expected that sooner or later some of the administration parrots would proceed to mimic that misstatement and as expected, this occurred, because within a week you repeated the very same canard published in that issue.

The League Reporter commented on the fact that on June 26 a 36-to-35 vote in the Senate defeated our Republican effort to recommit to committee the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. The A. F. of L. misinformation sheet told its readers that whoever voted to recommit the CCC bill to committee was voting against price supports. Nothing, however, could be further from the truth.

Unfortunately, however, you picked up the A. F. of L. cue and also decided to stray from the truth by stating in Milwaukee that Senator WILLY had allegedly voted against a bill which would make it possible for farmers to get continued price supports for their milk. Oh, what deliberate bunk on your part.

Let me point out the following facts so as to nail that Democratic mistruth in its

tracks and so that never again will anyone have the audacity to repeat so vicious a misstatement.

1. The question of continued price supports for milk was not under the remotest consideration in that 36-35 vote.

A DEMOCRATIC SENATOR PROVED DEMOCRAT BRANNAN WRONG

I refer you to a statement made by the Democratic Senator who had cosponsored the amendment, the Honorable WARREN MAGNUSON, of Washington. He stated that the bill, H. R. 6567, increased borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation by \$2,000,000,000. He stated further as reported on page 9294 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that—

"Both the House and Senate were in complete agreement that the CCC borrowing authority should be increased. In consequence, any Senator who votes with me to reject this conference report cannot be accused by that action of being against the farmers of this country. Irrespective of whether we send this bill back to conference, a \$2,000,000,000 increase in CCC's borrowing authority is assured. The only question before the conferees has to do with section 3 of the Senate version—the so-called Magnuson-Morse amendment. If we reject the conference report this amendment again will be the only issue before the conferees."

UNITED STATES FARM ITEMS NEED TARIFF PROTECTION

2. Senator MAGNUSON then went on to show that completely contrary to what the Secretary of Agriculture stated in Milwaukee and what the A. F. of L. sheet stated in Washington, a failure to reject the conference report jeopardized the entire price-support program. Why? Because as you full well know, the aim of the Magnuson-Morse amendment (which I also supported in its original version) was to streamline a procedure for tariff protection of American farm commodities. Thus, this amendment was designed to transfer to you as the Secretary of Agriculture, the exclusive right to investigate injurious effects or imports of foreign commodities on our domestic farm program. We of the Republican minority felt that it is absolutely ridiculous to continue to import tremendous quantities of potatoes, for example, or foreign types of cheeses when at the very same time, huge surpluses of potatoes and cheese are piling up in our own warehouses. That is why the Magnuson-Morse amendment was offered, because under it, when farm surpluses piled up, there would be authorized to be established an import fee of up to 50 percent of value or a quota limiting the amount of imports to not less than 50 percent of the imports during a representative period in the past.

3. Let me point out that the whole idea of such procedure dates all the way back to November 23, 1935, when President Roosevelt issued Executive Order No. 72, delegating preliminary investigation authority to the Secretary of Agriculture when imports interfered with domestic farm products under the Triple A Act. However, it was found that this procedure dating back these 15 years in which the Secretary of Agriculture makes a review and reports to the President, and the President then asks the Tariff Commission to make a study—that this procedure takes as long as 17 to 18 months or 2 years. Therefore, the Magnuson-Morse amendment was offered to establish a single, simple investigation by the Secretary of Agriculture on the injurious effects on farm imports.

The conference committee, unfortunately, mutilated the Magnuson-Morse amendment and we had no alternative therefore, but to try to vote to send the bill back to the committee so that it could restore the Magnuson-Morse amendment, and thus in ef-

fect, protect United States domestic farm production.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE WANTS TO TORPEDO FARM SUPPORTS

4. In summary, the 35 of us who voted to recommit the bill were voting for protection of American farmers. On the other hand, the 36 who voted against recommitment were, I believe, in sincerity but in mistaken approach voting against the welfare of American farmers.

You, the Secretary of Agriculture, who are sworn to protect the interests of American agriculture have in effect endorsed an act by the Senate which jeopardized the very price-support program which you are supposed to be executing.

This, I trust, helps to straighten out the situation which you have unfortunately attempted to confuse.

I hope that you will be coming back to Wisconsin soon again, because I think that we will give you a real Badger greeting (at the polls) such as we did in November 1944, to your predecessor.

Oh, by the way, I was just wondering whether the Democratic administration will now attempt to defeat Senator MAGNUSON because of his cosponsorship of the amendment or Senate Majority Leader LUCAS, because he completely rejects the farm plan which bears your name?

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

STANDARDS OF ELECTRICAL AND PHOTOMETRIC MEASUREMENTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 441) to redefine the units and establish the standards of electrical and photometric measurements, which were on page 3, lines 10 and 11, strike out "National Bureau of Standards" and insert "Secretary of Commerce," and on page 3, lines 14 and 15, strike out "National Bureau of Standards" and insert "Department of Commerce."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2046) to provide authority for certain functions and activities of the National Bureau of Standards and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, strike out line 2 and insert "..."; on page 2 line 12 strike out "Bureau" and insert "Secretary of Commerce"; on page 2 line 15 after "facilities", insert "of the National Bureau of Standards", and to amend the title so as to read:

An act to provide authority for certain functions and activities in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill S. 2201, an act amending section 2 of the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), to provide

basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the National Bureau of Standards, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, lines 6 and 7, to strike out "The functions of the Bureau shall be the following:" and insert "The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to undertake the following functions:"; on page 2, line 22, strike out "Bureau" and insert "Secretary"; on page 5, lines 15 and 16, strike out "specified functions of the Bureau" and insert "functions specified herein"; on page 5, lines 18 and 19, strike out "work of the Bureau" and insert "performance of the functions specified herein"; on page 6, lines 4 and 5, strike out "National Bureau of Standards, the Bureau" and insert "Secretary in the performance of functions specified herein, the Department of Commerce"; on page 6, line 8, strike out "equipment," and insert "equipment"; on page 6, lines 8 and 9, strike out "National Bureau of Standards" and insert "Department of Commerce"; on page 6, line 10, after "investigation" insert "authorized herein"; on page 6, lines 11 and 12, strike out "National Bureau of Standards" and insert "Department of Commerce"; on page 6, line 16, strike out "of the National Bureau of Standards" and insert "authorized herein"; and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 2 of the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

GRANT OF EASEMENT TO EAST BAY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT, ALAMEDA, CALIF.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2507) to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of an interceptor sewer pipeline in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the Maritime Alameda Shipyard, Alameda, Calif., which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to grant and convey to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, without cost to the said utility district, and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Commerce may deem proper, a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, operation, renewal, replacement, and repair of an interceptor sewer pipeline or pipelines within two strips of land 20 feet wide each, one extending a distance of seven hundred and thirty-nine and thirty-seven one-hundredths feet northerly from Tynan Avenue and the other extending a distance of one thousand two hundred and eighty-five and seventy-four one-hundredths feet southerly from Tynan Avenue, both lying along the easterly boundary of lands comprising a part of the

Maritime Alameda Shipyard, Alameda, Calif., and contiguous to the westerly boundary line of the Central Pacific Railway Co. right-of-way, metes and bounds descriptions of such strips of land being on file with the Secretary of Commerce.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of an interceptor sewer pipeline in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the Maritime Alameda Shipyard, Alameda, Calif."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 27, line 21, which was under consideration at the time of recess yesterday. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 27, after line 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

INDEX-DIGEST OF THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the Librarian to edit and publish the index-digest of the publications of the Temporary National Economic Committee, including personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$18,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Library of Congress—Library Buildings," on page 31, line 12, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$695,200" and insert "\$698,680."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, that complete chapter II of the omnibus bill. Before we proceed with the next chapter, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 5, beginning with line 5, and ending with line 9, was agreed to. Before that action is taken, I wish to state that through an oversight the Senate failed to appropriate \$2,416 to pay the pages for the 2 weeks after the Congress adjourns. The reason for my request for reconsideration of the vote is so that that item may be inserted; that is to add to the present figure the sum of \$2,416.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and by unanimous consent, the vote by which the amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment I suggested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,-025,789" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,-028,205."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I shall not object, but I should like to know what the effect of the amendment is.

Mr. ELLENDER. The effect is to increase the amount by \$2,416 so as to pay the pages for 2 weeks after Congress recesses or adjourns. That is provided for under Public Law 641 of the Eightieth Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter III—Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary—Title I—Department of State—Salaries and expenses," on page 42, line 18, after the word "advance", to strike out "\$77,300,000" and insert "\$78,300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 43, line 6, after "(5 U. S. C. 168d)" to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That the compensation of the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration shall be \$17,500 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may be have the amendment identified?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is on page 43, line 6.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that amendment is going to be withdrawn. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. I desire to make a statement with reference to the amendment.

Mr. President, I have the honor of being chairman of the Appropriation Subcommittee for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary. I am gratified that the full committee approved, and has so reported the recommendations of my subcommittee. I feel that this is a tribute to my colleagues on the subcommittee, and I wish at this time to express my appreciation to them for the splendid work they did on chapter III of this bill. I wish also to express my personal appreciation and to compliment the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], chairman of the full committee, for his leadership in guiding this very difficult appropriation bill through the committee. He has devoted many long hours to this task, and deserves the thanks of the Senate for a job well done. We have accomplished substantial reductions, and I wish to assure the Senate that these reductions were only made after exhaustive hearings and many hours of consideration. They represent the judgment of the subcommittee, concurred in by the full committee, as to the minimum that should be allowed each Department and agency for the performance of their necessary functions during

the fiscal year 1951. Chapter III, as reported, represents a reduction in cash and contract authority of \$142,136,665, or 11.1 percent below the budget estimates, and is \$35,144,230 or 3 percent below the amount allowed by the House. The budget estimate was \$1,276,649,397; the House allowed \$1,169,656,962; the committee recommends a total of \$1,134,512,732.

For the Department of State, the budget estimate in cash was \$230,077,397; the House allowed a total of \$217,651,297. The committee recommends a total of \$204,483,067, a reduction of \$25,594,330, or 11.1 percent below the budget, and a reduction of \$13,168,230, or 6.1 percent below the House.

For the Department of Justice the budget estimate in cash was \$149,002,800; the House allowed a total of \$144,230,000. The committee recommends a total of \$141,952,000, a reduction of \$7,050,800, or 4.7 percent below the budget, and a reduction of \$2,278,000, or 1.6 percent below the House.

For the Department of Commerce the budget estimate in cash was \$782,419,000; the House allowed a total of \$725,429,000. The committee recommends a total of \$696,183,000, a reduction of \$86,236,000, or 11 percent below the budget, and a reduction of \$29,246,000, or 3.7 below the House.

For the judiciary the budget estimate in cash was \$24,113,700; the House allowed a total of \$23,560,165. The committee recommends a total of \$23,478,665, a reduction of \$635,035, or 2.6 percent below the budget, and a reduction of \$81,500, or 0.3 percent below the House.

In contract authority, the committee recommends an increase of \$7,000,000 for the institute of inter-American affairs in the Department of State. The budget estimate for this item was \$14,000,000, and the House committee had recommended \$7,000,000, which amount was struck out on the House floor. For the Department of Justice the committee recommends no increase in contract authority. For the Department of Commerce the committee recommends a net increase of \$2,629,500 in contract authority. The committee recommends an increase of \$6,538,500 in contract authority for air navigation facilities under the CAA, but also recommends a decrease of \$3,909,000 in contract authority approved by the House for the national Bureau of Standards. While the committee is recommending an increase of \$9,629,500 in contract authority over that allowed by the House, the total of the committee's recommendation is \$22,620,500 below the budget estimate, or 24.8 percent.

Mr. President, I have only attempted to sketch the broad outlines of the committee's action in regard to chapter III, and I shall be happy to answer any questions that any Senators may have.

I may say Mr. President, that the committee recommended an increase in salary for Mr. John E. Peurifoy, the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, from \$15,000 to \$17,500 per annum. Since the committee's action, the President has transmitted to the Senate

the nomination of Mr. Peurifoy to be Ambassador to Greece. Since Mr. Peurifoy will not be occupying the position which he now holds in the Department in Washington, I shall ask, when we arrive at that amendment, that it be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are now at that amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 43, beginning in line 6.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be rejected, because of the reasons I have stated and in view of the fact that Mr. Peurifoy is about to be sent as Ambassador to Greece, and will not occupy the position he now holds in the Department of State.

It was the view of the committee, let me say, that in view of the value of Mr. Peurifoy's services—his fine, candid, up-standing way of presenting matters to the committee and of handling the affairs of the Secretary of State when he came before the committee—he should have the same salary as that of the Deputy Under Secretary of State who is just ahead of him.

However, now that Mr. Peurifoy is to be sent as Ambassador to Greece, I am asking that the recommendation of the committee be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 43, line 6.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to state that the committee amendment should be disagreed to, as requested by the chairman of the subcommittee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Representation allowances," on page 43, line 13, after "(22 U. S. C. 1131)," to strike out "\$675,000" and insert "\$900,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 13, to strike out:

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For financing the liability of the United States, created by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1061-1116), \$2,233,000, which amount shall be placed to the credit of the "Foreign Service retirement and disability fund."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Buildings fund," on page 43, line 24, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service," on page 44, line 13, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "\$10,600,000" and insert "\$9,900,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contributions to international organizations," on page 44, line 21, after

the word "Congress", to strike out "\$55,178,297" and insert "\$53,753,067."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Missions to international organizations," on page 45, line 25, after the word "chauffeurs", to strike out "\$1,600,000" and insert "\$1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International contingencies," on page 47, line 7, after "(44 U. S. C. 111)", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$2,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico," on page 48, line 12, after the words "purchase of", to strike out "four" and insert "eight"; and in the same line, after the word "vehicles", to insert "of which six shall be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 49, line 19, after the numerals "1944", to strike out "\$5,035,000" and insert "\$3,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "American sections, international commissions," on page 51, line 11, after the word "Commissions", to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$600,000"; and in line 15; after the word "forth", to insert "except that \$92,000 of such amount shall be available upon the enactment of this act and until expended only for the examination and survey of the Red River of the north and its tributaries for the purpose of determining what action should be taken to control floods and provide proper drainage in the areas through which such river and tributaries flow."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I thought the clerk had skipped the committee amendment on page 48, in line 12, but I believe I am in error as to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Both those amendments are agreed to.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International information and educational activities," on page 54, line 13, after the word "organizations", to strike out "\$34,000,000" and insert "\$32,700,000, of which sum \$200,000 shall be used for the purpose of preserving friendships with the peoples of western European countries by means of radio broadcasts, said programs to be created and produced under the supervision and control of the Department of State by experienced private international broadcasting organizations; and."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, to that committee amendment, I have an amendment to offer. It has been printed and lies on the desk, and I now offer it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 54, in line 13, in lieu of the figure "\$32,700,000", it is proposed to insert the figure "\$36,645,000."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to discuss this amendment for a few moments. I have offered amendments on several occasions—this will be the third year—to the appropriation items for this particular program.

Before I discuss the actual effect of the amendment I am offering to the committee amendment, let me say that I have from the State Department a report as to a tentative distribution of the cut which has been made in this program.

I wish to say, first, that this program should not be regarded as a peacetime business-as-usual type of program. I think what is going on today in Korea, and what has been occurring in the satellite countries for the past 3 or 4 years surely should demonstrate to the Senate and to the people that this program is a very vital and important part of our security and of our defense.

Last night I happened to read an article in which I know many Senators will be interested. It appears in the Saturday Evening Post, and is by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, who is admitted to be one of our best civilian authorities on the question of the Defense Establishment. It is a disturbing article. As I read about the sad state of our military security I was more than ever concerned about the weakness of our information and exchange program. Apparently we are not very wise in our efforts to prevent war or to win a war after it has started.

This information program has been neglected and has been kicked about ever since the war ended. I think its effect upon our ability to defend the American system in certain other countries has been greatly underestimated. I desire to recall to the Senate a few words from the debate of June 30, last year, appearing at page 7479 of the RECORD, as follows:

One of the principal means by which communism has now gained control of China is through the activities of Chinese who have been indoctrinated in Moscow over a long period of time. Senators will notice, if they read carefully, that practically all the leaders, like Mao Tse-tung in China, or Tito in Yugoslavia, or Togliatti in Italy, were trained under programs very similar to the one which is supported by the appropriation we are considering. They were trained in Moscow by that type of program, leaders throughout the world, people who have been brought to Moscow under educational exchange programs. Since the earliest days of the Soviet regime it has maintained and expanded its educational exchange program.

We have relied—I think perhaps too much, as events are showing in Korea today—upon what we thought was a very strong and invulnerable Military Establishment. The point is, I think, that this program should be considered in its relationship to our foreign policy. It is not a business-as-usual activity. Its purpose is not simply to give opportunities to individuals as such. It is to enable us to develop a corps of young people who have experience in foreign countries which they can devote to the defense and the security of this country, among other things. That is certainly one of the primary objectives.

I would not—as I did not yesterday with regard to the new office building—

be here urging the increase of any appropriation purely of a peacetime nature which we could forego for the moment without in any way prejudicing our foreign relations. I need not tell the Senate that the real trouble and the real danger to this country is not in connection with domestic affairs, but in connection with foreign affairs. I need not tell the Senate that the great mistakes which have been made within the past few years have been primarily in our foreign relations. That is due, to a great extent, to the fact that we have not developed and sufficiently utilized the services of experienced persons who are acquainted with the history and who know how to speak the languages of the countries with which we have to deal. I think that is generally admitted.

We were isolationists so long that now, when we enter into the foreign field, whether we like it or not, we are poorly prepared. To alter that situation is one of the principal objectives of this program. I think it is a great reflection upon the judgment of this body that year after year we have cut down this program, holding it to a bare minimum. The history of it is familiar to Senators. Last year it was cut in a manner very similar to the cut made this year. The year before that, as I recall, it was very substantially cut. It is true that last year there was, later, a nonrecurring appropriation in the deficiency appropriation for certain physical equipment in the radio field. But the actual operations of the program have been severely curtailed. I think that has been one of the greatest mistakes we have ever made.

For the RECORD, I desire to recall what has happened here. We are providing great economic and military aid to many countries, on a scale far larger than the amount of money devoted to this program of establishing real understanding among the peoples and of enlightening them as to why we are engaging in such programs as the ECA. The House of Representatives proposes that the amount of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 for the information and educational exchange program be reduced from the budget estimate of \$36,645,000 to \$34,000,000. That, as I say, follows the pattern of last year very closely. The Senate committee is now proposing an appropriation of \$32,700,000. I believe that the reduction of \$1,300,000 recommended by the Senate committee would be, to say the least, unrealistic in the face of present world conditions and in the light of the amount of money being devoted to communistic propaganda throughout the world.

If we are to create a peaceful world, it will not be through the use of arms alone. I do not think we can do it by the use of arms alone, nor by providing economic aid, alone. We must employ some means of arousing the understanding and the cooperation of peoples throughout the world. Present world conditions emphasize this need for a much greater effort in telling the American story abroad and in combating false propaganda with the truth. Yet, at this time, when the need is so great, an effort is being made to reduce the appropria-

tion, although the amount originally proposed was only \$36,645,000.

One particular aspect of the appropriation has to do with the exchange of students. The House committee made an observation that the emphasis should be placed on the aspect of the program, under Public Law 584, which does not call for dollars. Of course, I think that demonstrates a complete misunderstanding as to how the program operates. The dollars which were requested, which were allocated under the budget submitted by the Secretary of State, amounted to only a little more than \$600,000. Last year, we had a program with only 10 countries. The most recent addition, as will be recalled, was Austria, which brings the number of countries to 19. Yet this provision of the bill will entail a decrease in the amount of dollars which were available to carry on the program with only 10 countries. So it is obvious that if the provision is adopted it will necessitate a much further restriction of the exchange program.

As a matter of fact, for the fiscal year 1950, approximately only 50 percent of the grants which were authorized to enable foreign nationals to come to this country could be accepted because there were no dollars available. In other words, it achieves no results to urge the Department to increase the programs which use foreign currencies alone when there are no dollars to balance them. I think the total amount which would be needed under a fully balanced program would be only \$1,500,000. When we put that in the perspective of what we are doing through ECA and through other aid programs, it is merely a drop in the bucket, and I simply cannot understand the wisdom of restricting this program.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Arkansas will remember that the ECA, last year, brought students to this country for the purpose of studying our institutions, with particular reference to the matter of learning how to balance budgets. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas whether any of the students who are to be brought under this appropriation will also be interested in learning how to balance budgets?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know. I may say, first, that the ECA program is not this program and has no connection with it. The administrators of this program do not determine what the course of study shall be. I confess a doubt as to whether this would be one of the best places to find out how to balance a budget. We have considerable difficulty on that score in the Senate, I may say. So I doubt that that would be one of their principal objectives.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very brief observation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In answer to the Senator from Missouri, I may suggest that the way to balance the budget is not by depriving foreign students of any of the benefits to be enjoyed in America. The way to balance the budget is to take it out of the United States Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I said a moment ago that I had obtained a tentative statement, if this reduction remains in the bill, of what the Department estimates it will have to do in order to adjust itself to the reduction which has been imposed by the House and the Senate. On their radio program, \$405,000 would be cut from their estimated budget. I refer to the one with which they started. It is said this will require the elimination of the publication of broadcasting schedules and all other promotional activities designed to expand the overseas listening audience, and that it will make it impossible to activate certain programs in minority languages of the U. S. S. R. which are so vital in reaching a larger section of the Russian people.

The motion-picture program has been cut \$447,403. This will reduce the number of documentary motion pictures, foreign-language versions, and distribution prints by one-sixth below the present level.

Motion pictures, of course, are a very effective method, particularly among the masses in some of the countries, who are not particularly receptive to reading material because there is a certain amount of illiteracy in those countries. Motion pictures have an important field in this country as compared with the written-material field.

The press and publications cut is \$994,513. This will force a reduction of almost one-third in the present pathetically small effort which the Government is now making in the field of news and printed materials in the face of a continually expanding flood of Communist literature being issued in nearly every country of the world.

These reductions will force curtailment of our library and cultural institutes in other countries. The reduction in the appropriation for libraries is \$829,480. That program is one as to which I have heard no criticism. Reduction of our library activities will be viewed with great concern by the peoples of other nations, since they know that this is the time that we should be redoubling our efforts to show the beneficial effects of the democratic way of life.

The exchange-of-persons program would be cut \$536,354. This proposed reduction will curtail our program for the exchange of persons between the United States and other countries. Under Public Law 584, we have now signed agreements with 19 countries, permitting us to use the proceeds of sales of surplus war properties abroad for a program of educational exchange.

This is a two-way exchange of graduate students, professors, teachers, and research scholars between the United States and the 19 other countries. This reduction in the exchange-of-persons program will limit our activities, not

only with respect to exchanges financed completely by United States dollars, but will also reduce the dollars which are necessary to enable full use of foreign funds in bringing foreign students, professors, research scholars, and teachers to the United States.

Under this program, most of the money, in round figures approximately \$7,000,000 in the equivalent of foreign currencies annually, is available. I would remind the Senate that those funds did not come from appropriation by the Congress. They are credits arising out of the sale of surplus war materials. I am convinced that if the money had not been used for this purpose, we would have gotten nothing out of the surplus war materials at all. It would have gone in the same way as it did in the First World War. It is as near to getting something for nothing as I can imagine. But we cannot continue it as a one-way proposition. We cannot send 1,500 students abroad into their graduate institutions and not accept any students in return. It is provided in our own law that the program shall not be operated to the prejudice of our own students, in other words, to give places to foreign students to the exclusion of our own students. So long as it balances, it does not prejudice anyone, because if for every student we send abroad we take one, no one can say he has been excluded. So long as it is within reasonable balance it can continue.

I am confident that over a long period the other countries will not continue to accept any substantial number of our students without making it possible for an equivalent number to come to this country. It would take, I think, approximately a million and a half dollars. Last year only 50 percent of the grants offered to foreign students could be accepted because there was no way to obtain funds to support them here. Their currencies are not convertible into dollars. Even though individuals have pounds or francs, under the regulations now existing, they cannot obtain dollars. Of the 600 students brought here last year, only about one-half were supported by funds appropriated by the Government. Fraternities, individual citizens, and institutions put up the remainder of the money. I know, from the experience in my own home town, that three foreign students were supported during the past year by local citizens. All their dollar requirements were met by local citizens, and particularly by other students in the University of Arkansas.

Aside from the benefits which accrue to the individuals from abroad who come to this country, I think it is a fine way to cultivate interest in our foreign relations among our own students, and to inspire support for an intelligent foreign policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a recapitulation of the figures showing what has happened in connection with the various programs. It shows a total cut of \$3,945,000 and where it occurs in the budget.

There being no objection, the recapitulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1951 information and educational exchange programs, tentative application of House and Senate cuts

	House	Senate	Total
Radio.....	\$200,000	\$205,000	\$405,000
Motion pictures.....	272,403	175,000	447,403
Press and publications.....	784,513	210,000	994,513
Libraries.....	629,480	200,000	829,480
Exchange of persons.....	236,354	300,000	536,354
Scientific and technical cooperation.....	300,000	85,000	385,000
Administrative support.....	222,250	125,000	347,250
Total.....	2,645,000	1,300,000	3,945,000

	Original request (President's budget)	Net budget (Senate Appropriations Committee recommendation)	Obligated, fiscal year 1950 (present programs)
Radio.....	\$11,790,932	\$11,385,932	\$10,525,469
Motion pictures.....	3,886,285	3,438,882	3,800,134
Press.....	6,267,235	5,272,722	6,015,040
Libraries.....	4,190,842	3,361,362	4,187,138
Exchange of persons.....	3,507,129	2,970,775	3,440,980
Scientific and technical cooperation.....	2,985,315	2,600,315	3,238,380

¹ Exclusive of construction of radio facilities, \$9,779,616.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, we are quibbling over a small amount of money as compared with the total appropriation provided for in the bill. I want to contrast what private American institutions are doing in the field of advertising, which is an activity very closely associated with the program of information with which we are concerned.

In the last issue of the magazine Advertising Age we find the amounts which certain large manufacturing companies in this country expended for newspaper, magazine, and radio advertising in 1949.

General Motors spent \$39,184,000 for that purpose. That one company, selling automobiles, spent substantially more than this whole program would cost to carry on a reasonable program of information for the whole world.

Procter & Gamble spent \$30,305,000.

Colgate-Palmolive-Peet spent \$20,185,000.

General Foods spent \$19,727,000.

Lever Bros. spent \$19,010,000.

The total amount expended by those five great companies was \$128,411,000. Of course, there are many other companies doing the same thing, and the total expenditures would probably exceed a billion dollars.

We know that our businessmen have very good judgment and ability to analyze what is effective in their programs, and I believe the Senate might learn something from what they are doing and how they evaluate this kind of a program when it involves a matter of selling their own products.

As I understand, our program is designed to try to sell to peoples abroad what we sometimes call western civilization, or our American democracy. I think we should do it adequately, or we should abandon it. We are following a policy of starving it to death gradually

and keeping it so restricted that it is ineffective. It subjects us to criticism for not achieving results.

I feel very strongly, Mr. President, particularly with regard to the exchange program, because I followed it very closely. I attended every meeting of the Board of Foreign Scholarships held in Washington during the past 2 years.

The fiscal year of 1949 was the first full year during which this program was in operation. As late as yesterday I discussed the subject with Mr. Sargeant, one of the men from the State Department who has recently returned from a trip of inspection of the progress which is being made in European countries under this program. He was most enthusiastic about it. He was enthusiastic about the benefits resulting not only to the individual Americans who are participating, but particularly about the impression which those Americans make upon foreigners, and the reaction on the part of the people of Italy, France, England, and other countries, in which these Americans have visited, to their presence in their respective countries. I know it has the possibilities of being one of the most effective programs in promoting our foreign relations and, I would say, in preventing conditions which result in war, if it is given a reasonable time to operate.

We have had a little experience in this field with countries such as Belgium. That program involved approximately only 700 people, about 500 of them Belgians. Over a period of years it did not involve as many persons as this program has taken care of during the first year of its operation. Nevertheless, great advantages flowed from the program. I should like to pay tribute to Mr. Hoover for having had the vision to participate in setting up that program, which was undertaken immediately following the first world war. The funds involved were surplus funds left over from the relief program which he had administered. Prior to that time the Boxer indemnity funds were used for similar purposes. It was not a mutual exchange. It was not exactly like this program. However, it had some of the same elements in it. I think everyone who is familiar with it knows that it accomplished much good even though it was on a very small scale. None of these programs has been on a sufficiently large scale really to have had a large impact upon any one country. What they did was to give us a core of people in these countries with whom we could do business, and who were of great assistance to us in carrying on our foreign relations with their respective countries.

Perhaps an equally good example of what has happened from a similar program has been the experience of Robert College in Istanbul. I happened to be there 2 years ago, and I found that some of the most influential members of the Turkish Government were graduates of Robert College. They understood our country, they understood our purposes. There was no confusion in the minds of those people as to the issues involved between us and the Communists. I think anyone who has considered the

role which Turkey has played in the past 2 years, and has thought about the subject at all, will agree that it is the strongest bastion of the West in that whole area. None is afraid that Turkey will go Communist tomorrow. Certainly no one is nearly so much afraid of Turkey going Communist as we were that Italy or France might go Communist only a short time ago.

Mr. President, when I appeared before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in support of this program, some interest was evinced with regard to individual statements or reactions on the part of participants in the program. I submitted for the record a few of those comments. I do not have them all. I get some of them in the course of a year. Participants write to me from time to time. Of course, most of them go to the State Department and to the Institute of International Education in New York, which is in much more intimate touch with the program.

I desire to read for the RECORD a few excerpts from the letters and articles which I supplied to the subcommittee. Before doing so, I wish by way of preface to say that the Board of Foreign Scholarships, which was appointed 2 years ago to determine the policy for this program, is one of the finest boards I have ever seen. Its members work very hard and are extremely conscientious in their administration of the act. They do not administer it, but they determine the policy by which it is administered. First, I wish to call attention to an article by Mr. Martin R. P. McGuire, who is a member of the Board. He is a professor at the Catholic University of America. The article was published in the February issue of the Bulletin of the National Catholic Educational Association. The article appears at page 1389 of the hearings. I read from the article as follows:

The writer believes that Catholic colleges and universities should consider the Fulbright program of the highest importance and should try to participate in it as much as possible. It would seem unnecessary to observe that Catholics, as Catholics, should be more interested than others in promoting sound international understanding and cultural exchange. Yet it must be admitted that, all in all, American Catholics are not as active as they should be in this field.

At page 1390 of the hearings the following appears in Mr. McGuire's article:

I would add that it is also one of the most significant and far-reaching in its possibilities. Therefore, I hope that our Catholic colleges and universities will give it the full attention it so rightly deserves, and, above all, that they will participate actively in it in the various ways which I have indicated.

I call attention particularly to one letter, beginning at page 1390 of the hearings, written by Mr. Richard B. Bilder, who at the time he wrote the letter was at Cambridge University, in England. I believe two or three passages in the letter are extremely interesting and state concisely what I think is a very important aspect of the program. Mr. Bilder says:

The more interesting question to us both, however, is whether the Fulbright program appears to make sense from the point of view of international understanding. I am

convinced from my short time in England and on the Continent that the answer is overwhelmingly "Yes."

The "ambassadors of good will" idea, which I used to consider rather cynically, has impressed me as being really meaningful. There is no better antidote to the European conception of Americans than a normal decent American. There is nothing more damaging to Russian propaganda about America than a normal American ready and competent to fairly analyze and answer it. I have been amazed at the widespread anti-American feeling existing in Europe. In part, I think, it's irrational, based on the natural antipathy of the charity taker to the giver and on jealousy and frustration. In part, it appears to be the result of some of the grosser actions of American tourists and soldiers who, uncomfortable in their environment and without enough time to "settle in," have behaved in rather extravagant, high-handed, or immature manners. In part, unfortunately, it is also the result of the words and actions of some of the people and groups in America—phenomena which assume gross misproportion and misinterpretation over here—but nevertheless have a factual basis. Nonetheless, the feeling exists and represents a danger point to American foreign policy—one which must be neutralized as far as possible, in my opinion.

It appears to me that the Fulbright program is a very effective weapon to do this. Let me walk in a bit further with some of the things I have observed.

(1) The Fulbrighters tend to be more representative Americans than Europe has yet seen. Tourists' limitations as well as soldiers are too obvious to need comment. The Parisian America is more eccentric, more avantgarde, often of the "Let's be indignant about America—I'm way ahead of my times" school (this is a monstrous generalization). From what I've seen of my fellows here, on the other hand, they tend to be serious, mature, nice guys with both a sense of their responsibility in representing America to Europeans and yet no exaggerated sense of 200-percent Americanism which would antagonize people here.

I skip some. He says:

In England (I imagine in contrast to the Continent) the Communist line falls pretty flat, although the ignorance about things like the American political system is amazing. But what interests me most is that those who accept it are often (a) quite nice people, potential friends, or at least no enemies of the United States and (b) very articulate. I have found that frank and honest discussions on the pros and cons of American life have had no little effect on some of these people's views.

You can explain Marshall aid, how it doesn't consist of Coca-Cola, how it comes out of Americans' pockets and is an act of good will rather than imperialism, and how it couldn't possibly be an export surplus method of maintaining full employment since it began in an inflationary period. And thus on and on. Of course, these reflect my own personal views—the approach I take—but I've found the people surprisingly intelligent and a consequent necessity for admitting certain (what I consider) bad things. The best argument, of course, is that occasional error and misuse is the price that a nation must pay for democracy, and that these things are heard of in the United States whereas not in Russia because of the absence of censorship. In fact, our own papers bring these things to light. It is also impressive to these people when you point out that the United States thinks enough of the cultures of foreign nations to send students abroad to study, and is sufficiently proud of its own institutions to allow foreign students to study in the United States

in obvious contrast to Russia. These facts tend to make Russophiles, who have never seen a Russian face to face, think. Intelligent discussion, not phrase throwing, seems most effective.

It's hard to fight for democracy and diversity and the sort of spirit I believe America to represent (and the Europeans, I believe, would support) when at every turn you're frustrated by an (isolated) example of the "truth" of Communist propaganda. On the other hand, a real example—Fulbrighter Porter Williams from Charleston comes to mind—works wonders. It's one thing for an Englishman to read the Worker and another to have quiet, universally respected and liked Porter discuss the question of Negroes from personal experience. The people nod, get less indignant, more sober, go away seeing that the world isn't a black and white God and devil proposition. Typical comment: "Now we understand the problem much more clearly." Soon they're even kidding him about being a southerner and about the Yankees and also smiling at Worker headlines. It seems to me that, politically, this is enough to make the whole program a paying proposition.

Mr. President, there are a great many other letters, but I have read all I care to read out of this particular letter. I shall not take the time to read all the others, but there is one in particular which I think is interesting. This is from Mr. Albert L. Wallace, and this happens to have been addressed to me. He says:

I am from a small coal-mining district in Pennsylvania, was able to go to college only because of the GI bill and work on the side, and was rapidly coming to the end of my Government time. I wanted very badly to continue my education, in order to fit myself for university teaching, but knew that the next few years were going to be rough unless I could get a scholarship. I applied for one of your sponsored scholarships, expecting to find that they were riddled with politics and red tape, graft, and corruption. I can candidly say that I have never seen nor heard of an educational grant more capably and impartially handled, nor designed to reflect a greater influence on the course of American educational affairs. The influence of the Fulbright scholarship will continue to be felt for many generations yet to come. This is a piece of legislation of which you can justly be proud, sir.

There are several others. One which I desire to read is by Mr. Robert Trumble, who writes special articles for the New York Times.

I desire to point out that under the existing legislation, particularly the Smith-Mundt Act, everything that can be done under the point 4 program is already authorized. Of course, I am in a difficult position as to the point 4 program, because this program is held down so severely that in order to accomplish anything in this field I assume we must have an additional program.

My criticism has been that if we desire to make this program effective it would have resulted in a much more efficient administration and procedure if the amount of this appropriation had been increased, rather than to come in with a proposal for \$45,000,000 for point 4, and I understand there may be an additional appropriation for Information later. As I said before, there is all the authorization needed to carry on the program of technical assistance in the Smith-Mundt Act.

I noticed yesterday, in a discussion with a Member of the Senate, he did not seem to be aware of the extent of the authority that is contained in the Smith-Mundt Act. But here is an interesting little comment, under the date line of Rangoon, Burma, March 3, from Mr. Robert Trumble, to whom I just referred. He was talking about some of the people we had sent there. They had requested technical people, just as we anticipate under point 4. He says:

They fill some of the vacuum left by the departure of British technicians in the break with alien rule.

Practical projects range from teaching of modern agricultural methods to a physical-education program. In the realm of pure science United States researchers are collecting data under various headings, such as rural village life, the endocrine cycle of the tropical lizard, and the emergence of Burmese law upon the removal of alien courts.

All of these are modest projects, but those in the practical field mean a great deal to Burma, for they are opening avenues of development that had hardly been touched before and that are greatly needed. Burma, on her part, has sent 70 scholars to the United States for various types of training, and there is a continual clamor for more of what Americans can offer toward the improvement of the country. There are 150 applications on file for 10 United States scholarships now available.

Marshall Noble, United States Embassy officer, handling the Fulbright program here, commented that the working of the act was peculiar in Burma in that the major benefit is to this country, whereas elsewhere it was the Americans who were gaining the most from their studious activities.

Otto K. Hunerwardel, of Gainesville, Fla., a retired United States agricultural extension agent, and his wife are up north in the Shan States teaching the tribespeople for the first time that food can be preserved in cans, how to knot and splice rope, how to stretch a wire fence, and other elementary farm techniques. Mr. Hunerwardel now has the natives eating sauerkraut made from surplus cabbage that they used to throw away. He recently demonstrated caponizing for the first time in Burma and has introduced the avocado tree.

Those are very simple facts, but as I understand the point 4 program, that is the main objective. It is incredible that so many persons do not know these facts, but it is true that they do not. Carrying on this kind of work involves very little cost to us, but is of tremendous importance to the areas which may be affected. I believe we should engage in a program of this kind, which is of real and substantial assistance to other peoples who need to have knowledge given to them rather than to engage in a tremendous program along other lines which would exhaust our own resources. I believe it to be the very thing we speak of as the essence of the point 4 program.

Mr. President, I do not want to be misunderstood as trying to criticize the point 4 program. I say only that I think it would have been better judgment on the part of the Appropriations Committee to have considered the whole picture and tried to provide for one effective program rather than to spread it out along different avenues.

As I understand, point 4 will entail a new coordinator, and a new organization, whereas, in my opinion, there now exists a very efficient organization in the State Department. It had some diffi-

culties in the beginning with respect to the Voice of America. That was a new undertaking. I think we can all understand why there were difficulties in connection with it. But I have heard very little criticism of it in the past few years. The trouble is that the sum which we appropriate for it is entirely too small. It should be much greater. I think the minimum for this program should be \$50,000,000 this year.

What should not be lost sight of is that this is not a mere "business as usual" program. I think it is of extreme importance in the very grave fight for survival between western civilization and communism. Of course, an efficient army is fundamental, but the next most important activity I can think of is this program.

In thumbing through the appropriation bill, I found one item with which I happen to be familiar. The item deals with the RFC. Those who advocated it had no difficulty in having the appropriation increased in the committee by \$700,000 on the basis that there were more mortgages to be handled in the coming year than were handled during the past year. Since that time, however, we have transferred the National Federal Mortgage Association to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. That increase was obtained apparently without much difficulty.

I asked the committee to earmark not less than \$1,500,000—not an additional \$1,500,000, because \$680,000 was already appropriated, and therefore the amount would be less than \$1,000,000—to carry on the program for the exchange of students. The words "exchange of students" I think perhaps are a cause of some misunderstanding of the real significance of the program. These students come from every State. It is true, of course, that the great State of New York has representation far out of proportion to its size, but that is because of the great concentration of educational institutions in that State. Nevertheless, every State participates in the program. That is because it is extremely important that there be persons in every community of this country who shall have some knowledge of the rest of the world, and who can, when they return, be the source of originating ideas, present explanations of what is going on, and explain our policy, can help in developing a real backing for the policies which our Government undertakes, and, of course, help in the formulation of such policies to the extent that they participate in public affairs.

I shall speak of another very important thing. Recently there has been much criticism of the State Department, as there has been throughout our history. The Department is not very intimately connected with the processes of becoming elected to office. We all neglect it, and among our youth there is a very limited source of humane material for the State Department.

I visited some of the American Embassies abroad, and I found most excellent men representing us. I am not offering this as a criticism, but as an explanation. I do not think we can expect otherwise, but in many cases the excellent men in

our embassies could not speak the language of the country to which they had been sent. Few had had any previous experience abroad. But think how much more effective we would be if a large group of our citizens of the highest talents could receive some experience abroad, come back, as I think some of them would, with a desire to assist their country and Government in its foreign relations, and volunteer service in positions of influence where they could help the United States develop some system that might preserve peace in the world.

I can think of nothing, as I said, aside from an extremely able and strong army, that would contribute more to the preservation of peace. Indeed, I think it would contribute much more than an army would to the preservation of peace, and also, if we must have war, it would be extremely valuable in the prosecution of war. Wars are no longer provincial quarrels. Men who know and understand the peoples of the world are invaluable in the prosecution of modern global warfare.

Senators will recall what difficulty we had in the last war in rounding up persons who knew something about Japan. I remember that a search was made all over the country for anyone who had pictures of places in Japan. In my State of Arkansas, where it was not likely that there would be many persons who had such pictures, inquiries were made for maps or pictures of Japan and China and all the Pacific area. That would indicate that there were extremely few persons in this great country who had any knowledge at all of that area, and the same can be said of persons having knowledge of the rest of the world.

Americans are notoriously bad linguists. That is not because of the fact that they are not intelligent and are not capable of learning other languages, but because there has not been much occasion for them to do so or much opportunity. But under this program the cream of the youth of our country will, as they hear of the program, apply themselves to the learning of other languages. I think they have already done so.

This is the first year of the full operation of the program. It was conducted on a very restricted scale a year ago. Some 800 scholarships were granted as of last fall. This year there are more than 6,000 applications, I believe. A tremendous interest is being shown. There are 1,190 educational institutions in this country which have committees composed of members of the faculty who undertake to screen the applicants.

Someone raised the question in committee the other day how the applicants are screened. The question was asked whether the danger did not exist of sending abroad or receiving them from abroad persons who might be Communists. I think the best way to screen them in the initial stages is by persons on the campus where the applicants have gone to school, who have known the applicants for 2 or 3 years. Most of them, however, are graduates, which in the normal course of events would mean they had gone to college 4 years. If there is

any way to provide any guaranty with respect to the character of the individuals, it is by the method I have just described. We have instituted a policy which decentralizes—and it will progressively decentralize more than it does now—responsibility for the selection of the persons who come under the program. I know of no better way to guarantee that we will get the best possible candidates under this program than the screening method on the campus.

What will happen in 3, 5, or 10 years, as these individuals return to America, after the experience they have had abroad, and begin to assume their places in our society, and I hope in the Government? What will happen in private life as they become journalists or teachers or business men? I think the potentialities of the program are practically unlimited. I doubt that I myself can even visualize what is possible if the program is properly carried forward on a scale sufficiently large to make an impact upon our great country.

As I said, the program heretofore has been on a small scale. The result, however, of that small scale program I think justifies great confidence in the effectiveness of the program as a whole.

Mr. President, the report I spoke of was published last October, when only 10 countries were participating. Today 19 countries have signed. As of last October there were a few more than 1,800 participants in all categories. That is beginning to be a substantial number. About 830 or 840 of those consist of Americans going abroad, approximately 600 of Europeans coming here, and the difference of approximately 390, is made up of foreign people going to American institutions abroad. Those are round figures.

Mr. President, I desire to emphasize that heretofore only 10 countries were involved. There are 19 now. So that if we have to spread over 19 a lesser appropriation than we had for 10, it can be seen what will happen to the program. If we continue along the same line for the next few years I think the result will be a gradual strangulation and elimination of the program.

I cannot see the sense of it. The best estimate we can make is that after it is full grown, with 19 countries participating, about a million and a half dollars is all that would be needed to supplement the travel grants, which can be paid for in foreign credits.

In my judgment, a terrible mistake is being made in cutting this program down, and if once it is cut down and the people lose interest in it, it will be dead, and I know of no way to revive it until perhaps after the next war, or some other catastrophe. The tendency to neglect vital programs, which should be carried on as permanent programs, when there seems to be a lull in our difficulties, has been one of the great curses of our foreign policy. We become excited after trouble and try to do something, Mr. President, and immediately when there is a lull we cut it down.

I have wondered in the last day or two whether the committee would have reduced this appropriation if the Korean

outbreak had occurred before it reported the bill, because this program certainly has a bearing on the developments of the past few days.

I cannot think of a more valuable contact, for example, than if we had several hundred men in Indochina, let us say, or Burma, or Indonesia, who had been to school here, who had contacts, who spoke the language, who understood what our purposes are. If such a group were there functioning today, what a great source of strength it would be to us. The same can be said of other countries.

It simply does not make sense to me to cut down this program when so small an amount is involved. We can go through the bill, and here and there and everywhere find vast amounts of money appropriated for things that have no relation to our essential security, to the difficulties that confront us from abroad.

I hope the Senate will reinstate this small amount, at least for this program, and not cut it below the estimate of the Budget Bureau.

THE SITUATION IN KOREA—ARTICLE BY HAROLD ICKES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I was rather shocked this morning to read a dispatch which appeared in the Washington News telling of an attack published in the current issue of New Republic by Harold Ickes against the Allied supreme commander in the Far East, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I could hardly believe my eyes, and I sent for a copy of the New Republic to read the article in full.

Mr. President, the Communist press and their left-wing allies have been attacking the supreme commander in the Far East for a long time, but I hardly expected; and I think that the American people hardly expected, that a former member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States would drive a knife into the back of the supreme commander, who is responsible for the defense of the American position in Korea and in the Far East.

Mr. President, this attack is less excusable because it is unjustified and is untruthful. Were it not for the fact that if unchallenged, the misstatements by Mr. Ickes might be picked up and used as facts elsewhere, I would not rise on the floor of the Senate today to challenge the article, but I think that when an article is as untruthful, and as filled with misstatements as this is, the Members of the Senate and the people of the United States are entitled to have the story scotched right now.

In the first place, the charge of Mr. Ickes is that General MacArthur was caught flat-footed and unready. The facts of the matter are, Mr. President, that the Korea mission to train the troops in that country was not under the command of General MacArthur. It was a mission established, as in Greece, under the American Ambassador, who was responsible to the Department of State, and not to General MacArthur.

Mr. President, so that I will not be misunderstood, I do not mean in that statement to be critical of Ambassador Muccio. I have the highest regard for him. I think that he is one of our top diplomats

in that area of the world. Ambassador Muccio I met when I was in Korea, and I stopped at the American Embassy. I have never seen a more conscientious public official. I know that he was greatly concerned because of the lack of material being sent to Korea.

I happened to have gone to the thirty-eighth parallel. I talked with the members of the mission in Korea. I know that they were greatly concerned about the situation. But the decisions that were made not to have American combat forces in Korea were decisions that were made in Washington, and not by General MacArthur in the Far East.

Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that for a long period of time General MacArthur, in his dispatches to the Department of the Army, kept them fully conversant with the fact that the spread of communism in Asia was detrimental to the peace of the world and the security of the United States, and when the archives are finally opened I think they will be found to be replete with messages from General MacArthur giving an accurate summary of the dangers in that area of the world.

Mr. President, in addition, in this article which Mr. Ickes wrote, he criticizes General MacArthur for the fact that some of our equipment needed by the Korean forces had not been sent out there. I again underscore the fact that that was not General MacArthur's responsibility. The decisions that were made were made here in Washington, and before the committees of the Congress of the United States there has been ample testimony that of the \$10,000,000 allotted in the arms implementation bill of 1949 for Korea, less than \$200 had been spent for shipments made prior to June 24. The only shipment which had taken place up to the time when war broke out in the Pacific area was a shipment of some signal equipment out of our surplus and excess stocks. Mr. Ickes in his statement said:

Our civilian Ambassador to Seoul, John J. Muccio, had returned to Washington a month or so earlier to warn that South Korea was in danger of attack. With little support, he made enough of an impression to induce the shipment of some heavy artillery for use against the terrorizing Soviet tanks of the North Korean Army. It had been alleged that a leak apprised the Communists of this shipment, with the result that they launched their attack before the artillery could reach Korea.

Mr. President, there was no such shipment of artillery prior to the start of the fighting. I have accurately stated the fact that the only shipment under the arms implementation program which had taken place prior to the outbreak of hostilities on the 24th of June, our time, or the 25th of June, Korean time, was some signal equipment.

Mr. President, I believe the Members of the Senate who read this article will find that it is loaded with misstatements. It is an obvious attempt to smear the United Nations Supreme Commander in the Far East. It gives aid and comfort to the enemy. Even though Mr. Ickes has apparently turned his back on General MacArthur, in the heavy responsibilities he has out there, I am sure that

neither the Congress nor the American people will turn their backs on our commander in the Far East.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending amendment, which is identical with the one I offered earlier today.

I do not think it is necessary to tell the Senate how vital this program is, in the light of current events abroad. The savage and desperate struggle now raging in Korea in only one front—admittedly a critical one—in the great conflict in which we are engaged in the world today.

What are we fighting for in Korea? Yes, we are fighting in support of our own national security and our own national interests. But if this were all we were fighting for, we might well consider whether Korea was the best front on which to fight. The fact is that we are fighting for our way of life and for the way of freedom throughout the world. We are fighting for the right of all nations and of all peoples to order their destinies without being subject to violent aggression or violent interference in their internal affairs. We are fighting for the principles of freedom, democracy, and equality of opportunity for all men.

In order to maintain this fight, in order to press forward with it, we must reach the peoples of the world through every medium and by every means available to us. We must reach them and convince them of our motives and purposes. We must assure them of our interest in their welfare. We must assure them of our desire for their security.

I need not tell Members of this body how vital the information and educational activities financed with these funds are. I believe that the amount recommended by the Budget Bureau is far from adequate for the tasks confronting it. I expect that the President may request us, in the days ahead, vastly to increase these funds.

In view of the testimony presented in recent days by such competent witnesses as General Marshall, General Eisenhower, Secretary Acheson, and others before the Thomas subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, it is obviously foolhardy to cut back on the very inadequate sum recommended by the Budget Bureau.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas has already outlined eloquently and convincingly the damage which could be done to our efforts to convey an understanding of our motives to other countries, were the student exchange program to be curtailed. I think that is a very great danger. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that nothing we could do would bring greater returns and greater dividends for our own security and for the protection of our way of life than the continuation—nay, the expansion—of the exchange-student program.

But I have been informed by competent officials that many other essential projects in the information program will suffer greatly if the proposed cuts are sustained. For example, the State Department has been planning to short-wave new programs to various minority groups in the Soviet Union. Today the State Department broadcasts only in Russian and in Ukrainian. Many other groups in the Soviet Union are believed to be hungry for freedom and for information about the non-Communist world. The Voice of America, if broadcast in other languages, would be very effective in providing this information. Unless we restore these cuts, the State Department will not be able to proceed with these plans.

Another effect of this curtailment of funds would be on the motion-picture program. In many areas of the world, motion pictures have been our most effective ambassadors. In connection with the supplying of films to foreign national groups, it is necessary to provide translations and captions in the foreign language in question. If we do not vote adequate funds, this program will be severely handicapped.

There are many other activities, too, which would suffer from these reductions. For example, the State Department now maintains approximately 150 libraries in various parts of the world. These libraries are windows opening up a view of America to scholars, businessmen, government officials, and working people. This library program, too, must be maintained and expanded as an additional weapon in the battle for men's minds.

Mr. President, the least we can do today is to restore the full amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget. We should and must serve notice to the world that the United States is not retrenching in these programs but is expanding and proposes to carry the campaign of truth to the furthest reaches of the world.

A wise man said "The truth shall make you free." We must help make men free through activities such as this. I hope the Senate will support this amendment and any other amendments to increase the funds for this vital undertaking.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONNOR in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Langer
Anderson	Gillette	Leahy
Brewster	Graham	Lehman
Bricker	Green	Lodge
Bridges	Gurney	Lucas
Butler	Hayden	McCarran
Byrd	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Capehart	Hickenlooper	McClellan
Chapman	Hill	McFarland
Chavez	Hoeey	McKellar
Connally	Holland	McMahon
Cordon	Humphrey	Magnuson
Donnell	Ives	Malone
Douglas	Jenner	Martin
Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.	Maybank
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Millikin
Eaton	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Ellender	Kem	Mundt
Ferguson	Kerr	Murray
Frear	Kilgore	Myers
Fulbright	Knowland	Neely

O'Connor	Smith, N. J.	Tydings
O'Mahoney	Sparkman	Watkins
Robertson	Stennis	Wherry
Russell	Taft	Wiley
Saltonstall	Thomas, Okla.	Williams
Schoepfel	Thomas, Utah	Young
Smith, Maine	Thye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAM in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and to give very briefly my reasons therefor. I think the committee has been exceedingly generous with respect to this particular proposal. I enjoyed the speech of the Senator from Arkansas very much. He makes a very engaging speech when he has a subject such as this, which involves the education of youth, to which to address himself. In my opinion, however, he has somewhat overlooked the practical aspects involved. We have here a somewhat different situation from that which obtained when the Senator from Arkansas first undertook to advance this proposal.

Much has been said by the Senator from Arkansas, as well as by the Senator from New York, concerning the effect of the defeat of this proposal. Mr. President, if the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas should be rejected, it would not mean the defeat of the program.

Reference has been made to action of the committee in recommending an appropriation of \$32,700,000, when the Budget Bureau's estimate called for \$36,645,000, which represents a difference of nearly \$4,000,000 between what the Budget Bureau estimated and what the Senate committee actually provided.

Let us see how that would work ordinarily and how it will work in this case. Suppose I became interested in an excellent, kindly, friendly proposal such as this one; and, being a poor man, I did not have the money to carry it out. Suppose I went to one of my friends—there are several here in the Senate whom I could name, but I shall not do so—whom I know to be very well off, indeed, in this world's goods; and suppose I said to him, "Here is a proposition I have. I have figured out what it will cost. It will do an immense amount of good, but I do not have the money it requires. I know you are a rich man, whereas I am a poor man; and I want you to help me out."

Suppose my friend replied, "What is the amount of money you want?"

Then suppose I said, "As I figure it out, it will take \$36,000,000 to carry out my plan. It will be very helpful to the young people and students in many foreign countries. It is true that we were not elected for the special purpose of enacting legislation to help the young people of foreign countries; to the contrary, we were elected for the purpose, among others, of helping with the education of our own people. Nevertheless, I think this project is a very worthy one and should be put into effect."

Suppose my friend then would say to me, "I have looked into it; I have had experts examine it; I have had persons in whom I have great confidence consider

it carefully. I cannot give you \$36,000,000, but here is \$32,700,000."

Mr. President, would it be good judgment for me to refuse that amount? Would not I be a little off the track of what is practical if I were to refuse a proposal of that kind?

Could the Senator from Arkansas conscientiously say that because he could not get \$36,645,000, he should refuse a somewhat smaller amount? Are we to understand that the appropriation of \$32,700,000, approximately \$4,000,000 less than the full amount requested, will result in spoiling the entire project?

Mr. President, this is a new project; one of this kind has not previously been established. It is true that the ECA is beginning a similar project, and it is true that the State Department is beginning a similar project; and it is true that the State Department is mentioned in connection with this particular case. However, this project is a new one.

Can the Senator from Arkansas conscientiously say that because the Senate committee and the Senate itself and the Congress will not give him the amount of money he requests—namely, \$36,645,000—but is willing to give him nearly \$33,000,000, that will destroy his project? What figures does the Senator have to show that the reduction by less than \$4,000,000 of the amount of the appropriation for this project will ruin the project or will spoil it, as he argued to us so persuasively a few minutes ago? I simply cannot see it that way.

I think the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and subsequently the full Appropriations Committee itself have been exceedingly generous to the Senator from Arkansas and to his proposal.

It is a worthy proposal. If we had plenty of money, the situation would be different; but I doubt very much whether the proposal will be ruined by the appropriation of a somewhat smaller amount of money than the full amount requested. The item is in the bill; and I expect to vote for it, so far as the amount of nearly \$33,000,000 is concerned. The committee has determined to reduce the amount to that extent.

So I earnestly hope the Senator from Arkansas will forego his amendment to the committee amendment, and will not ask the Senate to adopt his amendment to the committee amendment, in view of the relatively small difference between the two amounts.

Would not it be better for the Senator from Arkansas to agree to the smaller amount, especially in view of the present financial condition of the Government—with an unbalanced budget and with our boys being killed on foreign fields, and with the necessity for the Congress to appropriate large sums of money to protect our boys, so far as we can, and also to protect our country?

So it seems to me that the practical, everyday, good-sense view of the matter would be for the Senator from Arkansas to say that he is perfectly willing to accept an amount which in my judgment the House and the Senate committee have been most generous in agreeing to.

I do not believe that the amount recommended by the committee for this program has even been equaled before. I do not recall a time when our Government has ever been more generous in making provision for an undertaking of this sort.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I may say to the Senator that I did not intend to leave the impression that if the full amount of approximately \$36,000,000 is not appropriated, I shall not want to have any amount appropriated. I did not seek to leave that impression.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps the Senator misunderstood me. Nevertheless, he referred to the fact that the proposed decrease would spoil the project. So much was said about the sad effect on the project if the amount of the appropriation were reduced to \$32,700,000, that I received the impression that the Senator from Arkansas had it figured out in his own mind and knew where every dollar of the money would be used, and that he was convinced that if the entire amount of \$36,645,000 was not appropriated, he would not want any money at all appropriated, but would turn down any smaller amount.

I hope the Senator will not turn down this most magnificent gift—the most magnificent gift the Government has ever made for such a purpose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, first let me explain my own attitude. After all, this is not a private project of my own, and I do not expect to get one of these scholarships.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I am not suggesting that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This program will be administered by the State Department. The objective of this program is the same as the objective of the ECA.

I should like to make a deal with the Senator from Tennessee: I will vote to cut the ECA appropriation \$10,000,000 if the Senator from Tennessee will agree to add \$5,000,000 to the appropriation for this program. Certainly I think the country will benefit a great deal more from a program which will enable us to have in our country citizens of 19 foreign countries, who will be influential both in a military and in a diplomatic and in a business sense, then if we were to spend money on a factory in one of those countries. It is truly my judgment that the return from this program is the best return we can receive from an investment of public funds. That is all there is to it.

If the program does not have a real bearing upon the promotion of our foreign policy, the official policy of this Government, then I say it should be entirely eliminated. If we are wrong in the significance we attach to the program, then it should be abandoned. But it is an accepted policy, as expressed in two laws passed by Congress, one being Public Law 584, passed in 1946, and the other the Smith-Mundt Act. So the program is not a new one. All the reduction in the appropriation does is

simply to make the amount so small that the program cannot be effective.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator from Arkansas make the argument to this body that reducing the amount available for the program from \$36,645,000 to \$32,700,000 will destroy the program? Is that what the Senator says?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The reduction in the appropriation will weaken it substantially.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will weaken it substantially, the Senator says.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It certainly will.

Mr. McKELLAR. How in the world can a Senator say that a reduction of about \$4,000,000—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is a 10-percent reduction in the program.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator think that a 10-percent reduction in the appropriation will destroy the program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I say it will substantially weaken it. I think the same can be said about many other programs.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I hope the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will not compromise in line with the suggestion just made.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not going to compromise, Mr. President. When the Senator uses the word "compromise," he reminds me of an incident that occurred in my own life. I will tell the story. At one time I was engaged in a great law suit. It was a forgery case. There was involved a considerable sum of money, thirty or forty thousand dollars, which in these days, when I was a youngster, meant a great deal. By the way, we had no income tax in those days, Mr. President.

My law partner was an elderly lawyer. He turned the case over to me for the purpose, as he said, of advertising me. I said, "Good heavens, Carroll, how can you expect to advertise me by giving me a big lawsuit such as this which you say at the outset cannot be won? You said I must not fool myself about succeeding in winning it. You just told me it was impossible to win it." He said, "I have written a two-page letter to the bank telling them the case cannot be won. I heard you try a case the other day, though you did not know it. What you need is advertising. This case will advertise you."

I could not understand how losing a case of any kind would favorably advertise a young lawyer. So I demurred very strongly. However, my partner had the upper hand and I had to follow his advice, and I did so.

There were 11 lawyers on the other side. The endorsers of the paper were all rich men, and they had employed good lawyers. I tried the case and to the astonishment of everyone I won it. The case went to the Supreme Court of

the State of Tennessee and I finally won it there. But while it was there the lawyers on the other side, one of whom was Gen. Luke Wright, who was afterward Secretary of War under Theodore Roosevelt, another one of whom was Thomas B. Turley, who held the same position that I hold now as United States Senator—both were great lawyers—came to Colonel Carroll and offered to settle the case at 50 cents on the dollar, for half the face of the notes. Colonel Carroll recommended that settlement to the bank. The bank agreed to it.

Colonel Carroll, it seems, had delivered a talk at the bank directors' meeting, and had spoken about me. At that meeting one of the directors insisted on calling for me. I went there. The director said that Colonel Carroll had recommended that the bank accept the offer of settlement, and wanted to know what I would recommend if the case were mine. I may say it was not my case. It came to the office before I became a partner of Colonel Carroll. I tried to evade answering the question, but could not. So, very foolishly, I said, "Colonel Carroll and gentlemen, I would not accept that compromise." I placed myself in that position. I refused the compromise. It was not a compromise such as the one offered by us to the Senator from Arkansas. We offered him practically everything. The compromise in question was a 50-50 compromise. One of the directors said, "Mr. President, I move we reconsider and let the case take its course." So I was placed in the situation of continuing to fight the case, because the motion was adopted by the bank directors. The case went to the Supreme Court, and I won it there.

I will say I never spent any more unhappy days in my life than those I spent after having made that very foolish decision. I did not know what would finally happen. What did happen was that through good luck the Supreme Court decided in my favor, and my clients got every dollar of the money sued for.

The Senator from Arkansas may obtain every dollar he seeks, but I doubt it. If I were in his place I would certainly accept the approximately \$4,000,000 cut out in the \$36,000,000 asked for.

Looking at the matter in a plain, common-sense, everyday way, I express the hope that the Senate will stand by the committee. The subcommittee, of which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is chairman, which considered this matter gave it its best attention. They had received the very best proof and evidence that could be obtained on the subject. They recommended an immense amount of money to begin with.

Mr. President, we must not fool ourselves about the way we spend money. We are spending money too rapidly. There is no telling what may happen to us. We are already on the verge of a war, and we ought not to go haywire, so to speak, and throw money away.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In view of the arguments made yesterday, I desire to pro-

pound a question to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. This body has been in existence longer than the public laws to which the Senator from Arkansas referred. Does not the Senator from Tennessee consider the amount of \$32,000,000 allowed by the subcommittee and approved by the full committee for this program to be a respectable amount?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not only is the amount the committee recommended a respectable amount for the purpose in question, but it is one of the most generous things any government in the world has ever done. Members of this body are all highly educated and highly informed men. Does any Senator, man or woman, know of any comparable gift made by any government for the purpose of education—a gift made by one government to the citizens of other governments or to other governments? Does anyone know of any such generosity by one government to another government or by one people to another people? If so, I yield to any Senator who will rise to say that he knows of a more generous gift than this one. Mr. President, I think this is the most generous gift which ever was proposed.

It has been only during the past few years that we have felt that the Federal Government has the power to contribute to the cost of education in the States. However, under the proposal now before us we shall be providing for education all over the world.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that we are not contributing to the individual States in the way that we shall be contributing to the foreign countries under this program?

Mr. McKELLAR. Undoubtedly that is true.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not also true that although the Senate has passed a bill for Federal aid to education, the Congress as a whole has not passed it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes the House has not passed it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it true that that measure is not the law of the land?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. On the other hand, under the program now before us, we shall be contributing very liberally to the proposal sponsored very nobly, in my opinion, by the Senator from Arkansas; shall we not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to make it clear that the major part of this money is not for education at all. The amount of money to be used for that purpose is only a minor part of the entire amount. In the original budget estimate, only \$682,000 was to be used for that purpose. If the amount provided is distributed according to the schedule I read a moment ago, which I obtained from the State Department, the amount of money

to be used for education will be cut in half, reduced, let us say, to \$350,000.

Certainly it is incorrect to leave the impression that the entire amount for this program will be used for educational purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. If only \$350,000 will be used for that purpose, what will become of the remainder of the \$32,000,000 or \$36,000,000?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I mean to say that the Senator from Tennessee left the impression that the entire amount is to be used for education.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then what is the remainder of the fund to be used for?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The particular part to be used for the exchange of students is a very small portion of the full amount.

However, of course, I am interested in the entire program, including the library service, publications, radio, and other things.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that my neighbor from Arkansas—for he lives near me and he bears a very fine reputation in his State—is a very active and vigorous and, I think, successful logician, but I do not agree with his logic in this case; I think he goes too far. If we are to begin this plan, and if we are to continue with it, I think we should do so in a reasonable and an ordinary way. I think we should not undertake to spend such tremendous sums of money for such purposes while the state of the world is as it is at the present time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the principal purpose of the entire sum is to try to make the state of the world a little better.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senator from Arkansas has that purpose, because nothing else could very well impel him to take the position he does regarding this matter. I know he conscientiously believes it. However, I think he is mistaken. It is not possible to buy the friendship of men or of nations. Sometimes we have tried to do so; but, as a matter of fact, it is impossible to purchase the friendship of either men or of nations. Those who try it find that it is a very difficult thing to do. We have tried it several times, and have found the difficulty; and I hope we never undertake it again.

Mr. President, I favor education as much as does anyone else. When I was a boy I had to work in the fields in the hot sun. Sometimes the temperature rose to 95 or 100; and it is rather difficult to chop cotton or plant corn or cultivate corn when the temperature is that high. However, finally I worked out my own education. I have the greatest sympathy for the boy or girl who is not educated, but who wants to have an education. We should help them in every way we can.

However, this proposal comes at the wrong time, just now.

I appeal to my colleagues in this body to vote with the committee on this matter, Mr. President. The committee has done a very sensible and fair and just thing. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the chairman of the subcommittee, has allowed the Senator from Arkansas almost all he wants. The cup

of the Senator from Arkansas may not be running over, but it is almost running over. Yet he comes before us now and opposes the allowance the committee has so generously voted to make in this matter.

I hope that upon second thought the Senator from Arkansas will withdraw his amendment to the committee amendment, for it should be withdrawn. This is no time to spend money in the way the Senator from Arkansas proposes.

Mr. President, strange as it may appear, there are in this country some boys and girls who need an education, and need it very badly. However, although we are making some provision for education, we are not doing so in the way that would be done for the young people of foreign countries under this proposal, under which considerable sums of money would be spent for that purpose in foreign countries. Strange as it may seem, Mr. President, of course—to look at the distinguished Senator from Arkansas—one would never think so, because he gives every appearance of success, happiness, good education, and everything else—but, strange as it may seem, there are in Arkansas some persons who would like to be educated in the way that the proposal now before us provides for the education of persons in foreign countries. Certainly there are in the United States, and certainly there are in Arkansas, in particular, young people who would like to have these grand trips and would like to have this generosity showered upon them. However, this is not the time to do so.

This program should be deferred, Mr. President.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I simply wish to point out—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was going to make an observation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee a question. Does not the chairman of the Appropriations Committee think that in order to show the people of the United States just what this money is to be spent for, the entire wording of this particular section of the bill—appearing on pages 53 to 55—should be inserted at this point in the RECORD? Let me read it, if the indulgence of the Senator from Tennessee is granted me for the moment, so that we may keep the record clear as to how much money the American people, the taxpayers—the ones who would punish the Senate—are willing to spend for this particular purpose:

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of State to carry out international information and educational activities—

That, of course, has nothing to do with the educational program about which the Senator from Arkansas talks. But—as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948.

We then come to the following:

Salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the

Foreign Service Act of 1946 * * * ; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation (not to exceed \$11,000); printing and binding; entertainment within the United States.

This is not for the entertainment of American boys or American girls, but it is for the entertainment of those who are to become the beneficiaries of the \$32,700,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. My understanding is—and I ask the Senator from Arkansas whether it is correct—that the students are to be brought to the United States from various foreign countries at the expense of the United States, they are to be kept here at our expense, and they are to be educated at the expense of the United States Government—all of which, as I have said time and again this afternoon to the Senator from Arkansas, is very generous. It is extremely generous. It is extraordinarily generous. The Senator cannot mention another country that has ever done anything like it. It is wonderfully generous. But it is all being done at the expense of the United States. The budget of the United States Government is not balanced, as we all know. I hope to heaven it will be balanced, and balanced soon. I believe that a country ought to pay its debts, just as I believe that a man ought to pay his debts. A man who does not do so is hardly worthy to live.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to proceed, in order to make the RECORD straight as to where the \$32,700,000 which the committee approved, and which is now being recommended to the Senate for its approval, is to go. I mentioned entertainment within the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How much?

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it so much per day?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is "not to exceed \$5,000." Nevertheless, that \$5,000 is part of the \$32,700,000 recommended by the Senate committee. Reading further from the bill:

Hire of passenger motor vehicles.

Are those for American boys or American girls? I ask the Senator from Arkansas. It continues:

Services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 * * * ; advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons—

That is, transporting their remains when they die here—

not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; establishment and operation of agricultural and other experiment and demonstration stations in other American countries, on land acquired by gift or lease, and construction of necessary buildings thereon; radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, nar-

ration and script-writing, by contract or otherwise; and purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments—

A presentation to our Government? A presentation to our schools and to our institutions? No—

to foreign governments, schools, or organizations; \$32,700,000—

The sum approved by the Committee on Appropriations.

I think the committee has been extremely liberal. If the argument yesterday was correct, that this body cannot provide for itself necessary and adequate office space and rooms in order to take care of the needs of Senators, so that an employee may be able to wash her hands in privacy, then I think the same argument should be used in this particular instance, because as stated by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the committee has been liberal, and its action should be sustained. We have been extremely liberal, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. I now want to yield to my friend from New York.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Question! Question!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the solicitude of the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is appreciated. He appeared before the committee and made an extensive statement, in his able way. The trouble now is that the Senator, to my mind, is addressing himself to the wrong tribunal. The committee has recommended an appropriation of \$32,700,000, which the State Department can allocate as it sees fit. It can cut its program if it sees fit, though it is not required to do so. What the Senator from Arkansas can do is to address the State Department and see to it that the cut is not quite so deep as is indicated by his figure.

I have a copy of the figures I think the Senator was using today, by which it is proposed to cut the item of exchange of persons program \$300,000. I do not see that that is necessary. The Department can do as it likes about that.

Mr. President, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$32,700,000, which is \$1,300,000 below the House figure, and \$3,945,000 below the Budget Bureau's estimate.

For 1950, the appropriation was \$47,300,000. But \$11,475,000 of that amount was for a nonrecurring item, namely, the construction of radio range and facilities. The committee is aware that there are those who favor tremendous increase in this item. We have heard all kinds of figures that could be used in connection with this program. The committee's recommendation is felt to be sufficient, in view of the Government's present fiscal condition, and we feel that the amount recommended will allow a well balanced program in the field.

If this were the only money to be applied to this particular objective it might

be different. At least, those who are so solicitous about it might have some concern. But let me say that ECA has a technical assistance program of \$15,000,000, which involves the very same items. The High Commissioner of Germany has a program of \$18,500,000, which involves almost the same identical item as this. The Government of Occupied Areas has a program of \$4,350,000, involving items such as this; and Point 4, with \$10,000,000, in this very bill, has a program quite similar to this.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. President, sometimes we can take cognizance of rumors. There is a rumor which is now prevalent that the President is to send to the Senate a message requesting a supplemental \$100,000,000 to be applied to this particular program. The Appropriations Committee was guided by what was thought to be, and which is now thought to be, the view of the Congress. In other words, it is necessary to make a cut somewhere. With reference to this program, perhaps if we had \$20,000,000,000 to spare, more might be appropriated for it. But we do not have it. There is a deficit now, and it is increasing. We are operating "in the red," and we are going to go further "in the red." From day to day we are going to have a call for more and more appropriations for necessities, in order that we may save lives abroad, in order that we may bring this war to an end—call it a war or a police activity, or whatever one may wish to call it; I care not what.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I promised to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator mentioned the point 4 program, involving \$10,000,000. Is it not true that we authorized the transfer of over \$2,000,000 into that fund?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct; but does not that all the more augment my position?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would gather from the attitude of the Senator and from the attitude of the other members of the committee that any proposals for any increased sums would certainly meet with a cold reception in the committee. If it is unwilling to recommend in this instance an appropriation of approximately \$36,000,000, how in the world can any proposal of \$100,000,000 be expected to be accepted? Here is a regular program which has been authorized by two legislative acts. It is in being; it is functioning.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So, in my opinion, it is not logical to cut it on the basis of rumors as to some other programs which may or may not come up.

Mr. McCARRAN. But we are not cutting it. The Senator takes a position, which led to a fallacious statement a while ago, that this will ruin the entire

program. It will not do anything of the kind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would certainly weaken it.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator's attitude is like that of the character in the fable who was holding out for more. We would give the Senator more if it were possible, and if we could see the results.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point before he goes to another point?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am perfectly willing to join with the committee to cut the ECA appropriation. They are both designed for the same purpose, namely, to further our foreign policy. It is my considered judgment that a dollar spent in connection with this program will bring greater returns than will a dollar spent for ECA. There we have a program calling for \$3,000,000,000, but the committee could not swallow \$36,000,000. If the Senator wants to save money by cutting the ECA appropriation, he has my vote.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say, in response to what the able Senator from Arkansas has just said, that as chairman of the watchdog committee I went before the Appropriations Committee and recommended a cut in ECA so that the amount would be only \$2,200,000,000, plus the carry-over, which is \$276,000,000. I think the ECA appropriation should be cut; I have said so repeatedly. I think it should be reduced so that in 1952 it will be cut out completely. Somewhere along the line, Mr. President, the Congress must curtail expenditures. Here is a place where, if the program has all the merits claimed for it—and I am not going to argue about that—the Senator from Arkansas can take his fine argument to the State Department and say, "Do not cut this program; cut somewhere else." I think it would be a forceful argument, because if he presents his argument to the State Department as he presented it to the Subcommittee on Appropriations, he will be very convincing. That is why he is getting what he is getting.

I apologize to the Senator. I did not mean it as a personal matter at all. The program is now receiving a large amount from the Appropriations Committee. If the State Department wants to cut the particular item \$300,000, it is not the fault of the Appropriations Committee. They can allocate the appropriation as they see fit and as they think the program deserves.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to make it clear that I asked the committee to earmark a minimum amount for the program, but the committee refused to do so.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows better than I do how these things operate. They have certain overhead expenses, and there is nothing I can do about it, and the Senator from Nevada cannot do anything about it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Cuts are always made where there is the greatest pull on

the heart strings. That is the reason why the program in which the Senator from Arkansas is so much interested has been cut. It was known that the Senator, with his natural eloquence, would go to the floor and try to have the amount restored.

Mr. President, I shall not hold the Senate any longer. The committee held full and careful hearings on the question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Nevada, first, that I congratulate him. I felt he did a very thorough and careful job with his administrative assistants and with the administrative assistants of the committee in working out the various provisions of this chapter of the appropriations bill. As the member of the minority party who was in part responsible for this bill, I finally agreed with the Senator from Nevada on every single item of the chapter with the exception of this particular item. The budget estimate was \$36,645,000. The House cut it to \$34,000,000. A motion was made in the subcommittee to cut it to \$30,000,000, but it was finally compromised at \$32,700,000.

I hope, in view of the rumor, which I think is more than a rumor, which the Senator from Nevada has mentioned, regarding an additional \$100,000,000, we may properly leave the committee suggestion where it is and deal with the \$100,000,000 when the request is presented.

There was a very great difference of opinion in the subcommittee and in the full committee as to the amount, and I felt, in the end, that \$32,700,000 was approximately fair.

I would respectfully say that it is my belief that it adds to the security of our country to give information to other nations as to what we believe is helpful for them to know and to understand with relation to our mode of life and with relation to what the ideal of democracy in its full sense means. I would point out—I do not think it has yet been pointed out—that under the estimates \$11,700,000, in round figures, would go to radio; \$3,800,000 to motion pictures; \$6,200,000 to the press; \$4,100,000 to libraries; \$3,500,000 to exchange of persons, which is the interest of the Senator from Arkansas; \$2,900,000 to technical cooperation; \$9,100,000 to the USEI Mission; and \$3,200,000 for administrative purposes.

As the Senator from Nevada has stated, those estimates would be cut down \$2,300,000 in their total amount. This was a compromise, after long discussion. While I should like to see the amount greater, I think it is as fair a compromise as could be reached under all the circumstances. The statements which have been made concerning additional amounts for this purpose have been considered, and I believe we should let this item go unchallenged.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate that after such full consideration has been given, the amendment offered by the able Senator from Arkansas should not be adopted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What would the Senator suggest as to a limitation, along the line of my suggestion to the committee as to a supplementation?

Mr. McCARRAN. I would not have the authority to commit the committee. That matter was presented.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What would be the Senator's personal feelings? Would he personally support such a limitation?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not in this bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He would not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not in this bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation, but I do not want to take up the time of the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is perfectly agreeable to me to have the Senator make his observation at this time.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to thank the Senator for his courtesy. I merely wish to make one point. There seems to be a mistaken impression entertained by some Members of the Senate. The impression seems to be that the greater part of the funds provided in this item of the bill would be used for educational purposes, the project described and advocated by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. That project is a valuable one, and I favor it. However, I wish to point out that the amount for educational purposes out of the proposed appropriation of \$36,645,000 to supplement the other funds for education would be less than 10 percent. It is closer to 5 percent of the entire amount.

As the able Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out, the greater part of the funds to be provided would be used for other purposes. The \$36,000,000 would be used mainly to prove to the world—to our friends and to those whom we hope to make our friends—that the purposes of this country are unselfish and that we have no devious designs. I think one of the most unfortunate features of this whole situation is the fact that our purposes and our political philosophy have been misrepresented, largely in Asia, but in other parts of the world as well, by the Soviets and their satellites. We know our purposes are noble. We know that our record for the past 150 years is a noble one. Unfortunately, all the people of the world do not know that. They must be told it time and time again. The facts must be brought home to them. That is the only way in which we can make friends.

Mr. President, last night I voted against the erection of a new Senate Office Building which would have cost \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000 before completion. I did so very reluctantly. I did it at great cost to my convenience and the efficiency of my office; but, as I pointed out, I felt that this was not the time to use money for nonessentials. I said I wanted to use available funds—and more funds will be needed than we realize today—to be used, first, for our security and that of our friends and allies, second, for the health and welfare of the people of the Nation, and

third, for the efficient operation of government. I said I intended to cast my votes in the Senate for those purposes.

I believe the item under consideration is a defense and security item. If there ever was a security measure, this is one. I believe if we can hold our friends and make new ones based on confidence and respect for us as a people and for our purposes, we shall not only insure our military security but shall save a great deal of money as well. I think it is a pity that the amount of money asked for, \$36,645,000, which in itself is far less than I think should be made available for this purpose, has been reduced to \$32,700,000, which represents a cut of more than 10 percent. Therefore, I have urged in several colloquys—and urge now—that we increase this appropriation to the sum recommended by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the argument made by the able Senator from New York is the same argument to which we have listened before. If we had hundreds of billions of dollars lying in our Treasury today, the argument might have great force. However, we do not have it. Somewhere along the line, Mr. President, some agencies must curtail—not be destroyed, not be put out of existence, but curtailed. That is necessary so that all agencies of the Government may have a reasonable sum of money with which to operate.

Mr. President, as we go through this bill for several days we shall find that many agencies have had to accept reasonable curtailment. If they were to make their pleas to the Senate, they would make them as forcibly as the able Senator from New York and the able Senator from Arkansas have made their pleas. This proposal would not destroy the program in which the Senators are interested. It would not impair it to the extent that it could be called an impairment. It would curtail the program, so that those who foster, promote, and guide it may be guarded in their expenditures by the admonition which the Congress would bring to them by way of the imposition of this cut in the appropriation.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas will not prevail.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Saltonstall
Bricker	Hoey	Schoeppel
Butler	Holland	Smith, Maine
Connally	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Lehman	Sparkman
Douglas	Lucas	Taft
Dworshak	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Hendrickson	McKellar	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Robertson	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KEM, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr.

MURRAY, and Mr. O'MAHONEY answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. IVES, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. MYERS, Mr. LANGER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. WILEY, Mr. JENNER, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. THYE, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. ECTON, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. GRAHAM entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to the committee amendment on page 54, in line 13.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Chair please state the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to the committee amendment on page 54, in line 13, namely, to insert, in lieu of the figure "\$32,700,000", the figure "\$36,645,000."

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent on public business, and if present would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr.

CAIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—25

Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Fulbright	Lehman	Myers
Graham	Lodge	Neely
Hayden	McClellan	O'Connor
Hill	McFarland	Smith, N. J.
Holland	McMahon	Sparkman
Humphrey	Magnuson	Wiley
Ives	Morse	
Johnson, Colo.	Mundt	

NAYS—53

Alken	Gillette	Maybank
Anderson	Green	Millikin
Brewster	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler	Hoey	Schoeppel
Byrd	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Chavez	Kem	Taft
Connally	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	Langer	Thye
Dworshak	Lucas	Tydings
Eastland	McCarran	Watkins
Ecton	McCarthy	Wherry
Ferguson	McKellar	Williams
Frear	Malone	Young
George	Martin	

NOT VOTING—18

Benton	Flanders	Pepper
Cain	Hunt	Russell
Capehart	Kefauver	Taylor
Darby	Kerr	Tobey
Downey	Leahy	Vandenberg
Ellender	Long	Withers

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 54, beginning in line 13.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 54, in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$2,875,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Philippine rehabilitation," on page 55, line 21, after the numerals "1949", to strike out "\$13,000,000" and insert "\$10,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the committee amendment decreases the appropriation made by the House, would a motion to cut the appropriation still further require unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. The Chair thinks that an amendment to a committee amendment is in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But at a later period, after we have gone over the bill chapter by chapter?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is now considering the bill amendment by amendment. Whenever a committee amendment is before the Senate, that is the time to offer an amendment to it,

not to wait, because, as the Senate goes through the bill, the committee amendments are being agreed to. Regardless of what chapter they are in, amendments to committee amendments must be offered at the time the committee amendments are being considered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I understand that that is true, when the committee amendment increases the amount authorized by the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does not matter whether it increases it or decreases it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 55, line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, yesterday we discussed briefly before the Senate the possibility of reaching some kind of unanimous-consent agreement limiting the time of debate on various amendments and on the bill. It seems to me that, after having taken all day yesterday upon one amendment, and having taken practically 3½ hours this afternoon on another amendment, if we are to expedite the voting on amendments and the passage of the bill, we ought to be able to reach a unanimous-consent agreement. I suggested some time ago that possibly an agreement allowing 10 minutes to each Senator who might desire to speak upon any amendment would be acceptable. It would certainly be satisfactory to the Senator from Illinois and, I think, to most of the Senators on this side of the aisle. I again inquire of the Senator from Nebraska as to whether it may be possible to obtain an agreement of that kind.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in answer to the inquiry made by the distinguished majority leader, I may say that there has been much work done in an attempt to get an agreement with respect to the time for debating the amendments. I should like to state to the majority leader, however, that I know of two amendments to be filed which have not yet been filed. After they are presented, I am satisfied we can work out some sort of an arrangement. Those who intend to present those amendments desire more time. I had even thought of suggesting an exception as to a few amendments and perhaps agreeing on a limitation as to the remainder of them. I also thought of proposing a time limit on debate of the chapters.

While I desire to cooperate with the majority leader, I must say that until the amendments to which I have referred have been offered—which I hope will be done not later than this afternoon or tomorrow morning—I would not be in a position to go along with a unanimous-consent request. However, I think it can be worked out as soon as those amendments have been offered.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the Senator from Nebraska the approximate length of time which will be necessary in order to debate the particular amendments referred to which have not yet been offered?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me, there are two or three speeches on matters other than

amendments, as to which it may be desirable to endeavor to limit the time, if Senators want to make speeches.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to be permitted to finish my answer.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. For example, I know of at least two speeches on subjects other than the appropriation bill which would have to be canceled completely or limited to 10 minutes. As I said, if the Senator will bear with us, we are trying to iron out this matter. I am not in a position to do it today, but if the majority leader will renew his request, which I think is a very legitimate one, I shall try to answer the inquiry definitely sometime tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall subside for the moment, and shall interrogate the Senator later.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am in full sympathy with the suggestion made by the Senator from Illinois, but I do not believe that any Senator who is trying to proceed with the appropriation bill is to be blamed when time is taken out for other matters. If the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Nebraska will consult the RECORD of yesterday, they will see that it was not the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from New Mexico, or anyone else handling the appropriation bill who took the time. The debate was on something else. I shall be in complete sympathy with the Senator from Illinois if he will ask unanimous consent to limit debate on the appropriation bill, and will at the same time propose a limitation of debate on other matters. It is not fair to blame the Committee on Appropriations for the debates which took place yesterday.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am not attaching any blame to the Committee on Appropriations. I have all the affection and respect in the world for the distinguished chairman, who sits at my side day after day, and for all the other members of the Appropriations Committee. I was only attempting to follow through with a more or less tentative arrangement which had been discussed with different Members of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "The Institute of Inter-American Affairs," on page 56, line 15, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$5,500,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

SIGNIFICANCE OF KOREAN HOSTILITIES—NOT A LOCAL MATTER, BUT AN INCIDENT IN U. S. S. R. STRATEGY

Mr. FERGUSON. No one who has followed the course of events since the closing years of World War II could have any doubts about the meaning of hostilities in Korea. Except for Koreans themselves, north and south of the thirty-eighth parallel, the situation in

Korea is not a local matter. It is definitely an incident in Russian world strategy directed from Moscow. Proof of this central fact is indisputable. Any appraisal which fails to recognize this fact would be unrealistic.

Taken by themselves, the Korean people's only desire is the national unity and independence of their country. If left wholly to themselves, without intervention from outside influences, developments in Korea might be considered a local matter. Factional strife might even have been avoided if Korea had not been split into two areas, with each area conditioned into opposing factions.

But the Korean situation has not developed in a vacuum. It came about in the framework of Soviet strategy in its war against the United States and other free countries. As in the division of Germany and Austria, the Soviet Union managed the division of Korea to provide the Soviets with a base and instrument for its operations. This is what raises the Korean outbreak from a local matter to an international affair.

U. S. S. R. WORLD STRATEGY

Russian relations with the rest of the world flow in two main channels: (1) old-style Russian imperialism, and (2) the Communist crusade. Each is complementary to the other; wherever Russia extends her national boundaries, possessions, and interests, communism is served; and wherever communism makes headway Russian national interests are served.

Under the policy of imperialism, Russia has taken over territories formerly independent as in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. She has also taken territory belonging to other nations such as parts of Poland, Finland, Bulgaria, and Manchuria in China. Where it was wise not to take over territories, Russia has sovietized them in the form of satellites which accept Russian domination and do her bidding. These are her spheres of influence and the colonies she exploits, all well-known forms of imperialist policies. She is welding them into a Pan-Slav union, an old Russian imperialist dream. Other imperialist policies are Russia's attempts to reach out toward natural resources, such as Iran oil and Chinese minerals, attempts to control warm-water ports, Port Arthur, attempts to control strategic waters, the Turkish Dardanelles, the Gulf of Finland, the China Sea, attempts to control offshore islands, such as Kuriles and Sakhalin, and finally, attempts to exert her influence in the affairs of other regions, western Europe, Africa, non-Communist Asia and the South Pacific. These are the old imperialist policies in a modern world setting.

Under the Communist crusade, Russia is the mother of Communists everywhere who are committed to the destruction of all nations, peoples, institutions, and agencies which resist domination by communism. By division and disruption, propaganda, lies, treaty violations, infiltration, obstruction of normal processes, fifth columns, Communist fronts, puppet governments, and by fomenting discord and strife, Russia seeks to undermine the strength and independence

of the free world. The success of these Communist activities throughout the world varies from low to high degree, but everywhere the movement is pushed in preparation for the day when a revolutionary situation provides the opportunity for Communists to take over.

Resistance to Russian imperialism and to the Communist crusade has been given the name "cold war" because the Communist tactics do not fit in with the old idea of hot-lead war. But this is a misnomer springing from the failure to understand the nature of modern warfare. In the past, war was the attempt to conquer by force of arms, but if the emphasis is placed where it should be—on the word "conquer"—then war is any means by which one or a group of nations seeks to conquer others. The context of the modern world is such that instruments exist to conquer nations without the firing of a shot. They are the instruments Russia now employs in Communist activities. The conclusion is irresistible that the Communist crusade openly directed by the U. S. S. R. is war, in its fullest meaning, against the free world. Failure to recognize this on the part of free nations has already resulted in widespread Russian successes in areas where they might never have been gained if the true nature of the Communist movement had been understood.

Russian world strategy regards the Eurasian land mass as the base of operations. The U. S. S. R. itself is at the center. The first step in Russian strategy was to surround herself with a belt of controlled territory and peoples for the purpose of insulating Russia against direct attacks from without. It provides her with expendable manpower, resources, and defense in depth. Except for the Arctic, where weather is an important ally and safety factor, this insulating ring is now complete.

Russia is well into the second stage of her world strategy which consists of movements east, west, and south as opportunity arises. The tactics of the Communist crusade help to prepare these opportunities. They create "soft" spots and trouble areas in which it is safe to move. Russia's position as the safely insulated hub of a wheel permits her to move freely and at will in almost any direction. She can and does employ the tactics of diversion. Today, it is the Berlin airlift. Tomorrow it is the threat to the oil fields of Iran. At another time, the thrust is in the direction of the Turkish Dardanelles. Tito's Yugoslavia is threatened; Finland and the Scandinavian countries are threatened. Sometimes Russia moves directly as in the Baltic countries and in the Berlin blockade. At other times, she equips, encourages, and supports native satellites to move as in China. Everywhere the Communist crusade continues to weaken and disrupt free and independent nations.

Where the soft spot crumbles, either Russia moves in directly or natives of the area extend the Russian system with her aid. Each success increases Russia's strength and prestige, weakens the resistance of intended victims, or paralyzes them by fear.

4 that their acts in this matter were almost a sabotage of the program.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Nevada will advise me how long he thinks it will be before we shall finish with this section of the bill. I am particularly interested in knowing when the Treasury-Post Office section of the bill will be reached.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, we have about completed action upon the portion of the bill dealing with the State Department. The next portion of the bill is that dealing with appropriations for the Department of Justice, and then comes the portion of the bill dealing with appropriations for the Department of Commerce and for the Judiciary.

In view of the way we are proceeding, it seems to me that we probably shall require most of the remainder of the afternoon on the sections preceding the section dealing with the Treasury-Post Office appropriations. However, that is only a guess. Of course, all of us have seen much faster progress made in times past.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and that the order for the calling of the roll may be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed to state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 56, in line 16, after the word "expended", to insert "and in addition, the Institute is authorized, prior to June 30, 1953, to enter into contracts for the purposes of such act, as amended, in an amount not to exceed \$7,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of Justice—Legal activities and general administration—Salaries and expenses, general administration," on page 59, line 2, after the word "field", to strike out "\$2,175,000" and insert "\$2,125,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities," on page 59, line 11, after "(31 U. S. C. 529)", to strike out "\$7,330,000" and insert "\$7,475,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, Anti-trust Division," on page 59, line 17, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$3,850,000" and insert "\$3,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals," on page 60, line 12, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "\$12,600,000" and insert "\$12,847,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Fees and expenses of witnesses," on page 60, line 22, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, claims of persons of Japanese ancestry," on page 61, line 6, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$1,300,000"; and in line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal prison system—Buildings and facilities," on page 66, line 12, after the word "account", to strike out "\$900,000" and insert "\$800,000"; in line 17, after the word "which", to strike out "\$270,000" and insert "\$170,000"; and in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$970,000" and insert "\$870,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Alien Property—Salaries and expenses," on page 67, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$4,240,000" and insert "\$4,150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask whether the committee amendment on page 56, in lines 16 to 19, has been agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which that amendment was agreed to may be reconsidered.

I am informed that of the 300 positions in the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, 128 of them fall in the category with salaries ranging from \$7,000 to \$10,750—or that 43 percent of the personnel are receiving salaries of \$7,000 a year or more, indicating that this program is rather top-heavy with high-paid personnel.

It is my intention to move that the appropriation, instead of being \$5,000,000, be reduced to \$4,500,000, and that the contract authorization specified in line 19 be reduced from \$7,000,000 to \$5,000,000—in short, effecting a reduction of \$500,000 in the appropriations and \$2,000,000 in the contract authorizations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois requests unanimous consent for reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment on page 56, in lines 16 to 19, has been agreed to.

Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Reserving the right to object, let me say that I think the Senator from Illinois is addressing his suggestion to the wrong part of the bill. I think the part to which he should address his suggestion is on page 105, the

portion relating to the State Department—reading as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Institute of Inter-American Affairs: Not to exceed \$767,500 of the funds available to the Corporation shall be available during the current fiscal year for its administrative expenses, including administrative services performed for the Corporation by other Government agencies.

I am of the opinion that the Senator should address his suggestion to that item, rather than to the item to which he has just referred.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the appropriation on page 105 of the bill, in line 12, is only in the amount of \$767,500, whereas the appropriation dealt with on page 56, at the point I have indicated, is \$5,000,000.

The number of employees to whom I have called attention totals 300, with 128 of them receiving salaries between \$7,000 and \$10,750. So the salaries of those 128 employees would be well in excess of \$1,000,000, and therefore their salaries cannot be covered by the item of \$767,500 appearing on page 105—as we may determine by the simple process of multiplication.

Mr. McCARRAN. Of course, the item on page 105 is a part of the item on page 56.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois does not give us any good reason why we should agree to the change he has suggested, because he does not say that he is definitely or reliably informed that there is such a category of salaries. Moreover, the evidence before the committee does not justify that conclusion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me read from the Senate committee hearings, on page 759:

TOTAL EMPLOYMENT STRENGTH

Chairman McKELLAR. In the House hearings, on page 1285, Mr. STEFAN asks:

"How many people do you have employed over-all domestically and in the field in all categories?"

The rest of the conversation reads as follows:

"Mr. MYER. In 1950, we have 375 positions with 300 of them filled, Mr. STEFAN."

On the next page, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] asked:

I am reading from page 1286 now of the House hearings under the head "Statement of number and percentage of employees in 1951 estimate whose annual rates are \$7,000 or more."

Under the salary range of \$7,000 to \$8,999 in Washington there are 13, in the field 89, with a total of 102. That is, 102 draw anywhere from \$7,000 to \$8,999.

In the category of \$9,000 to \$9,999 there are 4 in Washington, 12 in the field, with a total of 16.

In the salary range of \$10,000 and over there are 7 in Washington, 3 in the field, and 10 in total.

The total is 128. I may say to the Senator, by his own cross examination, he brought forth the fact that there were 128 employees with salaries in excess of \$7,000 each. In view of the fact that this is three-sevenths of the total number of employees in the Institute, it seems to me that this organization is topheavy with highly paid help, and that we might very well, in view of the situa-

tion of the country and of the budget, impose a cut of at least \$500,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, still reserving the right to object, let me say to the Senator that it has been disclosed that these employees are of a particular type. They are experts who must be paid the salaries indicated in order to obtain their services. They are not ordinary workmen. They are experts selected for specific work. We shall have many of them in point 4, as well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator knows the definition of an expert, I am sure—a man who is a long way from home.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; I have heard that; and that is the reason—these employees go a long way from home.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCARRAN. I object for the time being. I do not know that I shall object eventually. I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that the matter go over, and perhaps I can confer with him and we may be able to arrive at an understanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The matter has already gone over. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary," on page 70, line 12, after "(not exceeding \$1,000)", to strike out "\$1,300,000" and insert "\$1,400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Census," on page 72, line 24, after the word "work," to strike out "\$29,500,000" and insert "\$28,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Administration," on page 74, line 5, after the word "aviation", to strike out "\$97,000,000" and insert "\$99,775,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to be captious, but these amendments are going through with supersonic speed, and they generally call for increases. I should like to raise the question regarding the amendment on page 74, line 5, that the committee has recommended an increase of \$2,750,000 over the appropriation provided by the House. Once this amendment is adopted, it is going to be very hard indeed to have the action reversed.

Mr. President, I should like to know what the reason is, and why there should be an increase of about \$3,000,000 in the Civil Aeronautics Administration. I may say that the House report says there exists a definite requirement as to personnel utilization and to provide ways and means of more fully utilizing the potential available operational capabilities of the field personnel. Expendi-

tures for the last year, Mr. President, were only \$95,000,000. The House provided an increase of \$2,000,000. The Senate Committee recommends an additional increase of \$2,775,000, making a total increase of \$4,775,000. Unless there is a good reason for it, I find myself very allergic to this request for an increase.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator that there is good reason for these figures applying to the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Much more equipment has been installed and many more ground guides and greater facilities for safety have been installed, requiring additional personnel. The committee recommended an appropriation of \$99,775,000 for salaries and expenses. This is an increase over the House appropriation of \$2,775,000 and is a reduction of \$4,475,000 from the Budget Bureau's estimate. So that the amount recommended by the committee is nearly \$4,500,000 under the budget estimate; and with the amount recommended by the committee, the CAA will be able, in the estimation of the committee, to continue at about the 1950 level.

The CAA came before the committee and asked for much more than this, and the Budget Bureau, in fact, allowed them more than this. It is a cut of nearly \$4,500,000 from the estimate of the Budget Bureau. The committee feels that this increase is justified, because of the growing emphasis on the aviation program and because of the needs of keeping the safety program at the highest possible level.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the House report, on page 44—and the House reduced the appropriation \$2,750,000 below the Senate figure—stated:

No part of the reduction is to apply to any activity of the Administration dealing with promulgation or enforcement of safety regulations.

The reduction was to be on the non-safety functions of the CAA.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senate Committee on Appropriations says in its report:

The committee recognizes the results derived from the promulgation and enforcement of safety regulations. However, this activity alone does not assure safety. Other activities of the CAA, including air traffic control, aids to air navigation, and airport services, together with the cooperative effort of the entire aviation industry, are required to assure the public's safety in air travel. The committee recommends a balanced aviation safety program among the several activities within this appropriation.

That was the attitude of the Senate committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. If I may continue for a moment, I may say that this is a matter which was gone into at great length by the subcommittee. The hearings are before the Senator. We thought when we cut the budget estimate as much as we did, we were going just about as far as safety would permit us to go.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say first that the House committee, which provided an appropriation \$2,750,000 less than that recommended by the Senate com-

mittee, said that the House cut would not interfere with safety. The House report indicates also that the reason the budget was asking for a large figure for CAA was that CAA has been assuming—and I now quote the House report—

The message-handling function for commercial airlines of a purely private operations nature at some of the overseas airway communications stations.

Continuing to read from the House report:

The investigative report suggested that the CAA take action to divest itself of the overseas communications function concerning private-message traffic, or else continue to serve on a fee basis. The committee is in complete accord with the following remark of the Administrator of the CAA, in his general statement:

"It is our plan to completely eliminate the furnishing without charge of communication services for company traffic to air carriers operating between the United States and overseas points."

Resuming the statement of the committee:

The committee is, however, at a loss to understand why such a situation has been allowed to exist for so long.

So, the implication is that if this service which is of a purely private nature, were put on a fee basis, or were discontinued, the CAA would need less money, and I think the Senator will find that the \$2,750,000 extra is really going to provide communications service for private overseas airlines, which should be charged to the private lines themselves.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, with the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say two things. I thoroughly approve of the appropriation which has been recommended by the committee. In my opinion one of the most important things we can do is to assure, so far as possible, safety in air flights. As I see it, what we are trying to do—and I have followed this subject for several years—is, to build up safety precautions on the fields we now have before we extend too much into new fields. Let us take those two things together.

The subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is chairman has reduced the amount for new airfields, but has increased slightly the amount for making greater safety precautions on the fields we now have. If the appropriation were left at its original figure, we would not only be unable to take care of our safety facilities this year, but we would actually have to cut down some of the stations we are now operating.

So far as the international situation is concerned, I would simply refer to one paragraph of the report:

The effect of saving \$420,000 by reducing the present operating level of overseas foreign aeronautical communication stations and the reduction of the stations will seriously interfere with the handling of overseas traffic and may result in inability to comply with international obligations.

There, in substance, is what was testified before the committee on the sub-

ject which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has brought up. I look upon the whole situation as involving safety in flying, which we want to make as safe as we can. I do not believe we can reduce the figure to the House amount without seriously interfering with the progress we are making in safety development.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know who has the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada theoretically has the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The estimate of the Budget Bureau is \$104,250,000. The committee has reduced this item to \$99,775,000, which is \$4,475,000 below the estimate. It seems to me the committee has done very well. The full committee approved what the subcommittee had done, and I hope that the committee amendment will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 7, after the word "storm", to strike out "\$32,000,000" and insert "\$27,500,000"; in line 8, after the word "which", to strike out "\$26,500,000" and insert "\$22,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 13, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "\$13,461,500" and insert "\$20,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, that is an increase of \$6,500,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the item to which the Senator from Illinois makes reference is a contract authorization in the amount of \$40,500,000, of which \$26,500,000 is for liquidation of prior contract authority. The House allowed \$32,000,000 with \$26,500,000 allowed for liquidation of contract authority. The Senate committee recommends that the amount for liquidation of contract authority be reduced further, or a cut of \$4,500,000 under the House figure. Based upon the rate of expenditure in the fiscal year 1950, the amount recommended by the committee will be entirely sufficient for the year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think the very able Senator from Nevada is speaking of the committee amendment on line 8. I congratulate the committee on the good work done here, but in lines 13 and 14 there is authorized an additional contract authority of \$6,500,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. This is a contract authorization also, and in the opinion of the committee, the increase was justified and in keeping with the history of the matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is great need for economy, and here is an increase of \$6,500,000 above the figure which the House committee believes to be proper. I shall vote against this committee amendment, but I wonder if the committee would not withdraw its request for an increased appropriation

in the general interest of national economy.

Mr. McCARRAN. No, Mr. President; this was inserted after long consideration and careful study, and it is in keeping with the entire history of the transaction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 14, after the numerals "1953", to strike out "\$45,000,000" and insert "\$37,000,000"; and in line 15, after the word "which", to strike out "\$12,000,000" and insert "\$34,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 9, after the word "expenses", to insert "of which \$35,000 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration for such expenses, including the maintenance and operation of aircraft.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask the meaning of the amendment on page 79? Does it mean an authorization of \$6,000,000 or an additional authorization of \$35,000?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is a transfer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Board," on page 80, line 5, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$3,400,000" and insert "\$4,000,000", a colon, and the following proviso: "Provided, That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Board without charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, and accessories surplus to the needs of such Departments."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an increase of \$600,000 over the appropriation provided by the House.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator refer to page 80?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; to the amendment which is now under consideration. The House appropriated \$3,400,000. The committee recommendation is \$4,000,000. It is an increase of \$600,000 plus transfers. I might point out that the total appropriation was a million and a half dollars in 1945, and it has been steadily increasing ever since. A large part of the increases which have been granted have been allegedly for the purpose of decreasing a large backlog of work, but despite increased appropriations, delay in making decisions and failure to decrease the alleged backlog have continued. The House committee has long recognized the fact—and I read from the House report, page 46:

That the trouble with this agency of Government was not one of appropriations.

We have had a supposed reorganization of the CAB along the lines suggested

by the Hoover Commission, and I believe that if the recommendations of the Hoover Commission brought about increased efficiency, as is alleged to be the case, the CAB does not need this increased appropriation. I therefore suggest that the Senate restore the House appropriation by rejecting the committee amendment and thereby save \$600,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 80, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada with reference to the amendment just agreed to, wherein it is stated:

Provided, That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Board without charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, and accessories surplus to the needs of such departments.

I should like to have some explanation of that broad grant of authority.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's question, this equipment, as suggested, is surplus, and instead of buying it the Army is authorized to transfer it to the CAB in place of having the CAB purchase new equipment.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. In view of events of the last week, is it presupposed that the Army, Navy, and Air Force will not need these supplies?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not certain that I caught the Senator's question. However, the material must be declared to be surplus before it can be transferred. When it is declared to be surplus, it may be transferred by the authorities to the CAB for public use. Otherwise the CAB would be required to purchase the material, and an appropriation would have to be made for that purpose.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may I say a word?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from Kansas makes a very good point on this particular item. One of the lessons which we have learned during the past few weeks is that we have disposed of too much surplus material. Because we have rushed the disposal of surplus materials, we now find ourselves weakened and in a position of not being able to furnish the supplies which are so much needed to back up our troops in Korea. I think the Senator's point is well taken, not only that the Army and Navy may need the supplies, but that the policy of declaring material surplus material has gone too far.

Mr. McCARRAN. In further answer to the Senator from Kansas, and also in answer to the suggestion made by the Senator from New Hampshire, I should like to read from the report of the committee, as follows:

The amendment relating to the transfer of aircraft and aircraft parts from the Military Establishment is requested to provide authority for replacing obsolete and over-

age Board aircraft at no cost to the Board. At the present time the Board owns 17 aircraft of various types. Of this fleet, six are in need of major overhaul and fabric recovering, eight are in need of fabric recovering, and one is in a completely unflyable condition. All but six of the fleet are considered to be obsolete and should be repaired.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Is the impression sought to be conveyed that the committee took the position that the material was practically obsolete?

Mr. McCARRAN. The material mentioned in the report is regarded as practically obsolete, and must be repaired or replaced by these surplus commodities.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as I remember the testimony, I would say that the Senator from Nevada and I were convinced of the fact that the planes, which are to be used for replacement purposes only, are no longer of any service to the Air Force. They are antiquated planes. Their armament has been removed. They were transferred to the CAB for transportation purposes only, as they were no longer fit for fighting purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce," on page 82, line 18, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$5,300,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an increase of \$300,000, and is an increase of \$245,000 over last year's appropriation. The committee in its report justifies this increase by stating that "the amount recommended by the committee will allow modest increases in the Office of Business Economics, the Office of Domestic Commerce, and the Office of International Trade." Mr. President, this is not the time to be making modest increases in civilian-agency spending. If we cannot make drastic reductions, we should at least make modest reductions, not modest increases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 3, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$2,050,000" and insert "\$2,155,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an increase of \$105,000 over the House appropriation. I hope it will be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Patent Office," on page 84, line 4, after the word "photolithography", to strike out "\$11,300,000" and insert "\$11,530,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is an increase of \$230,000 above the House appropriation of \$11,300,000 passed by the House. Although the committee admits in its report, on page 37, that this agency, namely, the Patent Office, has "an excessively high supervisory overhead," it went ahead and increased the appropriation by \$230,000 over the House figure.

This was done although the House had already increased by \$460,000 the amount appropriated last year. I should think the \$460,000 increase allowed by the House would be sufficient, and it should not be necessary to further increase the amount by \$230,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. The committee recommends \$11,530,000, which is an increase of \$230,000 over the House figure, and a reduction below the budget estimate of \$230,000. During the past year, for the first time in several years, more patent applications have been disposed of than have been received. The committee therefore restored half of the reduction made by the House, so that this tempo could be maintained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt. As many as favor the amendment will rise and stand until counted. [A pause.] Those who oppose the amendment will rise and stand until counted. [A pause.] The amendment is rejected.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected. I make the motion because if there is any justification anywhere for a larger amount, it is in the field of patents. I am a lawyer, though not a patent lawyer. However, the Patent Office is in an outrageous condition. If today an inventor wants to get a patent, 2 or 3 years must elapse before his application can be heard. Due to the war effort the fact that the Patent Office has been moved two or three times, the office is in such condition that there is a backlog of cases which it is trying to make up. If my memory serves me aright, it will take 10 years before the Patent Office can be placed on a current working level. If the appropriation is cut to the amount represented by the rejection of the committee amendment, it will take a longer time before patent applications can be put on anywhere near a current basis.

If a man is able to make something by reason of his inventive genius or ingenuity, he should know whether he will get a patent without having to wait 2 or 3 years. It may be that in that time he may be dead, or something else may have happened. Certainly, in the interest of business and the proper functioning of our economic life, the small amount recommended by the committee should be appropriated for the Patent Office. I was tempted to do what the Senator from Illinois suggested, but I was convinced that this amount should be appropriated if the Patent Office is to operate anywhere near on a current basis. I hope my motion to reconsider will be agreed to and that the committee amendment will be restored to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was rejected. [Putting the question.]

Several Senators asked for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A division is called for.

The Senate proceeded to divide.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Anderson	Hill	Millikin
Brewster	Hoey	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Ives	Myers
Byrd	Jenner	Neely
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Connally	Kem	Russell
Cordon	Kerr	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Leahy	Sparkman
Eaton	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Lodge	Taft
Ferguson	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McCarthy	Thye
George	McClellan	Tydings
Gillette	McFarland	Watkins
Graham	McKellar	Wherry
Green	McMahon	Wiley
Gurney	Magnuson	Williams
Hayden	Malone	Young
Hendrickson	Martin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment, on page 84, line 4, was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who came into the Senate Chamber since the original action was taken, I may say that last year the Patent Office received approximately \$10,840,000. The House bill increased this by about \$475,000 to \$11,300,000, representing an increase of something more than 4 percent. The Senate committee proposed a further increase of \$230,000. I am very glad that the Senate, on a division, rejected this increase, and I hope very much that the motion to reconsider may be defeated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a result of the rejection of the committee amendment on the motion of the Senator from Illinois, the Patent Office appropriation is reduced from \$11,530,000 to \$11,300,000, a cut of \$230,000. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the receipts of the Patent Office represent about 50 percent of its expenditures, so that the net cut is half of \$230,000, or approximately \$115,000.

By making that reduction, what are we sacrificing? We are reducing the force employed in the Patent Office by 75 men. The backlog of cases of patents pending in the Patent Office is now 220,000, and that number is being cut down at the rate of 21,000 a year. In other words, if there were retained the 75 employees in the Patent Office who would be lost to the office if the Senate committee amendment is rejected, it would still take 10 years to put the Patent Office on a current basis. At the present time it takes 2 years from the time an application for a patent is filed until the result is known.

It seems to me there are other places where we could make a cut. I have studied this particular case very closely

because I have received many letters requesting that an increase in the appropriation be made. I did not want to have an increase made. But after studying the matter, I believe we should increase the appropriation to retain the present force, not to increase it, in order to give the man who wants to secure a patent a decent break. I do not consider that he has a decent break if he is made to wait 2 years for his patent. I do not consider it a good break when there is a backlog of 220,000 cases, which are being broken down at the rate of 21,000 a year. I hope the motion to reconsider will prevail.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts and of all Members of the Senate to the splendid work done by the Appropriations Committee. Chapter III, as reported by the Senate committee, is \$44,773,730 under the House bill, and it is \$119,516,165 under the estimate of the Budget Bureau. It seems to me the committee has done a wonderful job, and I hope the Senate will sustain the committee by voting for the motion to reconsider and to restore the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Massachusetts said that if we restored the House appropriation it would mean a reduction in personnel. I assume the Senator meant a reduction in personnel below that provided in the Senate report. Is it not true that the House bill grants \$475,000 more than is presently appropriated, so that if we adopt the House figure we would have, not a decrease in the number of employees in the Patent Office, but an increase? We simply would not have as large an increase as would be the case if we adopted the recommendation of the Senate committee. Is that not the case?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I desire to answer the Senator from Illinois accurately, but it is a little hard to find the figure quickly. I think the figure on page 1372 of the hearings shows that, if the committee amendment should not be agreed to, the Patent Office would have to lay off 75 men whom they now have employed. I am not absolutely certain about that figure, but I believe it to be correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in order that Senators who were not present when action was taken on the amendment may be advised, I should like to say that the item in question is a part of the appropriation for the Department of Commerce. The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate cut the appropriation for the Department of Commerce by 11 percent.

This is a Department for which we thought the full amount of the appropriation should be retained, so that the Department can properly perform its work.

The committee recommends \$11,530,000, an increase of \$230,000 over the House figure, and a reduction of \$230,000 below the Budget figure.

During the past year, and for the first time in several years, more patent applications have been disposed of than ever before. Therefore, the committee voted to restore half of the reduction made by the House of Representatives, so that the tempo of the work might be continued in the Patent Office.

Let me say that the following testimony was received by the committee, from Mr. Marzall:

PRINTING AND BINDING

Mr. MARZALL. That is true to a certain extent, Senator SALTONSTALL. But we have this to consider. We have had an increase from the Government Printing Office from 10 to 14 percent. The Patent Office does about \$2,000,000 worth of printing a year, and that item of the increase of the Government Printing Office to the Patent Office would amount to about \$220,000.

It was on that basis and on the basis that we hope to keep the work as current as possible and have the patents issued as rapidly as possible, that we thought it worth while to provide the amount of money recommended by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 84, in line 4, was rejected.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 84, in line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 8568, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see pp. 10237-10239 of House proceedings for today.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say that the conference report is signed by all the members of the committee of conference—both the majority members and the minority members. The report has been agreed to by the House of Representatives.

I ask for the immediate consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire whether the report is unanimous on the part of all the conferees. Perhaps the Senator has already stated that,

but my attention was diverted for a moment.

Mr. HILL. Yes; the report is unanimous on the part of the Senate conferees—both the majority and the minority members—and is unanimous on the part of the House conferees. The report has been agreed to by the House of Representatives.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama for the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. I move the adoption of the report.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 8568, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,

July 13, 1950.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 17, 65, and 66 to the bill (H. R. 8568) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 28 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,648,500."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28.

The motion was agreed to.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Public Roads," on page 86, line 22, after the words "per diem", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,000,000, to be derived from the administrative funds provided under the act of July 11, 1916, as amended or supplemented (23 U. S. C. 21), shall be available until expended for continuing the construction of a laboratory, on a site already acquired, for permanent quarters for the testing and research work of the Bureau of Public Roads."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 24, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$405,000,000" and insert "\$385,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I desire to congratulate the committee on recommending a reduction in the appropriation for Federal-aid postwar high-

ways from \$405,000,000 to \$385,000,000, or a saving of \$20,000,000.

However, I should like to suggest that in this period of national emergency and relatively high employment, further road construction is not particularly needed in order to stabilize the economy. It might well be deferred, so far as the national defense situation is concerned, and it seems to me that we should make a further reduction in this item.

Therefore, to the committee amendment on page 87, in line 24, I offer the following amendment: Strike out the figure "\$385,000,000" and insert "\$285,000,000"; and, in addition, in line 25, to strike out "\$263,491,000, and insert "\$163,491,000."

The effect of this substitute amendment will be to make a saving of \$100,000,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator whether he knows the relationship of the changes he proposes to the commitments which have been made to the States by the Bureau of Public Roads, and the relationship to the contracts which already are let, and under which construction already is proceeding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the point is that by the system of advance commitments, the Bureau of Public Roads has virtually taken away from the Congress the power to appropriate money. The Bureau of Public Roads makes commitments for long periods in advance. Then, when on the floor of the Senate we attempt to make reductions in the appropriations, we are told that the commitments have been made and that we cannot change the amounts.

Mr. President, we in the Congress have the power to appropriate, and it is about time that we used it. We should not abdicate the power of appropriating money.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me state that the Bureau of Public Roads exercises no such authority. The Congress itself has directed, many times, that the Bureau proceed in this way, and in no other way.

These appropriations are made every 2 years, because the State legislatures meet every 2 years; and the appropriations thus are made in advance, so that the State legislatures will know what funds they must appropriate in order to match the Federal Government appropriations. The State government appropriations are made on that basis, and there is a contractual obligation on the part of the United States to meet or match the funds provided by the States. So there is no other way by which to proceed. We could not intelligently proceed on any other basis with the vast amount of highway construction in the United States.

The Senator does an injustice when he says that the bureaucrats do this. It is deliberately done every 2 years by the Congress of the United States, and the program is a sound one.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is it not true that we can simply postpone the

appropriation of these funds, so that \$100,000,000 which, under the amendment I have offered to the committee amendment, would not be expended this year, could be carried over into future years?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The adoption of the amendment I have offered would not mean that the projects will be abandoned, but would merely mean that the period of time during which construction would occur would be lengthened.

Mr. HAYDEN. It would mean that we would repudiate what is stated in the law as a contractual obligation on the part of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] many times has called the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are losing control over our ability to appropriate, and that we are losing it because of the system of advance commitments. Although in many cases I do not agree with the senior Senator from Virginia, nevertheless it seems to me that in this respect he is correct, and that it is about time that we in the Congress asserted our control over the budget for the ensuing year. We should not tie ourselves up as to future periods.

At the present time we are facing a period of great national tension. It may be that we should devote such funds, not to highways, but to munitions. However, every dollar we put into highways will reduce by that much the amount of money we are able to devote to military preparations, materials, and the necessary contracts in that connection.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me say that the commitments for which this money is being appropriated were made 2 years ago.

The Senator from Illinois will have an opportunity quite promptly to accomplish his purpose, because there has been pending before the Senate Committee on Public Roads a bill which that committee has reported today, and which will be upon the calendar. That bill has been passed by the House. The bill contains authorizations for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953, and contains provisions in regard to the contractual obligations to which the Senator has been addressing himself. If the Senator from Illinois is able to have those provisions deleted, he can cure the situation to which he objects. However, the proposal he now makes should not be agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not like to deal only with the distant scene in 1952 and 1953. I like to deal with the scene in 1950 and 1951. I do not think our hands should be tied by any commitments which have been made by Government bureaus, agencies or previous sessions of Congress.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, those of us who had the responsibility of maintaining the highway systems in the States during the war years, know how wholly inadequate our road systems were and how the heavy vehicles using the highways were pounding our hard-surface roads to pieces every day in the year.

I wish to commend the able Senator from Illinois for proposing reductions in any appropriation. Economy is a

necessity. But I do not believe there is economy in denying to the Federal highway system an adequate appropriation, in order that the requests of the States to match the State funds for adequate road construction may be met. If we are confronted with another national emergency such as the war may bring to us, we will need to increase our hard-surfaced highway system in the United States, in order to transport that which will have to be transported. Furthermore, we shall have to supplement by truck our existing railroad transportation facilities, or we shall not be able to meet the demand for the movement of merchandise and war equipment which will confront the Nation.

For that reason, while I agree with the Senator from Illinois that we should economize, yet I believe that if we bring about an economy in this appropriation, it may not be economy, but a very expensive action, in its ultimate effect.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I inquire who has the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that this item goes beyond the question of appropriation. This obligation was created, not by this Congress but by the Eightieth Congress, for reasons outlined by the Senator from Arizona, which compels the States of Illinois, New Mexico, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, as well as the other States of the Union and the possessions of the United States, to make their plans and programs 2 years in advance. That is because State legislatures meet but once every 2 years. The Eightieth Congress passed the authorization which necessitates this appropriation, since the obligation has already been created.

As stated by the Senator from Arizona, the Committee on Public Roads today reported a bill to take care of the roads for 1952 and 1953. But so far as 1950 and 1951 are concerned, the obligations for those years have been created, and the Senate would now be inconsistent and would be unfair to every State in the Union and to every possession of the United States if it were at this moment to reduce the appropriation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I may make one remark, Mr. President, before I yield again, let me say that this alleged obligation may be one of two kinds—legal or moral. So far as the legal obligation is concerned, I should like to have my esteemed colleagues consult the Charles River Bridge case, the citation for which is 11 Peters 420—1837, and *Stone v. Mississippi* (101 U. S. 814—1880), in which I think the courts have held very decisively that one legislature cannot bind

a future legislature. Each legislature, therefore, has the right to judge concerning its own appropriations. Therefore, the Eighty-first Congress is not bound by the action of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think the Senator has correctly stated a sound rule of law. Nevertheless, the sovereign State of New Mexico, in order to meet its obligations under the law, and to participate in a contribution by the Federal Government for roads, must appropriate the money or make provision by which to match the contribution which was made by the Eightieth Congress. I think the rule of law outlined by the Senator from Illinois is correct. That is the way it should be. One legislature should not be able to bind another. That is the very reason why the thing is done as it is done here.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me suggest this to my good friend from New Mexico: Suppose we were to adopt my amendment and were to save \$100,000,000, actually \$120,000,000 in relation to the House figure. The Federal Government would appropriate \$100,000,000 less. The States, under the 50-50 formula, would appropriate or spend \$100,000,000 less. I do not think the condition of the States would be severely affected. What would happen would be that the State deficits would be less than they otherwise would be, or their surpluses would be greater. It seems to me therefore—

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I may finish my sentence, I shall be glad to yield. It seems to me, therefore, that we should then, in a manner, be killing two birds with one stone: We would not only save \$100,000,000 for the Federal Government, but we would also save \$100,000,000 for the State governments. That, Mr. President, should constitute a great contribution to the war effort.

Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. THYE, Mr. MAYBANK and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am reminded of my experience as a small boy, chopping into a hornet's nest, with the hornets beginning to come buzzing at me from all directions. Again I seem to have chopped into a hornet's nest, and the hornets are buzzing around me. First, I will yield to the Senator behind me, who is nearest to me, the distinguished Senator from Florida.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will have to make that decision. The Chair cannot make it for him.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. While I hesitate to acknowledge his classification of me as a hornet, I should like to suggest that my question to the distinguished Senator, I think, will bring out the facts which will give the Senate a basis upon

which to work in this matter. The question to which I understand the Senator gave his answer was this: What relation does an additional cut of \$100,000,000 have to commitments already made?

If the Senator will allow me to make a brief observation based on experience in this field, I may say that this has to do with two sorts of commitments. I am not on the committee, and therefore I cannot speak with authority as to how much of this amount comes under one class and how much comes under the other. The distinguished Senator from Arizona and other Senators who are present can give those figures. This, I repeat, has to do with two kinds of commitments. One is for actual repayments to States in the fiscal year 1951 of amounts which they will have paid to contractors upon contracts now existing, already made and now under execution. I do not know how much will come under that classification, but my experience would impel me to say that much the larger portion of this amount would come under that classification, as to which the Senator will see there could be no possible question of saving the States anything. To the contrary, the proposal of the Senator, if agreed to, might easily prevent reimbursement to the States under an agreement already made, based upon action taken, some of it by the Seventy-eighth Congress, in 1944, some of it by the Eightieth Congress in 1948, and some of it by the Eighty-first Congress last year.

Mr. President, what I should like to ask the Senator, if I may ask him now, is this: With reference to the amount of \$100,000,000—which I hope is not taken out of the Senator's hat—what is the relation of the additional cut which he proposes to the commitments of the kind which I have just mentioned, and to further commitments of the second kind, which I think would be a much smaller amount, namely, commitments made to States, upon which they can make contracts in the approaching year, and upon which some small payments will be earned during the fiscal year 1951?

Can the Senator give me an answer to those questions? Without them, I should feel that we were completely without information upon which we could intelligently vote. I assume that the committee has gone to great lengths to find out just how much we can save as against the Budget estimate, and that it has already decided that as to the third postwar year, under the 1944 act, we can save nothing, and that, as to the first year under the 1948 act, we can save the \$20,000,000 which is proposed to be cut from the budgeted recommendation by the committee's proposed amendment.

If the Senator can give us specific facts upon which we can make a greater cut, the junior Senator from Florida will be glad to support him. But, without such specific facts, I should be forced to the conclusion that the making of this cut would be a repudiation of our agreements with the States and would be a decided imposition of penalties upon the States. They have to pay the contractors 100 cents on the dollar and then require re-

imbursement of that portion to which, under the particular type of road concerned, they are entitled, under the Federal aid system.

If the Senator can answer the question, I should like to have him do so, because I should like very much to be in position to support him. I appreciate his zeal for economy. I do not care to be classified as a hornet, except in the case of economy, in which case I am perfectly willing to be so classified, but I should appreciate an answer to the specific question as to what relation the proposed \$100,000,000 additional cut proposed by the Senator from Illinois bears to the specific commitment made by the Federal Government to the States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say—

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be delighted to yield to my good friend from South Carolina, who is not a hornet but is a good hard-working bee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Illinois. But as to the contract obligations we have in connection with the States, I should like to remind my distinguished friend, the able junior Senator from Illinois, of the enormous gas taxes collected by the Federal Government from the owners of automobiles who drive up and down the roads of the Nation and who pay the additional tax.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will my good friend from Minnesota be willing to defer, so that I may try to answer the Senator from Florida?

My proposal of a reduction, if it were agreed to, would leave nearly \$300,000,000. It would seem to me that would be sufficient to make payments on past work. Virtually every appropriation is to settle for past construction; none of it is for construction in the current year for which we are appropriating. I am leaving three-fourths of the total to settle it up.

Mr. HOLLAND. What proportion of the \$100,000,000 additional cut suggested by the distinguished Senator does he propose to apply against the sum of \$263,491,000, which is the remainder of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the three postwar fiscal years by the act of 1944, and what proportion does he propose to apply against the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1950, under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948? What proportion does he propose to apply against the amounts which are required to be repaid to the States for the repair or reconstruction of highways or bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, or landslides?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The proposal I made was that the entire reduction should be concentrated on the projected appropriation of \$263,000,000 carried out under section 2 of the Highway Act of 1944.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator know that it is a fact that the funds for the third year of the postwar period as provided for in the 1944 act are already expended, and we are completing the work which was proposed under the 1944 act, and the chances are that every dollar of the amount provided is money which must be repaid to the States in the approaching fiscal year for work done under contracts which have already been let, either during the present year or as far back as 1949? Does not the Senator realize that it is a clean-up of the 1944 act, and that probably every dime of it is due under contracts let long ago?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from Florida that he suggested that the cut of \$100,000,000 be made in the appropriations under the act of 1948 of \$115,000,000. If this would enable me to win his support, I should be very glad to have the money transferred to that item. I am trying to make it possible for the Senator to carry out his desire for economy.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota. He has been waiting for some time, which has put me in the ungracious position of being impolite to him.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I appreciated the Senator's humorous reference to hornets. There cannot be any economy in restricting Federal road funds, because if we do not proceed with highway construction we are absolutely depriving ourselves as a Nation of an adequate highway system. As the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] stated, we are denying ourselves revenue in the form of gas taxes.

Furthermore, Mr. President, during the war years those of us who were administering the affairs of state knew we were accumulating State funds and earmarking them. They were funds which were by statute earmarked; they were highway construction funds. We were denied materials with which to build highways. The Federal Government could not match funds with the States because we were denied materials. In the postwar years the State and Federal Governments proceeded with long-delayed highway construction, and we are now just catching up in the postwar years with highway construction which normally should have proceeded through 1943, 1944, and 1945. Unless we are willing to give the Federal Bureau of Roads the funds necessary to match the State funds, we are not carrying out the highway-construction program which has been long deferred. I think there would be no economy in making the reduction which the very able and conscientious Senator from Illinois has proposed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to my good friend from Minnesota that his statement illustrates the difficulty with which we find ourselves faced when we suggest a concrete reduction. We all recognize the need for economy; we recognize the fact that we had a large defi-

cit in the fiscal year which has just ended. We are faced with a deficit next year of from \$4,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000, not including possible war expenditures. The chances are the Korean situation will call for the expenditure of large sums of money, and we shall be in a difficult financial situation next year. The Senator from Minnesota, who is one of the finest Members of this body, recognizes that situation very well. When we recommend a cut in certain items, Senators are very reluctant to make a cut.

What I think we have got to do is to appraise the needs of the particular service in the light of the general financial situation with which we are faced. We are faced with the situation of a deficit, with high employment. The larger the deficit, the more we shall have to borrow. The more we borrow, the more credit the banks will have to create. The greater the credit, the greater the rise in prices, and the greater the economic disturbance.

I want good roads, as does everyone else. I do not drive an automobile, but my friends have automobiles and take me out for rides, and it is very pleasant to travel on the roads. But the question is whether we can afford this great expenditure in a period of great concern—

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In a moment.

Whenever we make a proposal of a reduction, we are told that we are legally committed to make the expenditure. We need resolute courage. The law is behind us. We are not legally committed. The decisions in the Charles River Bridge and Stone against Mississippi cases establish the fact that we are legally free. We can so adjust the appropriation that we can meet amounts due on past work and merely slow down the rate of future constructions. For every dollar we withhold on future construction, there will be a corresponding State dollar which will not be spent, so we shall be saving \$2 for the country as a whole. For every dollar we save for the Federal Government we shall be multiplying our good works.

I hope Senators will not interfere with this means by which we can release large quantities of energy, materials, and labor, and save at least \$100,000,000. Furthermore, I am not proposing to eliminate the highway program completely. We would still have nearly \$300,000,000 for this purpose. I merely want to slow it down because of the present need for economy.

I now yield to my good friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, is the Senator from Illinois aware of the fact that Federal law requires the States to use their road-user taxes on roads, or be penalized in the amount of money which they receive in the form of Federal aid for local roads?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have some recollection of that. I studied the history of the Shackleford Act up to 1930. That is my impression.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, is the Senator further aware of the fact that the

American people are paying into the National Treasury \$1,350,000,000 this year in road-user taxes in the form of gasoline and oil taxes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was not certain of the precise sum, but I know it amounted to a large figure.

Mr. KERR. Then does the Senator think it would be keeping faith with the American people to reduce the proposed appropriation which at \$385,000,000 is about one-fourth of what the American people are paying into the Treasury, and which has been pledged to them? Would it be keeping faith with the American people to reduce the amount to a point where it would be approximately one-fifth of what they are paying?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have never understood that the Federal gasoline tax was earmarked in any way, or that it could be used only for the purpose of building roads. I thought Federal gasoline taxes, like other taxes, went into the General Treasury and commingled with other general receipts, and that out of those general receipts specific expenditures were made. That is the whole theory of Federal taxation.

Mr. KERR. Is there not just as much justification for the Federal Government to apply the same standard to the road-user money which it collects as it compels the States to apply to the road-user tax money which they collect?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from Oklahoma wants to propose such a bill, I think it should be given careful consideration. However, I never understood that that was the situation at the present time. In fact, as I have read the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, such as in the Butler case, the Court has always held that taxes should go into the general fund of the Treasury and should not be earmarked for special purposes; that out of the general fund we should make appropriations. If the Senator from Oklahoma wishes to change the law, or change the whole system of the country, I think he should propose that change in the form of a bill.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is not proposing a bill. He was reminding the Senator from Illinois that the Federal Government requires that procedure of the States. Furthermore, the Federal Government has passed an act which has earmarked \$385,000,000 of its general revenue for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have not done so yet.

Mr. KERR. Insofar as the proposal is concerned, it would be earmarking that much, which would be about one-fifth of what the American people are paying in road-user taxes. It occurs to the Senator from Oklahoma that it would be a simple matter of justice for us to impose on ourselves the same standards which we force States to impose upon their people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are not earmarking anything.

Mr. CAPEHART and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to finish. I shall yield first to the Senator from Indiana when I have concluded with my statement, before other hornets appear upon the scene. We are collect-

ing gasoline taxes of \$1,350,000,000, according to the very able Senator from Oklahoma. That amount of money goes into the General Treasury. It can be spent for any purpose. It can be spent for highways, ships, airplanes, the courts, or for anything else. Out of the general resources of the Treasury it is proposed to spend a given amount for highways.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe that the able Senator from Illinois said a moment ago that he adopted the philosophy of our appropriating in accordance with our ability to pay. He has suggested that we take approximately one-fourth out of this appropriation of \$385,000,000, or about \$100,000,000. Will the Senator apply the same philosophy to the ECA appropriation and take one-fourth from them?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we need not deal with all these issues at one time. We are now dealing with highways. I will deal with the ECA appropriation when we come to it. I have again and again quoted to my good friend from Indiana the lines from Cardinal Newman's hymn, *Lead Kindly Light*:

I do not ask to see

The distant scene—one step enough for me.

I am not a member of the faith of Cardinal Newman, but I have always believed that hymn to be an admirable guide for political behavior.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that many students of taxation believe that taxes on gasoline should be reserved to the States, and that it is not proper for the Federal Government to invade that field? I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that the Federal gasoline tax had its origin in 1932, when the party which then had the responsibility enacted the tax in order to balance the budget? Is it not also true that it was enacted for a period of 1 year, with the understanding that it would be taken off at the end of the year? Furthermore, is it not true that at the end of that year it was increased by 1 cent, to a cent and a half. Furthermore, by successive renewals, is it not true that it was continued on the books? Therefore, instead of being a temporary tax, it came to be a permanent tax.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say in reply to my good friend from Missouri that I am not acquainted with the detailed history of that subject. I am ready to assume that it is as he said it is.

Mr. KEM. It shows that the tax was not earmarked for highway purposes, but was enacted for the purpose of being an aid to the general fund and to balance the budget.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to thank my good friend from Missouri for the help which he has given me. He has pointed out that the Federal gasoline tax was intended for general revenue purposes and not for the purpose of making specific expenditures, such as for the pur-

pose of constructing roads. I appreciate the Senator's help.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It seems to me that perhaps the Senator from Illinois believes himself to be the only one who has any political integrity in the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no. That is not my thought at all, and I certainly hope I have not created such an impression. I want to say, with absolute sincerity, that I have the greatest respect for the integrity of Members of the United States Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois who decided that what the Senator from Missouri said was the purpose of the gasoline tax?

Mr. KEM. It will be found—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri temporarily so that he may reply to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. KEM. It was stated in the debates in Congress. I shall be very glad to invite the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to those debates. That was stated to be the purpose of the law. It was shown in the bill that it was intended that the tax should be applied for 1 year. It was stated that it was for the purpose of balancing the budget. I do not have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with me, but I shall be glad to invite the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am positive that the Senator from Missouri will invite the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That was called to the attention of the Committee on Public Works. Personally I am becoming a little tired of having Senators make the Committee on Public Works the whipping boy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a very ungracious position for any Senator to be placed in to rise on the floor of the Senate and question an appropriation which is proposed by a committee of the Senate, especially when it is approved by a committee headed by my good friend from New Mexico, for whom I have the very highest esteem. A Senator who does so seems very ungracious, and he seems to put himself in the position of knowing more than the committee knows. I assure the Senator I do not feel that at all. I recognize the fact that it would be very natural for Senators to feel a certain amount of resentment in that respect, and I hope that the Senator will feel that there is no such motivation in my heart, and I only hope that by my conduct I can convince him of that fact.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am fully convinced of the sincerity of purpose of the Senator from Illinois. I attribute his state of mind to the fact that he does not understand the philosophy of public roads and what they mean to the people of the United States. I say that in all kindness. I do not attribute any malice or anything

of that sort to the attitude taken by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that of course roads are important, but they are only one part of the consideration. What I am suggesting is that we economize in this appropriation by about a quarter, save a hundred million, so that the deficit will be less, and that we will have a greater margin of safety for any war emergency which may develop. The highway program would go on, but it would be slowed down and we would save \$100,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The appropriation might be decreased, and I believe in economy, but I recall the vote of the Senator from Illinois this afternoon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In voting for the Fulbright amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. To give money to Europe. It happens that there are some Members of the United States Senate who think all the economy should not be borne by the people of the United States, and that the people of the United States, in order to be united, in order to bring about the economy which would make it possible for us to help other countries in the world, do need some roads. That is the only difference between the Senator from Illinois and me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, we need roads. The question is whether we need \$400,000,000 worth of roads.

Mr. CHAVEZ. A little while ago the Senator from Illinois was quoting what he thought the law was, and I am sure he was positive of his recollection, and there is no question as to his motives or his understanding. He thought he stated what the law was. We also have a law, passed by the Congress of the United States in the Eightieth Congress, under which obligations were made to the States, including, of course, the State of Illinois, and I am sure this appropriation would affect the State of Illinois much more than the State of New Mexico, so far as volume is concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Since Congress passed a law obligating the Government of the United States to the individual States of the Union, and also the possessions of the United States—Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico—would the Senator from Illinois say that after that law was passed, and the Congress obligated itself to the States, we should repudiate that law?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from New Mexico ask me that question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask that question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say it has been well established by court decisions that one Congress cannot legally bind a succeeding Congress to appropriate; that whenever we say that one Congress is bound by the decision of a preceding Congress, we give up the control over appropriations, and that we virtually surrender the power of a given Congress to affect economy. It seems to me that both on the principle of law and the exigencies of the present situation these

economies should be effected. I would also like to repeat that, even after saving \$100,000,000 by adopting my amendment, we would still have nearly \$300,000,000 left for highways.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In all kindness, I will say it is impossible to convince the Senator from Illinois either as to the logic or the reason or the fair play of the legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I very much wish I could vote with the Senator from Illinois to save this money, and I certainly expect to vote with him on other motions to reduce appropriations for nonessential projects.

My remarks are not addressed to the merits of the building of roads. I have always been a strong believer in roads. I know they have done a great deal for my own State, and I know they have done a great deal for the other States of the Union. I would not be shocked if the amount appropriated for roads were, under the present circumstances, reduced, if it were possible to do so in good faith, but speaking as a former governor of a State, my feeling is that we could not possibly reduce this appropriation and still act in good faith toward the States.

I am afraid the junior Senator from Illinois is not fully familiar with the procedure that is followed in the various States, certainly in the State of New York, and I have no doubt in other States. We have what we call a map, which is prepared to care for the needs of the State in the building of highways for a period of 3 years. We let contracts for that period.

A great part of the appropriation under consideration, which is the result of action taken, I understand, by the Eightieth Congress, is to reimburse the States for expenditures already made. The money has been paid out of the treasuries of the States, and the only way the States could be reimbursed is through payment by the Federal Government. The remainder of the appropriation, or at least the greater part of it, would be used to place the States in a position to contract under a plan which was adopted a long time ago.

I am afraid the Senator from Illinois does not realize that when a State authorizes the building of a 50-mile stretch of road, it does not undertake the construction of the entire 50 miles at one time. The State will build, here and there, parts of the road, and if the Federal Government should not now put the States in a position to meet their obligations, there would be a checkerboard all across the State—and I believe this would apply to every State—little patches of road begun and then discontinued, ending nowhere, beginning nowhere. It would be a great disservice to the States.

It may not legally be repudiation, but I can say to the Senator from Illinois that while I was governor I counted on the good faith of the Federal Government to reimburse me for obligations

which I as governor had assumed or authorized, and I would feel it was repudiation, and I believe my associates would so feel. Therefore I cannot vote with the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wonder if the Senator will yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield for that purpose except by unanimous consent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New Mexico to ask a question of the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know whether the Senator from New York attended the hearings on the Federal aid highways bill which was considered by the Committee on Public Works, under the leadership of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Public Works Committee. Will the Senator from New York, who was formerly a governor, and is no doubt familiar with the procedures, the techniques, the mechanics, of how Federal contributions are used by the State governments, advise the Senate whether it is not a fact that the State of New York itself, instead of seeking, in this particular instance, an appropriation of \$450,000,000, suggested to the committee that the entire fund collected from gasoline taxes, amounting to \$1,350,000,000, be devoted to the construction of roads?

Mr. LEHMAN. In the first place, the Senator from New York desires to say he did not attend the hearings, and he does not know what the requests of the State of New York were for gasoline moneys. I have no doubt they would have been very happy to receive increased gasoline revenues.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that the State of New York has an intelligent technical engineering organization which takes care of the roads in the State of New York?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is quite correct; we have a highway department.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is a nonpartisan body, dealing only with public roads, and with the benefits to the people of the State of New York which might result from the construction of public roads.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I can advise the Senator from New York and the Senator from Illinois that New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and every other large State in the Union, is away behind in roads, and they asked us, instead of appropriating \$450,000,000, to provide a billion and a half dollars so that they might proceed with the construction of the roads which are so badly needed for the benefit of the people of the individual States.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is quite correct. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that I have always been a great advocate of the building of roads. I think they should be built to the limit of the

available resources of the States and of the Nation. I did say a few minutes ago that while I have been, and now am, an advocate of roads, I would, in view of what I consider a possibly very critical situation, be willing temporarily to delay the building of roads. But I have no doubt whatsoever of the fact that roads are needed and are a great asset to the States and the Nation alike.

I should like to say one further word. We were talking about the needs of the States and the financial resources of the States. I point out to the Senator from New Mexico that in preparing the revenue planning for the State of New York—and I am sure it is true in the Senator's State also—there is put down as an asset, an inviolable asset, the amount that is due from the Federal Government for the next 2 years.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is a part of the planning.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator from Illinois will indulge me one moment more, I should like to ask the Senator from New York a question. The Senator said that because of the general circumstances he would be willing to defer temporarily the construction of roads. Suppose the roads proposed to be constructed were military roads? Suppose they were interstate roads that necessarily had to be built for the security of the country? Suppose they were access roads which would lead to military establishments. Suppose they were military roads that had to do with a naval installation, or an Army installation, or an aviation installation? Would the Senator from New York make the same statement with respect to them?

Mr. LEHMAN. I may answer the Senator from New Mexico in this way: I can make the statement without qualification that, so far as I am concerned, I am going to vote for every appropriation which I am convinced is in the interest of national defense and national security. Certainly if roads are involved in our national defense or national security I would favor them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not at this time, Mr. President. I should like to make a statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield further.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think the issue is clear. As I have listened to this discussion I have almost felt that I was being accused of trying to destroy the American home and tearing down all the verities of American life. That is not my purpose, Mr. President. It is my humble purpose that, instead of appropriating \$385,000,000 for highways, we appropriate only \$285,000,000, making a saving of \$100,000,000. We would still appropriate nearly \$300,000,000, and, with a corresponding amount from the States, we would have a total of nearly \$600,000,000 for Federal-aid highways. In addition there would be the amount spent by the States and localities for non-Federal highways. So we would still

have a large volume of highway construction.

Mr. President, the issue here is plain. I do not desire to detain the Senate any longer. I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 87, line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 3, after "1944", to strike out "\$135,509,000" and insert "\$115,509,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Bureau of Standards," on page 90, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$540,000" and insert "\$700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 25, after the word "thereto", to strike out "\$1,270,000" and insert "\$1,430,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 6, after the word "stations", to strike out "\$3,100,000" and insert "\$3,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "sites" and insert "a site"; in line 9, after the "a", to strike out "radio laboratory building and a"; in line 11, after the word "by", to strike out "acts" and insert "the act"; in line 12, after the numerals "1949", to strike out "Public Laws 366" and insert "Public Law 2"; in line 13, after the numerals "386", to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$134,000"; and in line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$5,675,000" and insert "\$1,766,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to discuss briefly the paragraph beginning on line 7 of page 93, and ending on line 17.

I was surprised when I read the hearings before the Appropriations Committee with respect to the matters which are dealt with in that paragraph, to find that no military justification had been made on behalf of the radio laboratory building for which that paragraph provides. I feel it is very important that the committee and the Senate be apprised of the military significance and the military impacts of that laboratory. I want to make the record complete by reading into it several documents pertaining to this matter. I shall skip around in them as much as I can to make my presentation as brief as possible and as much to the point as possible.

The first document I desire to read into the RECORD is a statement by the Bureau of Standards reading as follows:

The Central Radio Propagation Laboratory of the National Bureau of Standards was established at the direct request of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff in order to carry on and expand the radio propagation work

which has proved essential for military operations during the last war. By this means the major propagation work of the three branches of the Military Establishment would be centralized in one agency and coordination of the work would be assured. The activities of the laboratory are guided by an interagency radio propagation executive council, which establishes priorities of projects and reviews the annual budget so that duplications of work is avoided.

The establishment of a radio laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards is critical for the following reasons:

a. The extension of the radio frequency spectrum by a factor of 1,000,000 requires an extensive program of research, development, calibration, and testing. This program has been underway as authorized by Congress but has been handicapped by lack of suitable facilities and location.

b. The variable characteristics of radio waves required extensive propagation studies and prediction services for both military and civilian needs. In this sense, the field of radio propagation requires a service of prediction analogous to that required in weather.

I want Senators to listen particularly to this language:

Such services are crucial to the military services: For example, loss of planes and lives occurred during the last war as a direct consequence of lack of information as to the fading of radio frequencies and radio disturbances which effectively eliminated communication of our aircraft with bases.

c. The location and present facilities of the bureau in Washington are totally inadequate for the present program: the urgency of the program however was such that the program was begun and authorized by Congress at a level of \$3,000,000 per year, beginning in fiscal 1949. The program was and is closely coordinated and planned by the Air Force, Army, Navy, CAA, Air Navigation Development Board, FCC, Coast Guard, State Department, and industry, and reviewed by the Research and Development Board. The new facilities are crucial for (1) maximum effectiveness of a program now scattered in temporary structures clearly recognized as inadequate by the bureau and the military services; (2) effective and economic coordination with a related program of \$750,000 now being conducted in Colorado because of natural terrain conditions by the bureau for the military and the Air Navigation Development Board; and (3) consolidation of some field activities which cannot be performed in Washington.

The Committee on Appropriations had none of that information before it when it considered this appropriation. I am not surprised therefore that the committee struck from the bill the appropriation which provided for the building of this very essential laboratory, a laboratory of extremely critical importance and badly needed for the national defense.

I read further:

The program is crucial to the national defense and is of vital importance to civilian applications of radio. The role of this program in defense:

1. Prediction services as to the frequencies which can be used to insure communication from one point to another, anywhere in the world, at any time, are vital for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Radio waves are affected by sun spots and by disturbances in the ionosphere and meteorological phenomena. To maintain a prediction service requires extensive and continuous studies and monitoring, subsequent analysis of data, and the issuance of predictions to the services. Warnings of sudden disturbances must also be communicated at once to the

services with instructions as to what action must be taken to maintain communications.

I may say, Mr. President, that at Climax, Colo., Harvard University has a laboratory where the sun is photographed from day to day, where the impact of sun spots upon electronic waves throughout the world is measured, and where the importance of sun spots and their effect upon radio propagation is being studied and being determined.

I continue to read:

2. The development of effective guided missiles, which depend on radio waves for guidance, requires studies of the characteristics of waves at all frequencies. The success of this program depends on the solution of a large set of problems in this area: any delay here will adversely affect our readiness and effectiveness in utilizing these missiles. This program requires prompt action and considerable expansion, which cannot be achieved without adequate facilities.

In the paragraph to which I refer, the Appropriations Committee very properly left in the provision for a guided missiles laboratory, inasmuch as the two are joined together; they are connected scientifically, because the propagation of radio waves and the program in that connection and the guided missiles program cannot be separated; one is dependent on the other. The remainder of the justification reads as follows:

3. The global nature of our military responsibilities requires studies of radio propagation, in unusual geographic and climatic regions. The Bureau's program on propagation in the Arctic is of special importance here. This program requires adequate supporting research, development, and test facilities. In a suitable laboratory, for a considerable portion of the work must be done in a well-equipped laboratory.

4. Radio navigation and directing finding require the analysis and test of systems, the study of the properties of the radio waves in a given frequency range, and the synthesis of these studies into satisfactory systems for a variety of military purposes and conditions. Satisfactory radio navigation and direction finding are absolutely crucial in air warfare.

5. Radar, one of the most powerful methods of detecting and tracing air and sea targets, requires extensive knowledge of the best frequencies, studies of the range of radio waves, and problems of selection of radar sites. These studies by the Bureau for the military services require the proposed facilities and location if they are to be economically and quickly done.

6. Pressing work in countermeasures—including methods of getting radio signals through interference of the enemy—requires new facilities of the kind indicated.

7. Aircraft-to-aircraft and aircraft-to-ground communication essential to military operations and commercial aviation safety requires extensive and prompt studies of the higher frequencies—200 megacycles and above—about which insufficient information is now available.

The importance of these activities to the national economy, aside from the immediate and direct military applications, parallels in several respects those projects noted above. Prediction services, radio warning disturbances, radar, radio navigation and direction finding, the provision of standard frequencies and time signals, day and night—are important in the safe operation of civilian aircraft and shipping. Studies of radio propagation and of frequency allocations and frequency assignments are vital to every field of radio service, whether military or civilian.

In summary it is absolutely essential that the activities of the CRPL be removed from the Washington area as soon as possible and be provided with adequate facilities. Increasing congestion of the radio spectrum in this area makes adequate experimentation rapidly more difficult just at the time that military needs are most pressing. Under currently increasing emergency conditions, moreover, it appears that military needs will require intensification and extension of this program, which is impossible in the Washington area.

Mr. President, I wish to read certain statements coming from our military authorities. First, I wish to read a letter addressed to me by Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce at the time when the bill authorizing this laboratory was before our committee. In the letter he refers to Senate bill 443, the bill which provided for the laboratory. His letter reads as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, June 2, 1949.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate
and Foreign Commerce, United
States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that concern has been expressed by several members of your committee with respect to the location of the site for the proposed radio laboratory building the construction of which would be authorized by S. 443 for the National Bureau of Standards, presently under consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate.

As was stated in the statement of purpose and need for S. 443, transmitted to your committee on February 24, 1949, the activities to be carried out in this proposed laboratory are critical in the entire field of radio communications, of particular value of American aviation, and of vital importance to the Armed Forces. Members of my staff have therefore discussed the matter of the location of this site with the National Military Establishment, the National Security Resources Board, and the Bureau of the Budget. In accordance with these discussions, I am of the opinion that this building should not be located in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia and therefore recommend that amendatory language be provided in S. 443 to authorize the procurement of a site elsewhere. The proposed language, attached as exhibit A, is not restricted to a site for the laboratory building alone since buildings in the future where the same factors apply, should also be located at the same site for the reasons of economy, technical effectiveness, and administrative efficiency.

As stated in my letter dated February 24, 1949, to your committee, there exists an urgent need for the laboratory building which would be authorized by S. 443 and the Department strongly urges the enactment of this legislation as amended.

I have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this letter to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. President, one paragraph of the justification I read a moment ago indicates that there was a considerable loss of life in World War II because we did not have a complete understanding of radar and radio propagation and all the connected sciences.

Maj. Gen. Wilton B. Persons, United States Army, Director of the Office of Legislative Liaison, notified me as fol-

lows when we were previously considering this matter:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, February 17, 1949.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate
and Foreign Commerce, United
States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: Mr. Forrestal has asked me to acknowledge your letter of February 12, 1949, requesting the recommendations of this office with respect to a bill now pending before your committee, S. 443, to authorize the construction and equipment of a radio laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce.

This office has assigned to the Research and Development Board responsibility for providing your committee with a coordinated report on this legislation on behalf of the National Military Establishment.

Sincerely yours,

WILTON B. PERSONS,
Major General, United States Army,
Director, Office of Legislative
Liaison.

So, Mr. President, Dr. Karl T. Compton, chairman of the Research and Development Board, was speaking for the military when he addressed the following communication to our committee:

NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT,
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1949.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate
and Foreign Commerce, United
States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: In accordance with the direction contained in a memorandum to me from Maj. Gen. Wilton B. Persons, dated February 17, 1949, I am submitting herewith the views of the National Military Establishment on Senate 443, to authorize the construction and equipment of a radio laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce.

The work of the Bureau of Standards in the field of radio has had both tactical (military) and nontactical (civilian) applications. Some of its basic research work is of use to the military services, as for example, propagation studies, miniaturization (VT fuses and printed circuit techniques), fundamental studies of time and wave-length standards, and instrumentation (equipment for calibration and maintenance). The proposed facility will contribute indirectly to the research and development program of the National Military Establishment; and the National Military Establishment therefore takes a favorable view with respect to the enactment of the proposed legislation. It should be noted that the general character of Bureau of Standards work is such that the expenditure of funds for this facility should be regarded not as forming a part of the total national funds expendable on military research and development, but as separate from and supplemental thereto.

This report has been coordinated among the Departments and Boards of the National Military Establishment in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

Very truly yours,

KARL T. COMPTON,
Chairman.

After Mr. Forrestal resigned from the Office of National Defense, and was succeeded by Secretary Johnson, we took up the matter with the National Defense Establishment and asked them if they

still were interested in this laboratory, in the same way that they were interested in it when that establishment was under Mr. Forrestal. The reply was that they were. I received the following letter from Mr. F. H. Richardson, a deputy executive secretary of the Research and Development Board:

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD,
Washington, D. C., April 27, 1949.

Subject: Senate 443, "To authorize the construction and equipment of a radio laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce."

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: The report of the National Military Establishment on the above-identified bill was submitted to you by Dr. Compton in his letter dated April 5, 1949. This report, which was fully coordinated among the Departments and Boards of the National Military Establishment in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, took a favorable view with respect to the enactment of the proposed legislation.

Mr. Cooper of your committee's staff has asked whether, in view of the recent change in the incumbency in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the report on the subject bill may still be regarded as duly representing the viewpoint of the National Military Establishment. In Dr. Compton's absence I am replying for him to Mr. Cooper's query. I have made a check in the Office of the Secretary and I am authorized to inform you that, in the absence of specific action to the contrary, all actions by Secretary Forrestal, including all actions taken by subordinate bureaus and agencies, are to be regarded as still valid and in effect. By virtue of this presumption, the subject report on S. 443 falls within the class of actions which have not been altered by the change in the secretaryship.

Very truly yours,

F. H. RICHARDSON,
Deputy Executive Secretary.

Next, Mr. President, let me read the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER,
Washington, D. C., July 13, 1950.

DR. NEWBURN SMITH,
Chief, Central Radio Propagation Laboratory, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. SMITH: The enclosed statement is a copy of the statement previously presented indicating military support of the fiscal year 1951 Central Radio Propagation Laboratory budget.

Sincerely yours,

W. T. GUEST,
Brigadier General, USA, Chief,
Signal Plans and Operations Division.

Although the statement enclosed with that letter carries a previous date, nevertheless it is, as a result, brought up to this very day, July 13, 1950. The enclosed statement from the Department of Defense reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—STATEMENT TO BE
MADE IN DEFENSE OF CRPL BUDGET FOR THE
FISCAL YEAR 1951

As in previous years, the National Defense Establishment is wholeheartedly supporting the radio wave propagation program of the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory of the National Bureau of Standards.

From the military standpoint, the work undertaken is essential and represents basic

data vital to development work in communications, navigation, and guidance systems.

The budget requested has been reviewed by a committee of representatives of interested Government agencies and, as a result, represents a well-coordinated and carefully planned program.

R. V. D. CORPUT, Jr.,
Brigadier General, USA, Chief,
Signal Plans and Operations Division.

Concur for Department of Navy: J. M. Grider (Commander J. M. Grider).

Concur for Department of Air Force: J. Welchbrod (affirmed). D. P. Graul, Col., USAF (affirmed).

Let me point out that Colonel Graul, one of those who signed the foregoing statement, is a member of the Air Force Matériel Research and Development Board.

That is the military justification for this laboratory.

Mr. President, as stated in those letters, the National Defense Establishment has with the Bureau of Standards a contract by which \$3,000,000 a year is expended by the Bureau in order to provide the National Defense Establishment with the benefit of the very latest research work and the very latest information on the propagation of radio waves.

I should like to ask the Senator in charge of this measure whether under these circumstances it would be agreeable to him to have the committee amendments, on page 93, from line 7 to line 17, inclusive, rejected, and then to change the figure in line 17 from \$5,675,000 to \$3,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, when this matter was before the subcommittee which had this chapter in charge, it was argued that there should be two laboratories, a radio laboratory building and a guided-missile laboratory. The guided-missile laboratory has not yet been decided on, so far as the site is concerned. As to the radio laboratory building, it was stated before our committee that the site had been selected at Boulder University, at Boulder, Colo. It was the judgment of the committee, in view of the fact that no immediate necessity then appeared for both laboratories, that we could get along for the current year with one. The committee concluded that the guided-missile laboratory would be the most important one, and therefore struck out the provision for the radio laboratory at Boulder.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is, Boulder, Colo.?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. Since that time, communications have come to the Senators from Colorado, some of which have been read to the Senate. After conference with the ranking minority member, we have come to the conclusion that in view of conditions now prevailing, which conditions have come upon us since the committee considered this item, it may be well to go forward with both laboratories. For that reason I ask the Senate to disagree to the following committee amendments: On page 93, line 7, striking out "sites" and inserting "a site", so that the word "sites" will be restored; in line 9, striking out the words "radio laboratory

building and a", so that those words will be restored; in line 11, striking out the word "Acts" and inserting the word "the act", so that the words "Acts" will be restored; in line 12, striking out the words in parenthesis "Public Laws 356" and inserting "Public Law 386," thus eliminating the words "Public Law 386"; in line 13 striking out "\$500,000" and inserting "\$134,000." In lieu of "\$134,000" there should be inserted "\$268,000," which is a cash allowance for both laboratories. And in line 17, in lieu of the committee recommendation of "\$1,766,000" there should be inserted "\$3,000,000." Mr. President, I so move.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, apparently it is much easier to get increases in an appropriation bill than decreases. The amendments proposed would increase the total cost by \$1,368,000. In view of the fact that there is a tremendous amount of research in the field of radio, both on the part of the Government itself and on the part of private concerns, it seems to me that this is a field in which we could conserve our money, and that the original judgment of the committee was therefore correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee amendment, offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator from Illinois that as I listened to all the testimony on this subject, both these laboratories are necessary for the Government. Both of them are of top priority. As the chairman of the Senate committee said, we discussed this question and we believed at the time that we should go forward with one laboratory at a time.

The guided-missile laboratory explains itself.

So far as the radio laboratory is concerned, the Bureau of Standards is now doing its work in 10 separate buildings in Washington, D. C. Because of the surroundings of the metropolitan area, it is difficult for the Bureau to carry on the work here. It appointed a committee, which examined a number of sites, and finally the Boulder site was selected. I think there can be no question that the Boulder site is a proper one. The only question is as to how fast we should proceed with this work.

The radio work in this laboratory, I understand, has to do with jamming. Russia today is jamming our broadcasts. We have this afternoon appropriated \$32,000,000 for informational broadcasts. We are told that another message will come from the President requesting \$100,000,000. The whole theory of this research work is to eliminate jamming and blind spots. Recently there have been some very bad airplane accidents, as a result of the pilots having lost contact in the air; for what cause, I have no knowledge. But there are, we know, blind spots where pilots lose contact and their radio facilities stop working. This research is directed to that problem.

I believe that it is perfectly proper and, in view of the fact that we are going to

proceed with this building unquestionably next year, and in view of the conditions in the world and of the world's problems becoming more difficult, it perhaps is wiser to start in this year than next.

For that reason, I would say to my most distinguished colleague from Illinois that I agreed with the Senator from Nevada, upon weighing the further evidence from the authorities of the Army and the Navy, that we should start this laboratory this year rather than next, even though it is going to take several years to complete it, and even though we know that we are in a crisis, which may continue. The jamming of broadcast programs certainly will continue, and it will be helpful to have this research done. For that reason, I agreed with the Senator from Nevada in regard to the amendments he has offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on disagreeing to the committee amendments. The motion of the Senator from Nevada is that the Senate disagree to the first four amendments, that the plurals be restored in each instance, and that the appropriation be increased from \$134,000, in one instance, to \$268,000, and that the final appropriation be increased to \$3,000,000. Is there objection to voting on the proposition as a whole?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I wish to give my hearty endorsement to the things which have been said by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada and by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, and to evidence full agreement with the representations and showings which have been made on our joint behalf by the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

I think it vital that we get at and push to completion these things, which have such direct impact on our war-making ability and our ability to better our domestic life in the way of communications.

Obviously, our Voice of Freedom for winning the hearts and spirit of other peoples will not be heard if our radio cannot surmount obstruction. The techniques of jamming have moved forward faster than our techniques for finding channels which cannot be hindered.

We have had entirely too much talk about things we are going to do which have not materialized. Our boys in Korea cannot defend themselves and defeat the enemy with fancy ideas and blueprints. It is necessary that we have the best possible means of communication so that we may have effective central and local direction of our military effort.

We are trying to lengthen radio waves, trying to pick better waves in the whole spectrum of radio frequencies. We are trying to evolve, as was pointed out by the senior Senator from Massachusetts, methods of preventing the jamming of our radio communications.

It is necessary that we improve with utmost expedition our radar direction methods. No Member of the Senate is in position to give us dependable assurance that we are immune in this country from evil messengers carrying explosives from other parts of the world with which to destroy us.

We saw in the last World War the enormous importance of radar. A man working with a radar set at Pearl Harbor saw images on the screen, which, had they been properly evaluated and acted upon in time, might very well have averted that great disaster.

In England they were operating radar installations, unbeknown to the enemy, and through the information thus received, Great Britain, with a pathetically small supply of planes and flying personnel, was put in position to anticipate the arrival of the raiding Germans and was finally able to win the battle of Britain, which gave us one more opportunity to preserve a world of freedom and civilization.

Mr. President, the activities of this laboratory are at the heart of our modern weapons: our guided missiles, our airplane and ground communications, and our detection devices. Let us get ahead with the job without a moment's delay.

I am deeply grateful to the distinguished Senator from Nevada for the broad and enlightened outlook he has taken with reference to this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Weather Bureau," on page 94, line 4, after the word "Committee", to strike out "\$24,447,000" and insert "\$24,897,000"; and in line 14, after the word "annum", to insert "and such employees may be appointed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have discussed with the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Nevada, a small amendment to the committee amendment. I offer it and ask, if it is agreeable, that it be taken to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 94, line 4, it is proposed to strike out the numeral "\$24,897,000" and to insert "\$24,927,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, when the hearings were held I appeared before the committee and made an elaborate explanation of the need for a weather station at Cushing, which is located in my State. For some reason the committee did not see fit to grant the request. The request I made was presented last year and again this year. Cushing is an important oil town in Oklahoma. It has a fine airfield, but it has no weather service. My amendment proposes to make available \$30,000 with which to establish a weather station at Cushing, Okla.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, since both the House and the Senate have rejected it, I think it should now be rejected.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, ordinarily the committee tries to facilitate matters so that the greatest number of Weather Bureau stations may be available. On this occasion the committee thought it was not necessary to put in any additional stations. The Senator from Oklahoma has made persistent efforts to have this weather station established in his State. His efforts in the matter are highly commendable. For the purpose of having the question considered in conference, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment proposed by myself and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senate has approved the expenditure of approximately \$24,900,000 for the Weather Bureau?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I undoubtedly cannot obtain unanimous consent for a reconsideration of the vote, but I should like to point out that appropriations for the Weather Bureau have been increasing with great rapidity. In 1945 the total appropriation was slightly more than \$13,000,000, and in 5 years we have virtually doubled that amount. We have now effected an increase of \$480,000 over that which was approved by the House. While I know it would be impossible to obtain unanimous consent for reconsideration, I think those facts should be stated and would like to record my opposition to this Senate amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, it may be well for the Senate to know that the Weather Bureau has taken on new and essential activities. It has now become a very highly important part of aviation in the United States. It is almost indispensable, if not entirely indispensable, to the safety of travel by air. Furthermore, the military service of the United States has called the services of the Weather Bureau continuously, and particularly the outpost station in Alaska is called upon in connection with the national defense. The appropriations have increased, but the reason for the increase is very patent, and it was patent to the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I voted against the establishment of the weather station, and I voted against the establishment of one in Iowa. I person-

ally hoped we would not increase the number of weather stations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—The judiciary—Customs Court—Salaries and expenses," on page 97, line 2, after the word "judge", to strike out "\$417,465" and insert "\$411,465."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Court of Claims—Salaries and expenses," on page 97, line 12, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$587,000" and insert "\$575,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Repairs and improvements," on page 97, line 16, after the word "Capitol", to strike out "\$10,700" and insert "\$140,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask if the Court of Claims is the red architectural horror on Pennsylvania Avenue just beyond the White House?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is. I would say to the Senator that it is the building located just beyond the White House.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall not object to this appropriation, because I think that building needs prompt demolition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries of Clerks of courts," on page 98, line 10, after the word "assistants", to strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert "\$4,470,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries of criers," on page 99, line 5, after the numerals "755", to strike out "\$540,000" and insert "\$520,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous expenses," on page 101, line 3 after "(34 Stat. 476)", to strike out "\$725,000" and insert "\$675,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Travel expenses," on page 101, line 14, after the word "clerks", to strike out "\$725,000" and insert "\$650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative Office of the United States Courts," on page 102, line 7, after the word "field", to strike out "\$530,000" and insert "\$520,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Repairs and improvements, District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia," on page 102, line 13, after the word "thereto", to strike out "\$15,600" and insert "\$7,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—Government corporations—Department of State," on page 105, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$767,500."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this represents an increase of \$167,500 for the

Institute of Inter-American Affairs, concerning which we had discussion earlier this afternoon. I should appreciate it if the very able chairman of the committee would state the reasons which caused the committee to increase the amount by \$167,500. It is \$167,500 over the amount recommended by the House and the House amount was already \$75,000 over the amount for last year.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, with reference to this item on page 105, my recollection is that I agreed with the Senator from Illinois that we would discuss the item, looking toward some change in it. Since that time I have not had an opportunity to discuss it with the Senator. I think I have already made the explanation, and I can make it again if it will be helpful to do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada whether it is his understanding that the \$767,500 is a limitation on the use of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs' own money for administrative purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The appropriation has already been adopted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. The \$767,500 is a limitation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield for an unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have received word from the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], that several nominations have been reported favorably. As in executive session—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Senator from Tennessee proceeds, the Chair inquires whether there is objection to the adoption of the amendment on page 105, line 12, with reference to the Institute of Inter-American Affairs?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to point out that the administrative allowances last year were \$525,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Illinois is not ready to dispose of the amendment, the Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate, as in executive session, consider the nominations on the executive calendar, beginning with the Department of Justice.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we conclude with this chapter of the appropriations bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am willing that the Senator conclude with it. I thought there was to be some opposition to the item under discussion.

Mr. McCARRAN. I believe we can smooth it out. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois and draw his attention to the fact that last year the Institute had only \$4,751,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee was recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

Does the Senator from Tennessee wish to make his motion now?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to conclude with the chapter under discussion.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is agreeable to me. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. This year it is a \$5,000,000 cash appropriation, together with \$7,000,000 in contract authority and it is for that reason we are recommending an increase in the limitation on administrative expenses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that last year the corresponding administrative expenses of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs was \$525,000. The House increased that amount by \$75,000, making a total of \$600,000. The Senate committee is proposing to increase this figure by a further allowance of \$167,500. It seems to me that would be multiplying the overhead. Although I am only 1 of 96 Senators, I shall be compelled to vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Earlier this afternoon the Senate approved the committee amendment on page 42, line 18, increasing the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the State Department from \$77,300,000 to \$78,300,000, or an increase of \$1,000,000. Inasmuch as I must ask unanimous consent that the vote be reconsidered within 2 days, I now formally request that the RECORD show that at a subsequent date I shall move for reconsideration of these increases.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not hear what the Senator said.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood the distinguished Senator from Illinois to say that, in view of the fact that a motion to reconsider had to be entered within 48 hours, he wanted it known that within the next 48 hours he would do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator will have until Monday to enter his motion.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I renew my request that the Senate now proceed, as in executive session, to consider certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

E. F. Sallsbury, of Missouri, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, vice Edward Flad, retired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first nomination.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold I. Baynton, of Nevada, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to read a letter from the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] addressed to the minority leader. As acting minority leader I read the letter, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
July 13, 1950.

Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,

Minority Leader, United States Senate.

DEAR KEN: Reference is made to the nomination of Mr. Harold I. Baynton, now Acting Alien Property Custodian for an Assistant Attorney General in Charge of Alien Property.

I have no objection to the confirmation of Mr. Baynton as Assistant Attorney General in Charge of Alien Property, but if the appointment is to be charged to Nevada, I would favor a bona fide resident of the State receiving the position.

Upon a preliminary check with prominent members of the Nevada bar, I find that he is not a member of the bar in our State, that he is from Montana, more recently a product of Washington College of Law and now a trustee of that institution—and that well-known attorneys in Nevada with whom I have talked, do not know him.

I have no strong feeling in the matter except the State connection, therefore, I suggest that no further delay in his confirmation be requested.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles M. Spofford, of New York, to be United States deputy representative on the North Atlantic Council.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ford S. Worthy to be United States marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Holroyd McGinnis to be United States marshal for the southern district of West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the call of the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, July 14, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 13 (legislative day of July 1), 1950:

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Eugene J. Smith, of New York, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires July 15, 1950.

John M. Comeford, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal for the western dis-

trict of Wisconsin. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 8, 1950.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 13 (legislative day of July 1), 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Harold I. Baynton to be an Assistant Attorney General.

NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL

Charles M. Spofford to be United States deputy representative on the North Atlantic Council, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Ford S. Worthy to be United States marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina.

William Holroyd McGinnis to be United States marshal for the southern district of West Virginia.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

PROMOTION TO PERMANENT GRADE

To be rear admirals in the United States Coast Guard

Harold G. Bradbury
Roy L. Raney

The following-named personnel of the United States Coast Guard to serve on the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy as indicated:

To be associate professor with the grade of commander

John S. Merriman, Jr.

To be assistant professor with the grade of lieutenant commander

Ernest M. Espelle

To be commissioned instructors with the grade of lieutenant

Paul F. Foye
Ephraim P. Rivard
Stanley L. Smith

er to carry on the war. It looks very much as if this struggle will develop into a full-scale war, and if it does, is there one Senator who will sit on the floor of the Senate and not join in passing the necessary legislation to stop Communists in our own country, to stop giving them an opportunity to sabotage the war effort, to sabotage the Nation?

Mr. President, an attitude of doing nothing simply does not make sense to me. If the bill we are discussing is not as it should be, let us correct it, let us amend it, but before this session of Congress adjourns or recesses, in my opinion we should pass whatever legislation is necessary to deal with Communists within our own ranks, to reduce to the very minimum the opportunity of any sabotage among those who think as they do.

I see nothing un-American about that. It seems to me it is the most American thing we can do. I know of nothing more American than to protect America. I am confident that the great majority of the people of my State are for some sort of legislation which will put a stop to the undermining of our Government by those who would overthrow it, and if I understand the philosophy of communism correctly, it is to overthrow our Government and to overthrow the governments of all other countries.

Mr. President, I want to say in closing that I shall support any piece of legislation that looks to the control of saboteurs in the United States, and particularly in the face of the fact that we are now at war. It is not a police action. We are at war, and we are fighting those who hold to the philosophy of what we commonly know as communism.

So far as I know there are no good Communists. They are just Communists. I hope that Congress, before it adjourns, will take a good look at our laws, and makes certain that before we go home, if we do, there will be passed legislation which will properly protect the Government of the United States and properly protect and back up the boys who are giving their lives in Korea, who are face to face with and fighting the philosophy we know as communism.

CONVEYANCE OF FORT RUCKMAN MILITARY RESERVATION TO TOWN OF NAHANT, MASS.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 7477, providing for the conveyance to the town of Nahant, Mass., of the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7477) providing for the conveyance to the town of Nahant, Mass., of the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and

agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That, upon payment to the United States of the sum of \$23,000, the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the town of Nahant, Mass., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all lands constituting the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation, situated within the town of Nahant, together with the buildings and other improvements thereon: *Provided, however,* That the instrument of conveyance shall contain such terms and conditions which will allow the recapture of the property in the event said property is not used for educational, recreational, or other public purposes: *Provided further,* That the instrument of conveyance shall reserve to the United States, for so long as it is necessary for governmental purposes, that certain 15-foot easement for the maintenance, repair, and replacement of a cable and its appurtenances, and at such time as it shall be no longer required for governmental use, said easement may be abandoned and upon such abandonment will automatically terminate, and that certain temporary easement, terminating June 30, 1954, covering one and eight-tenths acres of land used in connection with the Turf Drainage Investigation Program, with right of access thereto, both easements being more particularly described in WAA Form 1005 dated June 22, 1948, Reporting Agency No. WD-1299, as amended by WAA Form 1005 dated December 15, 1948, Reporting Agency No. WD-1299-B, which are filed in the office of the General Services Administration"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
WM. BENTON,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
HERBERT C. BONNER,
ROBERT F. RICH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may make a unanimous consent request?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have on the desk some four amendments to the pending bill. I also intend to propose, on Monday, a further amendment to the bill. I am obliged to go to a committee meeting this afternoon, and I ask unanimous consent that if my amendments are reached in the course of consideration of the bill today I may be privileged to bring them up on Monday when the Senate convenes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state what the amendments are?

Mr. MAGNUSON. One amendment, Mr. President, is on page 61, one is on page 179, one amendment, submitted by me and some 20 other Senators, is on page 329; one amendment is on

page 247, and the amendment I propose to submit on Monday is to the cancer, heart and mental diseases section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, and request that the amendment be stated, after which I shall discuss the amendment for a moment or two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken on pages 444, 445, and 446 by the committee amendment, insert the following:

CHAPTER X-4—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 1001. Except as hereinafter provided, each appropriation, reappropriation, and contract authorization or reauthorization, made by this act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, to any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government (including funds of Government corporations authorized by this act for administrative expenses), is hereby reduced by 10 percent.

SEC. 1002. In order to provide for the most effective use of appropriations and contract authorizations reduced by this chapter, the head of each department and agency in the executive branch of the Government is hereby authorized to make adjustments and

transfers between such appropriations, and between such contract authorizations, within his department or agency; but no such appropriation or contract authorization shall be increased under the authority of this section to an amount in excess of that provided in other chapters of this act.

SEC. 1003. The reductions provided for in this chapter shall not apply to the following:

(a) Title II of chapter IV; chapter X; so much of title I of chapter X-B as is contained in the paragraph headed "Mutual defense assistance"; and the amount appropriated to the General Services Administration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of July 23, 1946;

(b) Appropriations in title I of chapter VIII for the Executive Office of the President under the headings "Compensation of the President," "The White House Office," "Emergency fund for the President," and "Executive Mansion and Grounds";

(c) Appropriations and contract authorizations for the atomic energy program;

(d) Trust funds;

(e) Funds of Government corporations excluding those made available in this act (1) for administrative expenses and (2) by appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury;

(f) Amounts (other than under the Veterans' Administration) for furnishing medical and hospital services and domiciliary care, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, or clinic, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

(g) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations;

(h) Appropriations of, or measured by, receipts;

(i) Amounts appropriated by this act for the operation of law enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Customs, Immigration and Naturalization Services, and the Secret Service; or for the payment of compensation and expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and such other officers and employees of other agencies whose duties primarily pertain to intelligence operations (including funds transferred pursuant to section 6 (a) of the act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 211) or to the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States;

(j) Amounts provided for any program of the Veterans' Administration, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, clinic, or facility, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

(k) Amounts provided for payments to States or political subdivisions thereof;

(l) Amounts provided to make payment of or contributions toward pensions, retirement and disability annuities and benefits, employees' death or injury benefits, or other items of a similar nature;

(m) Appropriations for refunds, awards, and indemnities.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the amendment has been prepared by Senators from both sides of the aisle as an economy amendment to be substituted for the Thomas-Taber amendment found in the House appropriation bill.

This amendment has been most carefully worked out by a group of Senators who have met many times in drafting the amendment. The group has been in close consultation with our own legis-

lative counsel of the Senate and with representatives of the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of the Budget.

It is the opinion of our legislative counsel and of the downtown agencies that this amendment is technically correct to do the job of reducing appropriations in this 1951 omnibus bill.

Mr. President, only twice in the last 21 years has the Federal budget been in balance. The fiscal year just past has been one of deficit financing. The fiscal year we are entering will be one of deficit financing. We would incur a deficit in fiscal 1951 even if the Korean crisis had not developed.

The advocates of deficit spending always harp back to the cost of wars, past and future. The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that the cost of war is not the sole cause of the continuing Federal deficits. Excluding the cost of national defense, Mr. President, excluding the cost of international aid, excluding the interest on the public debt, excluding the cost of the Veterans' Administration—all other costs of the Federal Government have increased from \$2,000,000,000 in 1946 to an estimated \$12,700,000,000 in the President's budget estimate for 1951.

Today, Mr. President, this Nation is faced with a crisis as severe as any that has confronted this Nation in its history. We do not know what the immediate future will ask of us. We do know that we may be called upon to exert every last measure of strength. Events of the past few weeks ought to have convinced every American of the need for military and industrial preparedness to match the hour.

We cannot spend our substance today on projects not directly related to the requirements for national defense and the minimum needs of Government operation.

This amendment which is submitted today, Mr. President, will not balance the budget.

I do not promise that it will stop all unessential operations of the Government. I know there are many members of the Senate who do not believe this amendment goes far enough. But I would remind you, Mr. President, that it is an amendment in the nature of a compromise, worked out by several different Senators representing several different sections of the country and representing both major political parties.

The amendment proposes to reduce most appropriations for nondefense items by 10 percent.

The directive given in the amendment to the executive branch of the Government is clear and unmistakable.

There is no surrender of authority from the legislative branch to the executive branch of the Government. If this amendment carries, the President will know exactly how much is appropriated under each title of the bill.

Because the sponsors of this amendment are aware that there may be some appropriation titles which cannot stand a cut of 10 percent, we have written into the amendment the power to transfer between appropriations within departments and independent agencies.

In practical effect, Mr. President, this transfer authority makes the cuts department-wide.

The amendment carries sensible exemptions.

National defense, everything having to do with the war effort, atomic energy, and related programs are exempted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have just entered the Senate Chamber. Has the Senator's amendment been printed and does it lie on the table?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have just submitted it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator a copy of the amendment which he can let me see?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. I send a copy of it to the Senator's desk.

The Post Office, already operating on a deficiency basis, is exempted.

Payments of pensions and benefits to veterans and other personnel are exempted.

The fixed commitments of trust funds and existing contracts are exempted.

I would like at this time, Mr. President, to give a firm estimate of the amount that this amendment would reduce appropriations and reappropriations found in the 1951 bill. I am informed that the Director of the Budget currently is preparing such an estimate, which should be available within the next day or so.

Pending an estimate from the Bureau of the Budget, I believe this amendment may reduce the bill by approximately \$600,000,000.

Mr. President, the amendment is a workable amendment. If it is adopted, appropriations and expenditures for nondefense items will be reduced.

Of course, Mr. President, this amendment is going to lessen some of the operations of Government. The number of employees in the executive branch will be reduced. I would remind the Senate, however, that defense agencies already are building up their employee list and that a manpower shortage in Washington is beginning to threaten.

The amendment, also, will reduce appropriations for programs not directly related to defense. If it is adopted, we will put off for another year some of the construction and development which we had proposed to do this year.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that the members who urged so strongly putting off construction of a badly needed Senate Office Building will be consistent and support the amendment.

I can anticipate the arguments that will be forthcoming in support of some of the nondefense programs which the amendment is going to reduce. But this is a critical period and many worth-while things must be put off. I, personally, would favor a deferment of all nonessential public works at this time. The amendment calls only for a 10 percent reduction in such spending.

The people of America, Mr. President, already are called upon to sacrifice their sons in battle. They know that, should the international situation become worse, they will be called upon for many sacrifices of civilian require-

ments. The people of America will stand behind Congress, Mr. President, if we have the courage to cut from the President's budget some of the funds, not necessary for national defense.

In closing, Mr. President, let me say that I was very much impressed with a statement made a few years ago by a legislator in the State of Vermont, on the question of building an executive mansion for the Governor of Vermont. That question came up, and it had very popular support from the civic groups in the State. Finally one veteran legislator from a small town rose and turned the tide by making this statement: "I am not for voting money that we ain't got for something we don't need."

Mr. President, I think that very practical, humble statement could well be applied to the situation in our country today. I, too, am not in favor of spending what we do not have—for today we are operating on a deficit—for things we do not need.

That is the purpose of this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAPMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very much impressed with the statement which has just been made by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, and I feel that I should like to identify myself with the proposal he is making. I should like to ask him a question, if I may.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. At the time when I was studying the ECA program this year, and when I was discussing the matter with Mr. Hoffman, I asked him about the estimates of the funds needed by the ECA to carry on its work. He said that he was perfectly willing to take his cuts across the board, if he had to, but he hoped they would not be imposed upon the ECA after its funds had already been cut.

So I wish to ask the Senator whether he thinks it would be fair, after the funds for ECA already have been cut, to make a further cut of 10 percent in the ECA funds or commitments, which I feel are a part of our defense program.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from New Jersey, who is a great student of international affairs, and who I know has a great interest in the ECA, as I have, that this amendment does not exclude the ECA. It does exclude arms implementation or other military aid. We would be delighted to have the Senator from New Jersey join with us in sponsoring the amendment, and have him reserve the right on his part to take a different position on the ECA item, if he chooses to do so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think I would check with those in the ECA with whom I have been studying this matter, and see what position they would take in regard to the ECA program which is the bedrock of our operations in regard to European aid; and I believe that I

would reserve the right, when the matter comes up on the floor of the Senate, to try to restore the part of the ECA funds which then might be missing, if a 10-percent cut had already been made in the ECA funds, or if one was then proposed.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Is it not a fact that if the ECA funds are found to be insufficient by the end of the calendar year, we very possibly can provide for the ECA by means of a deficiency appropriation before the next calendar year?

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, that will be possible, particularly in view of the fact that, of course, it was not possible for the ECA to make exact estimates. Under those circumstances, the Congress was generous enough to appropriate more than ample funds for the ECA, and the ECA was efficient enough to conduct its operations in such a way as to have a carry-over of \$277,000,000.

It is quite understandable that it was impossible for exact estimates to be made of the funds required by ECA. However, the situation would be as the Senator says, and the representatives of ECA would be able to come before the congressional committees at such a time when we would know more definitely about the world situation.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from New Jersey has raised questions about the ECA. Is it not true that in the amendment, of which the junior Senator from Michigan is a cosponsor, provision is made that the 10-percent cut shall be on the amount stated in the bill as it is finally passed by both Houses of Congress and is signed by the President?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. So the conferees will be able to determine what, in their opinion, is the amount which is to be cut 10 percent; is not that a correct statement?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. As also indicated, is it not true that if an emergency arises, and if the President feels he needs money with which to take care of such an emergency—whether in regard to the ECA or otherwise—it is possible for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation to be requested?

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course.

Mr. FERGUSON. So the purpose of this amendment is to attempt to have the Congress cut the civilian, nonmilitary, nonfighting budget 10 percent; is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. When we are at war, even if it is termed a police action, and we are going to supply the men at the front and those who are engaged in arming Europe, then most certainly the time has come when we must save something from the least essential operations of Government in order to be able to give sufficient assistance and make sufficient

appropriations for activities which are vital and essential.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is the philosophy of the amendment, and I think it is the best possible approach which can be devised at this time.

Mr. President, we have not had an opportunity to invite Senators generally to join in sponsoring the amendment, but I should like to say that any Senator—regardless of political party—is invited to become a cosponsor of the amendment. If Senators will notify us of that desire on their part, their names can be added to the amendment before it is printed this evening.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have not seen the amendment, but under the circumstances I should like to know whether the proposed cut would apply to the rural mail carriers. Would they be cut 10 percent, under the provisions of the amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. The amendment excludes the Post Office Department in its entirety.

Mr. LANGER. How about the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. BRIDGES. The amendment excludes it in its entirety.

Mr. LANGER. What does the amendment include?

Mr. BRIDGES. It includes all the civilian components of the Government which do not directly apply to the military, to veterans, to arms implementation aid, to the FBI, to the Secret Service, to the Immigration Service, to grants in aid to the States, and so forth.

Mr. LANGER. How many Government employees, or what percent, would be affected by the amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know that I can state the exact percentage of Government employees who would be affected by the amendment, but I would say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that the amendment has been worked out very carefully so that it would not have the effect of injuring any program which is vital or essential at this time.

Mr. LANGER. Do I correctly understand from the distinguished Senator—if he will yield further—that the conferees will be able to determine which of the Government departments the amendment will affect and which ones it will not affect?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; they are stated in the amendment. What the Senator from Michigan said was that the conferees, of course, will determine the exact amount of the bill—as between the amount of the bill as passed by the House and the amount of the bill as passed by the Senate. So the amendment will apply to the amount arrived at in that way, rather than to the amount carried in the bill as passed by the Senate. That was the point the Senator from Michigan made, I believe.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has made a splendid presentation of it, and I shall not attempt to cover the ground he has covered; as a cosponsor of this amend-

ment, I desire to discuss it briefly. When the appropriation bill passed the House of Representatives it contained the Thomas-Taber amendment providing for reductions by formula in addition to those specifically set forth in the various appropriation items.

This over-all formula reduction to provide further economy was adopted on the floor of the House by a vote of more than 2 to 1. The predominating criticism of the House provision has been with respect to the technical difficulties which would arise in its administration.

The Senate committee amendment, which is offered as an amendment to the Thomas-Taber amendment in the House, has been drafted with the benefit of assistance by technicians from the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Senate Legislative Drafting Counsel. The Bureau of the Budget is now preparing a careful estimate of the savings.

For myself, I should not hesitate at this time, in this perilous condition of the country, to vote for much larger reductions in domestic civilian expenditures.

We are virtually in a state of war and from recent experience we know what military operations cost. This amendment applies no reduction to appropriations for the Military Establishment or for direct activities in support of our military defense.

In the current circumstances of international crisis abroad with its fiscal and physical requirements at home, I vigorously urge that nonessential domestic civilian expenditures should be cut to the absolute minimum.

This amendment does not go that far. I wish it did. I wish it did. I would feel much better about the security of the Nation.

I realize, of course, that much of the appropriations in this bill are tied to long-term commitments made by law which cannot be remedied in an appropriation bill. I take this occasion to repeat what I have been saying for years: We should proceed with caution toward the enactment of basic legislation which in effect commits the Federal Government to virtually permanent spending programs, and I hope that before the next appropriation bill reaches the Senate, the Senate Appropriations Committee will be able to advise us as to these programs and how much each of them costs in terms of requested appropriations.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, has explained in great detail, as I have said, the provisions of the amendment. It suffices for me to say that we do not propose by this amendment to reduce any appropriation essential to our national defense. The nonessentials which would be reduced would be cut by only 10 percent and there are few who would argue that there is not more than 10 percent of fat in every appropriation which comes before Congress. In addition, I am confident that we have had the benefit of the best technical advice available in the drafting of this amend-

ment so that it simply raises the question as to whether, in the face of war conditions, we choose to retrench by 10 percent in nonessential Federal expenditures which involve neither the military defense of the Nation nor legal and moral commitments to individuals, corporations, or political subdivisions.

I repeat, it is my sincere belief that a 10-percent reduction can be absorbed at this time on every budget expenditure item with the exception of interest on the debt and national defense.

As a cosponsor of this amendment, I shall support it in the belief that it represents the very least that we can do in an effort to make secure the fiscal position of the Government of the United States. For myself, as I have said, I should like to do much more in the direction of reducing nondefense expenditures, and I believe more may have to be done if conditions develop as it now appears they will, requiring large additional expenditures for our military defense.

Mr. WHERRY, Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. LANGER addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BYRD. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia a question, but before doing so, I should like to state that I have worked with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for many years, and with the entire minority membership, and I am well satisfied that all the Senators who have joined in offering this amendment to the appropriations bill have done so after careful study and consideration. If adopted, I feel satisfied that it will work mechanically in a very satisfactory way. That is a difficult thing to do, when an attempt is made either by way of rescission or by limitation or restriction in an appropriation bill.

I wish to say for the record that I regret that a greater reduction in the appropriations bill cannot be brought about this year. I feel satisfied that the Appropriations Committee, prior to the development of the Korean situation, had done a splendid job, and I wish to compliment the chairmen of the various subcommittees upon the bill which has been reported to the Senate. After nearly 8 years service in the Senate, with most of the time membership on the Appropriations Committee one of my regular assignments, I am satisfied that the Appropriations Committee has given a great deal of conscientious effort and study to the appropriations for individual items. But I must say that, in view of the emergency which confronts us, there can be no doubt of the absolute necessity of making every possible savings, to the end that military items for the defense of the country and trust fund items, which must be protected, are given adequate supplies of money, when and if the demand comes.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire

whether they have made any estimate of the saving which would be effected by this amendment. I do not know whether the figures have been worked out to the last detail, but I wonder whether the Senator can give us an estimate.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from New Hampshire, I believe, estimated the saving at about \$600,000,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. From \$600,000,000 to \$700,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. A very careful estimate will be made by the Budget Bureau within the next few days.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator give us an estimate of the total amount of reductions made by the House and the Senate, without the adoption of this amendment, and of the total amount of reductions that would be made with it?

Mr. BYRD. As a rough estimate, I should say that the reductions made by the House and the Senate without the adoption of this amendment would be about \$1,200,000,000. I should say that the reductions, including the reductions proposed by this amendment, would approximate \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia, and to join with him wholeheartedly in his observations, in the course of which he has stated—and I agree—that this certainly is a step in the right direction. I hope the Senate will look with favor upon the amendment, and that it will have the support of the Senate as an effort to save money where money can be saved, and to make it possible to use money where it must be used, if and when occasion arises.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator how the proposed 10-percent cut under this amendment would be applied. Would it apply pro rata?

Mr. BYRD. It would be applied to each department of the Government, to be broken up by each of the departments for specific application within the department.

Mr. LANGER. For example, would it mean, if the amendment is adopted, that travel expense could be cut 10 percent?

Mr. BYRD. It would.

Mr. LANGER. Would it mean that the supplies could be cut 10 percent?

Mr. BYRD. It is left to the discretion of the heads of the departments. The appropriation for the department itself would be cut, and that cut would have to be distributed within the department.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am reminded of a speech made some months ago, possibly a year ago, by the distinguished Senator, showing that in one department there was enough paper on hand to last for 78 years, and that another department had certain supplies on hand sufficient to last for 287 years. Under this amendment, I take it, it would not be necessary to cut

those supplies 10 percent, but they could be cut out entirely.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask one more question, if I may. If the amendment should be adopted, how would it affect the Byrd-Langer amendment?

Mr. BYRD. It would not affect the Byrd-Langer amendment, because that provides for a limitation upon employment. It would not be affected at all.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, the Bureau of the Budget would still have to reduce personnel?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

IMPORTANCE OF RETAINING OUR SURPLUS WAR MATERIALS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article appearing in today's issue of the Washington Daily News, by Jim G. Lucas, entitled "GI's Could Use Tanks We Let Go." I do not rise to talk about it in a spirit of criticism, but, rather, to make a suggestion after I have read the article:

American GI's, fighting a losing battle against Russian-made heavy tanks in Korea, could use some of those Uncle Sam lost, sold, or gave away a few years back.

It wasn't too long ago that Uncle Sam was peddling surplus tanks to all takers at a few cents on the dollar. In July 1947, for instance, we sold 10 light tanks, worth \$270,000, to Belgium for \$10,000. In December, we disposed of 21 more, worth \$568,000, to Canada for \$17,000.

In January 1948 we sold nine tank engines, track assemblies, and spare parts, worth \$166,000, to Venezuela for \$8,000. In March, \$49,000 worth of engines and spare parts went to Guatemala for \$2,000. In April, we closed a deal with Ecuador for 21 tank engines and spare parts, worth \$400,000, for \$20,000. In September of that year, we sold Mexico 12 tank engines, worth \$291,000, for \$14,000.

NINE THOUSAND AND EIGHTY-FIVE TANKS LOST

The Hoover Commission's national security task force said we made 86,000 tanks during World War II. Army statistics indicated we had 25,045 at the end of the war. In 1948, the task force said, the Army could account for 15,960 tanks. The task force said the Army was unable to state what had become of the others.

The task force said it believed the Army didn't know how many tanks it had. The task force charged that the Army was asking for money to modernize more tanks than were in stock. The Army overlooked the fact, the task force said, that 102 had been sold to the Marines, and asked for money to modernize them, too.

Moreover, the task force said, the Army couldn't account for the vast quantities of matériel on hand at the end of hostilities. The Army says it has matériel sufficient to equip only 18 divisions, although at the end of the war it had 89 fully equipped divisions and great additional quantities of matériel in the pipeline.

Mr. President, in order to save the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Loss of easily replaceable matériel is easily understood, but the loss of complicated, hard-to-produce military equipment is another matter, especially as the military was

put on notice 6 months after the end of the war as to the seriousness of the international situation."

HOOVER REPORTED IT

The case of the missing tanks was first told to Congress by ex-President Herbert Hoover on April 11, 1949. The next day, ex-Army Secretary Kenneth C. Royall said Mr. Hoover was totally incorrect.

Mr. Royall said 7,170 tanks were found to be obsolete and were transferred, sent abroad as military aid or lost for similar reasons. He said the tank transfer to the Marines was discovered and adjusted accordingly.

Mr. Royall said equipment for 35 divisions was sold to civilian, destroyed, demilitarized, given to the Red Cross or UNRRA, salvaged or made part of the Greek-Turkish aid program. Equipment for another 23, he said, was out of balance as to quantity, or needed repair.

The rug was pulled out from under Mr. Royall the next day. Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, at his first press conference, agreed with Mr. Hoover, who later said his facts were "taken from their original source, confirmed by officers in charge, and rechecked with independent sources."

The Hoover Commission task force said that—whatever the reason—it was evident we no longer had the tanks or the equipment for 71 demobilized divisions.

"Whether or not the equipment was perfect," the task force said, "its possession today would be of great comfort and value to the peaceful countries of the world."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, when World War II ended, I urged as strongly as I could that the Government should not dispose of any war matériel. I even urged that it should dispose of no factories. I recommended that it dispose only of that which was perishable, on the theory that the best we could do was to receive from 10 to 15 percent of the value of the surplus war matériel, and that we might need it again sometime.

The argument against that suggestion, of course—and there was some merit to it—was that war matériel become obsolete.

My answer then was, as my answer is today, that it is better to have obsolete material than to have no material at all.

The purpose of my rising, Mr. President, was to urge upon the President of the United States that if we are disposing of any war material at the moment, such disposal be immediately discontinued and; that we keep such material, even though it be obsolete. I feel that my recommendation when the war ended was sound, and I think it is sound today, that we not dispose of any of our surplus war material. If we had today the tanks which we had at the end of the war they would be very helpful to the boys who are fighting in Korea.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Is it not true that some material which might be classified as obsolete consists of critical material which is not available at this time, and might it not be very well for us to consider it from that angle and to keep and preserve what we have?

Mr. CAPEHART. There is no question but that the Senator is correct.

As I said a moment ago, Mr. President, I am making these remarks not in any spirit of criticism, because we are at war, but only to urge upon our Government that it not dispose of any war materials, because even that which looks like scrap is made of steel, copper, and other materials which in an all-out war effort become scarce.

I strongly urge that the Government immediately stop disposing of any so-called surplus war material, because, frankly, I do not think there is any such thing as surplus war material. It may have become obsolete, but obsolete material is better than no material at all.

I think we made a mistake, and I so stated 5 years ago, in disposing of our war plants and of surplus war material. I know it is easy for one's hindsight to be better than his foresight, and I am not trying to be critical in this instance, because we are at war, and it behooves every American to support his Government in time of war. I think it behooves us as Members of the United States Senate to offer constructive suggestions. I believe the suggestion which I have just offered, that the Government discontinue the disposal of even one penny's worth of war materials at this time, until the war in Korea is over, is a good suggestion. When that war is over, let us keep our war material, because obsolete material is always better than no material at all.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA—H. R. 331

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I desire to speak for a few minutes on a very important matter that is to come up for Senate consideration soon after we complete the consideration of the Appropriations bill, now before this body. I refer to the statehood bill for Alaska, House bill 331. The chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on Monday last, made a similar short statement at the time he submitted the report of the majority for inclusion in the RECORD.

The original version of House bill 331 was, no doubt, pretty well circulated in Alaska both before and after its passage by the House, but I doubt if a dozen copies of the bill as finally reported by the Senate committee have reached Alaska. I personally airmailed four or five copies to the daily newspapers of Alaska as soon as I obtained printed copies of the bill as revised by the Senate committee. To date, I have heard from only one or two persons in Alaska with reference to the contents of the revised bill. I am certain that the revised Senate bill is a tremendous improvement over the House version, but I also feel that it may be wise to take more time to perfect the Senate bill, as evidenced by the editorial from the Juneau Daily Alaska Empire, which I shall insert in the RECORD with this statement. If more people in Alaska were given the opportunity of reading the Statehood bill, as now proposed, I feel certain there would be many protests, not only with reference to the public lands provision, but also with regard to the provisions affecting the mining and fishing industries of the Territory.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask that the editorial above referred to be made a part of my statement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT WILL BE TOO LATE

When the original Alaska statehood bill, H. R. 331, after having passed the House, came to the Senate, and a hearing was had before the Senate Committee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, it was brought to the attention of the committee that this bill had not been given any circulation in the Territory, so that very few persons were familiar with its contents.

It was also pointed out that the provisions of the bill relating to the transfer of public lands to the new State were wholly inadequate. Apparently most of the proponents of statehood agreed to that and so did the members of the committee, for the bill has been amended in the Senate committee, and the chief amendments deal with section 5, relating to the transfer of public lands to the new State. We have received a copy of the bill as it now stands and as it was amended by the committee on June 21 and 23. Section 5 (b) of the latest bill reads as follows:

"After 5 years from the admission of Alaska into the Union, the State, in addition to any other grants made in this section, shall be entitled to select not to exceed 20,000,000 acres from the vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved public lands in the State. Such selections shall be made in reasonably compact tracts: *Provided*, That valid, existing rights shall not be affected by any such selections or grants. Where the lands desired are unsurveyed at the time of selection, the Secretary of the Interior shall survey the exterior boundaries of the area requested without any subdivision thereof and shall issue a patent for such selected area in terms of the exterior boundary survey. Such lands may be granted or sold by the State in tracts of not more than 640 acres for any purpose, but with a reservation to the State of a royalty of not more than 12½ percent on all minerals produced therefrom. The lands granted to the State of Alaska pursuant to this subsection, and income therefrom and the proceeds thereof when said lands are sold, shall be held by said State as a public trust for the support of public schools and other public educational institutions."

In the first amendment made by the committee the provision "that valid existing rights shall not be affected by any such selections or grants" was not included. However, the inclusion of that in section 5 (b) would seem to add very little protection for the new State in acquiring public lands.

As the section reads, the State shall be entitled after 5 years to select not to exceed 20,000,000 acres from vacant, unappropriated and unreserved lands in the State. As the tracts are selected the Secretary of the Interior shall survey the exterior boundaries of the areas requested and shall issue a patent for such selected area in terms of the exterior boundary survey.

Now, let us suppose that the new State after 5 years begins to select areas to be transferred to it by patent from the United States. Let us say it selects an area containing three or four thousand acres in one locality. The new State is not likely to select mountain peaks or tundra, but it may be assumed that it will try to select the best lands available, and it is difficult to conceive of any considerable tracts of land which might be so selected which would not contain within their exterior boundaries some unpatented mining claims and some other unpatented ground held by settlers for one purpose or another.

In the first place, since the State is authorized to select only from vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved public lands, it

could hardly be said that tracts which include unpatented mining claims and other unpatented claims would be either vacant or unappropriated; therefore, according to the strict letter of the law, the Secretary would refuse to make the survey and issue the patent to the State.

If he should attempt to make the survey and issue the patent, just how would the valid existing rights of any person be protected? Furthermore, there might be existing rights which the Secretary or the new State might consider not to be valid.

This would surely cause litigation in case the Secretary should consider the lands to be vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved and issue the patent to the new State.

The very best he could do would be to survey the lands selected and issue a patent which would contain a reservation in the language of the statehood bill that all valid existing rights on the land are unaffected. No one would know what those valid existing rights were, how many claims were involved, their area or extent, or what other rights might be affected, and there is no machinery set up in the bill for determining these things.

This is a most serious matter, and one which might well prevent the new State from ever getting any public lands or if it did acquire any, there would be endless law suits to determine who had valid existing rights on those lands prior to their transfer. Who would be the judge as to what was a valid existing right? In all cases it would require litigation.

Another objectionable feature in section 5 is the provision for the sale of State lands in tracts of "not more than 640 acres for any purpose." The meaning of that phrase is certainly obscure. We do not know whether it means that not more than 640 acres may be sold to any person or corporation—but if it doesn't mean that, it is meaningless.

If it does mean that any one person or corporation is limited to 640 acres, what would happen in the case of a mining company like the Alaska-Juneau Gold Mining Co. which operated before the war a large low-grade property on a very narrow margin requiring a very considerable acreage of land exceeding 640 acres? A mining property such as the Alaska-Juneau requires a very large investment, requires a large number of claims and millsites, power plant sites, land for transmission lines, dam sites, etc. How could it ever operate if it is restricted to owning 640 acres?

Another very objectionable provision in section 5 (b) is that which provides that when the State acquires lands and sells them it must reserve a royalty on minerals of not more than 12½ percent. The mining industry in Alaska and generally throughout the United States has always been strongly opposed to royalties, yet the statehood bill, for some reason which we cannot fathom, requires that the State must reserve a royalty on minerals, whether the people desire it or not. In our opinion this would further discourage mining in the new State.

A royalty is on gross production and again let us illustrate by taking the case of the Alaska-Juneau mine. It was a large low-grade mine and it was necessary to operate on a very extensive scale, mining 13,000 to 14,000 tons of ore a day on account of the very low grade of the ore. The mining in the prewar days was on a scale which required a gross production, we believe, of between five and six million dollars a year. The profit, in years when there was a profit, was very slim, and even if a royalty of 1 percent on the gross production had been in effect, that is to say, if such a mine were operated on lands acquired from the State, the royalty alone could well mean the difference between profit and loss.

It is difficult to see how such provisions were inserted in the statehood bill by the

committee and we repeat what we said before, that if statehood is to be granted to Alaska, it is certainly of sufficient importance to permit the people of the Territory to express some opinion as to the public lands provisions of the bill.

We think the bill as amended by the Senate committee should be generally distributed throughout the Territory in order that the people may read and consider and comment upon section 5 before it is enacted. It will be too late afterward.

Mr. BUTLER. An Associated Press dispatch from Seattle, under date of July 10, quotes a member of the International Fisheries Commission to the effect that the fisheries provision in the amended statehood bill would encourage foreign entanglements. I personally feel that we already have enough troublesome international entanglements without adding to them with a hasty passage of this bill. Since I assume, Mr. President, that there will be considerable debate on this and similar provisions of the Alaska statehood bill, I will not take the time of the Senate now to elaborate further, except to request that the press release referred to above be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IFC PROTESTS TO PROPOSED CHANGE, STATEHOOD BILL

SEATTLE, July 10.—An International Fisheries Commission member today charged the fisheries provision of the amended Alaska statehood bill would encourage foreign entanglements.

Edward W. Allen, a member of General MacArthur's fisheries mission to Japan, said the amended bill "threatens to sacrifice an important food asset of this country."

Allen contended the bill should be rewritten to state specifically what fishery control is to be vested in the proposed new State (Alaska).

"At least it should be redrafted to provide expressly for the repeal of the present fishery laws relating to Alaska," he said.

The Federal Government has been regulating salmon fishing for many years.

"It is the only power which can protect salmon runs in the future against destructive fishing by Russians and Japanese," Allen said.

Allen said the amended statehood bill does not repeal the present Federal laws protecting Alaska fishing, but does take away all facilities for enforcing them.

Mr. BUTLER. I also request that a news article entitled "Query Asked Into Palmer Airport Deal," published in the Daily Alaska Empire on July 10, be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUERY ASKED INTO PALMER AIRPORT DEAL—DICKER TO GET MATCHING FUNDS FROM FEDERAL AGENCY UNDER FREE, NEWS-MINER

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, July 10.—The Fairbanks Daily News-Miner has proposed a Federal inquiry into a \$150,000 land transaction for an airport project at Palmer, in the Matanuska Valley.

The newspaper said its own investigation showed an attempt was being made to place a disproportionate value on the land to get matching funds from the Federal Government.

About 128 acres of land at Palmer are involved. The newspaper said the estimated construction cost of the airport was \$120,000.

THE UNITED STATES TRAGEDY IN FORMOSA—ARTICLE FROM TIME MAGAZINE

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The United States Tragedy in Formosa," written by John Osborne, and published in the July 17 issue of Time magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACHESON MUST BE WATCHED—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW HAMPSHIRE MORNING UNION

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Acheson Must Be Watched," published in the New Hampshire Morning Union of July 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CASE AGAINST THE MUNDT BILL—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a column under the heading "The Mirror of Public Opinion," containing editorial comment on the Mundt bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

SITUATIONS OF STRENGTH—NEWSPAPER EDITORIAL

[Mr. MCCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Situations of Strength," published in the San Francisco Examiner of Thursday, July 6, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEATH OF SENATOR KNOWLAND'S MOTHER

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, what I am going to do is under instructions given me this morning by the Committee on Appropriations.

Through the processes of American opportunity, I happen to be the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Labor and Federal Security. Through those same processes, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is the ranking minority member. Word reached the committee during the day of the demise of our colleague's mother at her home in California. We who know the able junior Senator from California feel confident that, being the son of a worthy mother, he can and will, in his sorrow, say, "Thy will be done."

THE KOREAN SITUATION

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter, dated July 10, 1950, addressed to me, by Paul Mitchell, a member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Fleet Reserve Association, together with an editorial by Walter Winchell of July 9, 1950, on the same subject.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., July 10, 1950.

The Honorable JON MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: As a veteran of two wars, member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Fleet Reserve Association I respectfully request that you enter the enclosed editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of those sophisticated idiots who cannot see beyond their noses.

From what I have heard inside closed meetings of all veterans organizations, I

believe 90 percent of all the veterans in the United States are behind you in your superhuman efforts to expose the enemies within our lines.

If Mr. Acheson and the entire staff of the Eastern Affairs Section of the State Department had any self-respect they would have resigned in a body within 24 hours after the invasion of Korea.

But as long as they are selfish individuals they should be ousted by the Senate immediately for the good of our national unity.

I believe many millions of veterans are wondering how many more wars we will have to fight in order to make this world safe for democracy as long as we have such potential quislings in the State Department.

You may enter this letter also in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if you wish.

As a father of three boys I would like to see all of them give the best years of their lives to the service of their country without waiting for Congress to draft them to do their duty. But I most certainly will demand that Congress, regardless of party lines, destroy now and for all time potential traitors in every Government department.

Respectfully yours,

PAUL MITCHELL

Mr. WINCHELL. Mr. and Mrs. United States, under our American system the strongest form of loyalty is fair criticism based on brutal truth. No administration ever needed it more desperately and none has accepted it less graciously. But it continues to be the birthright of every American citizen to pay homage to his country without swearing allegiance to the Kansas City politicians. The very day that the first casualty list was published last week, Washington stated that the Korean situation was not serious. The very next day, however, reversing itself, the administration prepared to call up all men 19 to 26. The Air Force announced this week that it would hire private commercial airliners to rush support to our men in Korea. During the war we built 250,000 planes and we have spent billions for them every year since. If we could run an airlift for Berlin, why can't we run one for our own men in bloody Korea? Far more important, however, than where the money has gone, is this question: Why aren't the planes we need ready? The truth is, that the 70-group Air Force twice authorized by Congress was pigeonholed by Mr. White House himself. The President's own commission reported to him that 70 groups was the minimum necessary to defend our own cities from enemy attack. Gen. Toohey Spaatz resigned because he would not take the responsibility without them. But it was the late Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, who stopped the 70-group Air Force by warning that it would mean rationing and price ceilings. Now, you are about to get rationing and price ceilings without a 70-group Air Force. The very same Navy which was all but officially declared obsolete last fall is right now saving the State Department's Far East Munich from turning into a sickening American Dunkirk. And the irony of it, the State Department's 91 pansys are exempt from active duty and do not have to face the enemy panzers, but their dirty diplomatic linen is being washed, in American blood.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. I inquire of the Chair as to the point we have reached in the pending appropriation bill, H. R. 7786.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate had completed the chapter on Treasury and Post Office appropriations when it recessed on Friday. The next chapter in regular order would be that on Labor, Federal Security, and so forth.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who is in charge of that portion of the appropriation bill, desires to have it passed over for the present.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is unavoidably absent from the Senate. His mother passed away a day or so ago, and she is to be buried tomorrow. As the ranking member of the subcommittee which considered the Labor, Federal Security appropriations, he has requested that that portion of the bill be passed over until later. I understand that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is in charge of the next feature of the bill, that relating to Agriculture, is ready to go forward.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the subcommittee, for making the request. It is deeply appreciated. I am quite satisfied that while the remainder of the bill will be taken up a little out of order, beginning with the agricultural appropriations, complying with the Senator's request will not hold up the bill at all. In behalf of the junior Senator from California, who is the ranking member of the subcommittee, as the Senator from New Mexico has stated, we deeply appreciate his holding up the Labor-Federal Security chapter of the appropriation bill until the Senator from California is able to return.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, an amendment to the pending appropriation bill has been offered which calls for a 10-percent cut in peacetime expenditures of the budget. I wish to add my name as a cosponsor of that amendment, with the reservation that I shall submit or support an amendment eliminating the ECA from that 10-percent cut.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has asked that his name be added as a cosponsor to the amendment submitted by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself and 34 other Senators, that being an amendment to the appropriations bill, calling for a 10-percent rescission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the addition will be made.

MOBILIZATION OF AMERICAN MANPOWER AND INDUSTRY TO MEET WORLD CRISIS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is now crystal clear that the Soviets have developed a foolproof procedure whereby, unless we intervene effectively, they cannot lose and we cannot win. The procedure is simply that, with no cost in manpower to themselves, they impel a mercenary native army to aggres-

sion and thus confront the United States with two alternatives, one of which is ruinous and the other of which, though necessary, is bad.

The ruinous alternative of ignoring the aggression—of turning our back on an international rape—we properly rejected. The other alternative was to send our armed forces to stop the aggression and liberate the invaded country. This we are rightly now trying to do. At best, however, this is a bad, though unavoidable, alternative because it commits thousands of our young men for at least many months until local victory is secured, after which forces must remain to prevent repetition of aggression. At worst, it could mean thousands of casualties without victory. In any case the cost to the Soviets has been nil.

If the procedure which has been used by the Soviets in Korea is repeated in Indochina or Iran or other places on the rim of the Soviet Empire, we would have even larger numbers of young men bogged down in equally unprofitable adventures. The Soviets would then be in a perfect position to make their main effort at the No. 1 objective, which is probably the Ruhr, or at their No. 2 objective, which is probably Japan. And we would be unable even to send significant reinforcements because of being bogged down in these peripheral theaters.

With the Ruhr and Japan in their grasp the Soviets would have an industrial potential under their control which might well convince them that they could go to war with the United States with the good chance of success. It is generally accepted that the Soviets will have enough atomic bombs to strike a rugged blow at the United States in 1952-53. The Korean aggression, therefore, followed by a similar procedure in other places, and leading up to the seizure of the Ruhr and Japan later on, would conclude with the atomic climax of 1952-53. It all fits neatly into the time schedule and coincides with what we are told about the Soviet plane-gun-tank-building program.

The United States would then be just about isolated enough and weakened enough to be ripe for the plucking. The Soviets would thus, if we let them, have won World War III without even fighting one major engagement with the United States with their own troops—and without our having had a chance to use our superiority in atom bombs and other weapons. No wonder that former Prime Minister Churchill says: "I do not see how the passage of 2 or 3 years during which the Soviets will be building up a large stock of atomic bombs is going to make our problems simpler or our dangers less." Indeed not, Mr. President; neither do I. Nor have I heard a convincing explanation from any source that this would be the case.

We therefore face this question: Must we sit idly by and stupidly watch such a grim tragedy unfold before our frightened eyes? Or can we prevent the tragedy; and, if so, how?

We do not need to sit idly by. We can prevent the tragedy; and here is how:

We must recognize that we are this moment in a major war, and that Korea

is one part of a world war picture. This is true, although no one has declared war and perhaps no one will. We must thus quickly create a situation of military strength. This means nothing less than the immediate mobilization of American manpower and industry.

But we must not do this job alone. We must galvanize our allies and make sure that they work with us in building military strength. Every time we add to the military strength of one of our allies, whether through equipment or through American troops, we should have assurances that they add the utmost of which they are capable. This is the objective of the Atlantic Pact, but the pace of preparedness under the Atlantic Pact is woefully leisurely and it must be and can be enormously speeded. It has well been said within the last 10 days by certain statesmen that today Europe is in mortal peril. We probably do not need to have 12,000,000 men under arms in order to have men in even larger numbers in the armed forces of ourselves and our allies.

Thus could we regain the initiative and demand that the international brigandage, imposture, and subversion by the Soviet imperialists stop at once. We need make no demands on the Russian people, but we would put the ruthless men in the Kremlin in their place and would tell them in unmistakable language that they will not be allowed to play their merciless chess game to the final, tragic checkmate. Then the world could go on to lasting peace.

I know that this course would require an immense expenditure of treasure and human toil and immediate inconvenience, particularly to all our men of military age. But it should be possible, with God's help, to do it without great bloodshed, because the Soviet leaders have often shown their respect for strength.

One thing is clear: the present procedure of "heads you win; tails I lose" must stop, and stop at once. If we are getting pushed around to such an extent in Korea, what will it be, with our present procedures, when we come up against the Communists' first team? Certainly we would be faithless to those who have already sacrificed themselves in Korea and we would be negligent of our own interests if we regarded Korea as an isolated, purely local, action. It is better to be ready—hugely expensive though it is—and not to need it, rather than to need it and not be ready. In sober truth our very national existence is at stake. We have not a minute to lose. We must not stumble around at the threshold of disaster.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has just said about the necessity of our galvanizing our allies into action. What I am going to say is with that idea in mind.

I am proposing a substantial reduction in the amount provided for ECA in the pending bill. I believe that amount, from our standpoint, is entirely unrealistic. If the Senate will bear with me, I shall explain why I believe that is so.

Mr. President, I am offering an amendment to the foreign aid section of the pending measure, and I ask that the amendment be read at this time, for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 447, line 18, in lieu of "\$2,391,930,000" it is proposed to insert "\$1,950,000,000."

Beginning with the word "Provided", in line 2, page 448, it is proposed to strike out all to and including the words "limitations herein specified:", in line 7, page 448.

On page 448, lines 8 and 9, it is proposed to strike out the word "consolidated."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, as Senators will observe, this amendment, if adopted, will reduce the amount to be appropriated to the Economic Cooperation Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, to \$1,950,000,000. The amendment in addition will also eliminate from the appropriation bill the sum of \$276,761,473 carried over from last year's appropriation. The total saving that would be effected by this amendment to the bill is \$718,691,473. A saving of approximately \$1,000,000,000 in the original budget estimate would be accomplished.

This amendment would in no way affect the appropriations for assistance to the Republic of Korea, the military-aid program, or several other programs included in the foreign-aid section of the pending measure. My amendment applies solely to the economic recovery program for western Europe.

The unexpended balance for the fiscal year 1950, amounting to more than \$276,000,000, was not needed in that 12-month period. There now appears to be no justification for reappropriating it. Administrator Hoffman is to be congratulated on not spending all the money that was made available to him. The amount should be saved to the United States. It should not be made available for the following year just because it was not spent in the year for which it was appropriated.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I have confidence, as do all other Members of this body, in the Senate Appropriations Committee. I know that each member of the committee has given careful and painstaking consideration to every section of this important bill. I know that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] the chairman of the committee, will not think it amiss for me to suggest that the amount allocated to foreign aid should be reexamined in the light of the facts that have developed since the bill was reported.

What is this change of status? The difference between the way the job ahead

of us looks now, and the way it looked a few days ago, is well summarized in the following editorial review which appeared in the New York Times of yesterday, July 16:

THE UNITED STATES FACES IT

On June 27—the day President Truman ordered American sea and air forces to go to the aid of South Korea—this was the estimate of the job:

North Korea: Six to nine divisions—probably 95,000 men. Seventy to 100 tanks. Morale probably low. United States: Sea and air forces probably sufficient.

On July 16, after 19 days of bitter fighting in Korea, this is the estimate of the job:

North Korea: Ten to 15 divisions—150,000 to 250,000 men. Two hundred and twenty tanks, almost unlimited supplies behind lines, in Siberia and in Manchuria. Morale and leadership excellent. United States: Eight full divisions, perhaps 250,000 men in all, needed. Manpower, tanks, heavy artillery, planes in Pacific woefully inadequate. Vast supplies needed from home bases 7,000 miles away.

The difference between these two estimates is a measure of the problem that now confronts the United States. At the outset of the fighting the United States had envisaged a fast, mechanized campaign in which planes would play a major role. Then began the battle of the build-up on both sides—the battle to bring up the supplies, the weapons, and the men. It was the big battle—although fought far behind the lines—and the United States lost. Now the United States is faced with the grim possibility that it may be pushed into the sea and forced to mount a counterattack from Japan.

And what about possible Communist aggression elsewhere in the world? The 9 days that has gone by since this bill was reported on July 8 have brought us nothing but disillusionment.

It is time now for some new thinking, some clear thinking in the light of the unpleasant truths that we have had to swallow.

Last week the Senate gave clear indication in a relatively minor incident that it fully recognizes the gravity of the international situation. The Senate rejected the appropriation to build a much needed addition to the Senate Office Building. And yet, in the ECA appropriations of this omnibus appropriation bill, huge sums are provided for the construction of a wide variety of public works and other projects in foreign lands. These programs look to the future development of their respective countries. They have little or no bearing upon the present emergency. The proposed ECA appropriations are said to be for the purpose of overcoming so-called "dollar gap." Many of us are concerned today about the danger of a gap between our obligations and our ability to respond to them. In the field of national security we cannot entertain the slightest possibility of a deficit in performance.

NATIONAL DEFENSE IS OUR FIRST CONSIDERATION

It is becoming increasingly clear that the Korean war is likely to be long and costly, even if the Russian decide not to intervene directly. It is also apparent that the United States will have to bear the brunt of the fighting.

We must back up our boys on the fighting front to the limit. Upon this we are

all agreed. This is the first consideration in the minds of all of us.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that since I have been a member of this body I have supported without exception appropriations for our military establishment. I shall continue to do so as long as I am here. It has been my belief that we should build a national defense so strong that no nation in the world would be under the slightest temptation to attack us. I supported the supplemental national defense appropriation bill of 1948 providing funds for a 70-group Air Force. I was pleased when the present Congress approved the bill authorizing a 70-group Air Force.

Senators will recall that the program for the 70-group Air Force came before the Senate in 1948 following the passage of the Marshall Plan bill. The Congress had approved the Marshall Plan, and had then set about determining what we could afford to do for our military establishments. I asserted in course of the discussion in the Senate that we were putting the cart before the horse. I said that we should first adequately arm ourselves and then, after that, consider what amounts our economic resources would permit us to send out of the country as gifts to other countries, however praiseworthy. I think now as I thought then.

At a press conference only last June 22, 5 days before giving his historic order that our air and naval forces should go to the aid of Korea, President Truman said, at a press conference, that our country cannot pay for a 70-group Air Force. In view of the serious foreign situation, we need that 70-group Air Force. Our soldiers in Korea need it now. We can pay for it. We should provide for our own needs first, and then make gifts out of our remaining resources.

How shall we explain to the mothers and wives of our soldiers fighting in the race paddies of Korea that we cannot pay for needed guns, tanks, and planes of the right type for air cover?

The South Koreans have had the benefit of economic cooperation—plenty of it. Between 1946 and 1948, inclusive, we invested \$360,000,000 in relief and technical assistance in South Korea, approximately \$18 for each man, woman, and child in South Korea.

OUR PRESENT FINANCIAL SITUATION

Today the Korean war finds us in a state of unpreparedness. We are unprepared from a military standpoint. We are unprepared from a financial standpoint. Our national debt is more than \$257,000,000,000. During the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1950, the Federal Government went into the red more than \$3,000,000,000. It is estimated that the deficit for the current fiscal year will amount to \$5,000,000,000, excluding any additional expenditures in connection with the war in Korea.

What will be the impact of the Korean crisis on our economy? How large is our military effort to be? Are the additional military appropriations that will be required to pay for the Korean war and to strengthen our Armed Forces \$1,000,000,000, or \$5,000,000,000, or more?

No one knows the answers to these important question.

But we do know this: It is imperative that we eliminate all unnecessary expenditures, both foreign and domestic, not directly connected with our military effort. We cannot ignore the fact that there is a very definite limit to our financial resources. We know very well that we cannot bankrupt our Government and at the same time maintain our free institutions. Since American troops started fighting in Korea, the only communications regarding the war which the Senate has received from the President, so far as I know, are copies of his press releases. I am glad that if reports are true the President plans to address the Congress in person this week. Every member will listen to the words of the President with profound attention.

WE MUST USE OUR RESOURCES TO BEST ADVANTAGE

Equally important are the limitations on our material resources, such as iron and steel. We must provide the dollars required by an all-out war effort. We can do that. We can pledge the credit of the United States. But I seriously question whether we can continue to make extravagant gifts of raw materials to western Europe and still have enough to provide for our own requirements. If and when we run out of essential raw materials can we depend on our European friends to reverse the flow of gifts across the Atlantic?

The Korean war—whether or not Russia intervenes—is bound to make a serious drain on our resources, particularly industrial products, manufactures, and raw materials vitally needed for the war effort.

ECA has proposed to give away during the next year to Marshall-plan countries more than \$200,000,000 worth of industrial materials produced in the United States, including iron, steel, aluminum, copper, zinc, and industrial chemicals. ECA also would give away \$448,700,000 worth of industrial machinery and equipment, \$7,500,000 worth of rubber and rubber products, and more than \$77,000,000 worth of petroleum and petroleum products.

All available reports indicate that our soldiers in Korea need desperately more tanks, more planes, and more heavy artillery. They need weapons to be made from iron, steel, aluminum, copper, and zinc.

Mr. President, I am bold enough to say that it is not in the interest of the United States, it is not in the interest of our boys on the fighting front, for us at this point to give away vast quantities of critical war materials which may be needed by us to prosecute war, and which may soon be in short supply. I mean the war in which we are now engaged and any other war which may be forced upon us. Increased military production, as well as the mobilization of military manpower, will draw men from civilian production. Civilian producers will then start bidding against each other for goods and labor. Whether or not controls become necessary depends upon many imponderables. One of these is what we do

with our available supply of goods. Certainly the shipment of vast quantities of our goods as gifts to foreign countries will bring shortages, controls, and rationing that much nearer to our people. I am sure Members of the Senate will understand this when they vote on the pending measure.

We must not make the mistake of spreading our resources so thin around the world that they will not do anyone any good. We must husband what we have and put it to the best possible use.

Steel is a good example of what I mean. Our steel works were operating at full capacity even before the Korean war broke out. No material is more vital to the war effort than is steel for guns, planes, tanks, and ammunition.

On April 17, 1950, Secretary of the Interior Chapman told a House committee that iron-ore resources in the United States were being depleted at a rate that raised the possibility of restricted steel production within the foreseeable future. He predicted that Great Lakes ore production would fall 50 percent below present levels in 15 years.

Dr. James Boyd, Director of the Bureau of Mines, told the committee that the steel industry would be 3,400,000 tons short of our iron-ore requirements by 1959, even if all present foreign sources still were available.

Of course, Mr. President, it is unnecessary to say that in April 1950 Secretary Chapman and Director Boyd were not speaking with the Korean war in mind. They were talking about what would happen to this country, independent of any war effort.

It is impossible to say at this time just how much additional steel will be required for the Korean war. No doubt the demand will be great. The gifts of steel ECA contemplates making to western Europe might well cripple our economy and endanger our war effort.

It is becoming increasingly clear that our overgenerous gifts to western Europe during the past 2 years could have been put to much better advantage if they had been utilized in building up our own national defenses—turning out, let us say, heavy tanks now so sorely needed by our boys in Korea.

I need not remind the Senate that our first responsibility is to provide whatever is needed to enable our fighting men to drive the North Korean Reds back of the thirty-eighth parallel. What is it to be? Tanks for young Americans battling for their lives, or steel for the Marshall-plan countries, which have shipped, and are continuing to ship, large quantities of steel to the Russians? I shall have more to say about that in a little while.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN MARSHALL PLAN COUNTRIES

I have found it hard to justify the proposed expenditure of \$104,100,000 for gifts of tobacco to western Europe next year. According to ECA officials, Greece and Turkey, both of which participate in the Marshall plan, now have surplus stocks of tobacco.

ECA officials report that the level of productivity of the Marshall-plan countries generally is more than 20 percent above the prewar level of 1938.

On May 25, 1950, during the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] questioned Richard M. Bissell, Jr., ECA Assistant Administrator, concerning this matter. Here is the colloquy which occurred:

Senator FERGUSON. Have they—

Referring to the Marshall-plan countries—

any surplus out of this 20-percent increase?

That is the increase in production.

Mr. BISSELL. There are certainly a few spot surpluses, sir, of manufactured goods and a few even of agricultural goods. I would guess that a number of luxury products in Europe are in surplus and that they cannot market their whole amount.

Mr. President, even ignoring for a moment the situation in Korea, is it wise, is it sound, for us to continue to draw off our resources to increase further the rate of production in western Europe, when those countries are beginning to be plagued with surpluses? Does it make sense for us to continue to give away fertilizer to the Netherlands, for example, when ECA has advised us that the Netherlands is concerned about disposing of its current output of fresh vegetables.

On July 13, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement from the British Economic Record showing the improvement in the British gold and dollar position during the last year. I hope Senators will study this document. The dollar position has steadily improved since devaluation of the pound in September 1949, and has made American goods expensive in sterling areas. In the 9 months since September there has been a surplus of \$189,000,000, compared with a deficit of \$1,501,000,000 in the 9 months before. The British have balanced their budget, while our national debt continues to mount. Britain to date has received \$2,500,000,000 in aid under the Marshall plan. In the name of common sense our British gifts should be discontinued. This would save about \$500,000,000 in this bill. The British figures show why less is being heard these days from the advocates of foreign spending about the dollar gap. As a matter of fact, even before the Korean crisis, substantial progress was made by several important countries in improving their dollar position.

Imports into the United States—that is what we are buying from these countries—will set a new high record this year. The total is likely to exceed \$7,500,000,000 if the trend for the first 5 months continues. The gain over the corresponding period in 1949 has been about 10 percent.

The Korean crisis is increasing the import volume from the standpoint of both quantity and higher prices. Foreign countries benefit from this higher price trend on raw materials and other goods we buy from them.

In view of these considerations a new ECA appropriation of \$1,950,000,000 should be, entirely sufficient to continue the Marshall plan another year.

THE MARSHALL PLAN NO INSURANCE AGAINST WAR

Senators will recall that the Marshall plan was first presented to the Congress

as insurance against war. Either adopt the Marshall plan, we were told, in effect, or prepare for war.

On December 19, 1947, President Truman in a special message to the Congress, said:

I recommend this program of United States support for European recovery to the Congress in full confidence of its wisdom and necessity as a major step in our Nation's quest for a just and lasting peace.

The then Secretary of State Marshall, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 8, 1948, declared:

This program will cost our country billions of dollars. It will impose a burden on the American taxpayer. It will require sacrifices today in order that we may enjoy security and peace tomorrow.

On January 14, 1948, the then Secretary of the Army Royall said:

Without such effort the Army budget and the Army itself should be increased.

On the same day, the then Secretary of Defense Forrestal, testifying on the Marshall plan, declared:

Our purpose and object is totally and exclusively to prevent another war.

Mr. President, the object was totally and exclusively to prevent another war.

And on March 12, 1948, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], speaking on the initial Marshall plan authorization bill, said: "We are voting upon the peace of the world."

The Marshall plan was approved and carried out, substantially as recommended by the administration. I ask in all seriousness: Are the prospects for peace any brighter than they were 2 years ago, when the program went into effect? We now find ourselves engaged in a full-fledged war in Korea, although officially characterized, I believe, as a police action. Who among us will say that the chances for peace in western Europe are more favorable today than they were in 1948, when we started to pour out these vast sums of money belonging to the American taxpayers?

NO MORAL COMMITMENT TO CONTINUE THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. President, we often hear it said that we have a moral obligation to continue these appropriations. The fact is that the Congress is under no obligation, moral or otherwise, to appropriate any particular sum to continue the Marshall plan. Indeed, we are under no obligation to continue the program at all. This was clearly understood at its inception.

On March 2, 1948, during the Senate debate on the initial Marshall plan authorization bill, the then chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] had this to say:

Under the terms of the bill, every Congress—even broader, every session of every Congress—is a free agent to pass its own judgment on the question of whether or not foreign cooperation is justifying the basis upon which the enterprise was launched.

Let me repeat those words. The distinguished Senator from Michigan said that every Congress is a free agent to pass on the question of whether foreign

cooperation is justifying the basis upon which the enterprise was launched.

Then the Senator from Michigan declared:

Next January the Congress will be as free as the air to do what it pleases in respect to what has happened during the intervening months, and in respect to what may happen in the days that lie beyond that point.

Several days after the statement of the Senator from Michigan, I questioned the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who was then the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, concerning this matter. I thought it would be well that we understood from the official spokesman for each party what their understanding was of this important point. Here is the colloquy which occurred on March 13, 1948:

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas whether, in his opinion, there is any moral commitment extending beyond a 1-year period.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not so far as I am concerned. * * * We are here as Members of Congress, with a perfect right to discontinue the appropriation whenever we wish to do so.

Yes, Mr. President; we have a perfect right to discontinue the appropriation whenever we wish to do so.

These are gifts. They are the most princely gifts in all history. No refinement of reason can turn them into an obligation, moral or otherwise.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from Nebraska has been listening with great interest to the very forceful address being made by the junior Senator from Missouri. I remember very distinctly the colloquy that was engaged in by the junior Senator from Missouri and the two members of the Foreign Relations Committee to whom the Senator has referred. I agree completely that one Congress cannot bind a succeeding Congress; we all understand that. But so far as a moral commitment is concerned, if there are those who contend that there is involved a moral commitment to continue appropriations for ECA, is it not a fact that this Congress will have to use its judgment and carefully consider not merely the appropriations, because the appropriations mean materials.

I ask the Senator to emphasize the point he so forcefully made. Does it not behoove the Congress to exercise its best judgment relative to continuing ECA, in the light of the experiences through which we are now passing, with the idea in mind that it is no longer a question of dollar gaps? The question confronting the Congress at this time is a decision as to whether or not the money should be granted, not as dollars, but for the materials it represents, since furnishing the materials might deprive the United States and the national defense of the very things we must have, regardless of

how we may feel about aiding countries throughout the world. Is not that the vital question that is running through the Senator's mind as he addresses the Senate this afternoon, and as we consider further appropriations for ECA?

Mr. KEM. The distinguished minority leader has placed the matter clearly before the Senate in language which no one can misunderstand. Those who proposed the ECA plan, with commendable wisdom and foresight, provided that it should not be a commitment for any particular period of time. Instead, they left the Congress as free as the air, as the Senator from Michigan said, to decide, in view of developments and exigencies which might occur from time to time, what could and ought to be done with the money of the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. President, the record is clear on that point for all to read. I believe that many of our people are a little impatient about the suggestion now advanced that there is a moral obligation which must be carried out. We should decide whenever this matter comes before the Senate as of then, whether it is to the best interest of the United States for gift shipments to be made out of the country of essential war materials. We will be called on to answer to the people of the United States, if we are not reasonably prudent about these shipments. We ought to be called on to answer if we act without prudence, without foresight, without careful thought as to the effect of what we are doing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. There is another question I should like to raise, which is indirectly brought to the attention of the Senate by the Senator's remarks, but which was forcefully brought to our attention by an amendment which the junior Senator from Missouri offered during the debate on the authorization of ECA, namely, that the shipments of strategic materials referred to find their way into the hands of the aggressor through satellite countries. In view of what we read in the press—and in these days that is, apparently, the source we have to rely upon for information—what does the Senator feel about restricting or limiting the amount of money which goes to an ECA beneficiary country, that is, the beneficiary country itself, if it continues to ship strategic materials, such as oil, so that they find their way into the hands of the Communists, and finally into the hands of the Red Koreans, and are used in the battle against American boys who are trying to stop the expansion of communism in South Korea?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it is unthinkable that the Congress should permit the resources of the United States to be used for the purpose of making war against it, for the purpose of shooting down and killing the young men of America who are engaged in the fight for freedom.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator feel that the amendment he offered during the consideration of the authorization bill for ECA is more important now than ever, that no country which is a recipient of ECA aid should receive assistance any longer if that country continues the practice to which I have referred?

Mr. KEM. I agree entirely. When that matter was before the Senate on the previous occasion, the figures I presented were for the year 1948. I think the question may well be raised today: That was in 1948; what is going on now? I have investigated that matter and I am now prepared to shed some light on the situation.

SHIPMENT OF WAR MATERIALS BY MARSHALL PLAN COUNTRIES BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Officials of the Department of Commerce have advised me that the British have shipped, and so far as is known, are still shipping quantities of petroleum and petroleum products, including motor gasoline, to Red China.

Recently, upon the request of our State Department, American oil companies agreed to shut off supplies of petroleum products to the China Reds, and they have done so.

Under the Marshall plan, more than \$245,000,000 worth of petroleum and petroleum products have been sent to Great Britain, which is shipping these products now to Red China. Of these gifts, \$95,000,000 worth was made up of shipments from the United States.

Next year ECA wants to give away \$90,000,000 worth of petroleum and petroleum products to Great Britain, part of which would no doubt come from the United States.

So we are faced with this question: Which shall it be? Fuel to Great Britain, which in turn is sending it to Communist China for possible use in the tanks now crushing our troops in Korea? Or fuel for our own tanks, trucks, and planes on the fighting front?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. If I recall the colloquy in which the junior Senator from Nebraska and the junior Senator from Missouri were engaged during the debate upon the authorization of ECA, when the question of the shipments of petroleum arose, it was about the time, as I recall, when there was a deficit of oil in this country, and if I remember the figures correctly, nearly 600,000 barrels of petroleum products were being shipped into the United States daily at that time. The amount varies, I understand, and at times the slack is taken up, but in the light of the statement just made by the junior Senator from Missouri, and the conditions we now face from a military point of view, does he not feel that every ounce of gasoline which could be used in our national defense, and in the front line, wherever it may be, should be conserved, and that we should look with care on appropriations which take away from us and our

national defense the very products the distinguished Senator has been discussing?

Mr. KEM. I definitely feel so; and I do not confine it to petroleum and petroleum products. I extend it to all materials of war, and I am now going to present some figures about other war materials which are being funneled through Marshall plan countries to the other countries behind the iron curtain.

Earlier during this session, when the foreign aid authorization bill was being considered, I presented to the Senate evidence that certain Marshall plan countries, namely Great Britain, France, and Belgium-Luxembourg, were making large shipments of war material to Russia and her satellites. This information was official information—made available to me by the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce. Last year, for example, Great Britain sent more than \$12,000,000 worth of iron, steel, and manufactures to Russia and her satellites, and more than \$240,000 worth of ball and roller bearings.

I know the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], as a great machine-tool manufacturer himself, will appreciate the importance of those shipments.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point tables containing a partial list of exports from Belgium-Luxemburg, the United Kingdom, and France, to Russia and the satellite countries during 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The tables are as follows:

Partial list of exports from Belgium-Luxemburg during 1949 to Russia and satellite nations¹

Item	Amount in dollars ²	Amount in thousands of francs	Metric tons ³
Arms (to Czechoslovakia).....	\$6,040	302	-----
Iron, cast iron, and steel.....	19,782,840	989,142	151,749
Copper.....	11,028,820	551,441	23,523
Lead.....	1,583,160	79,158	4,836
Zinc.....	3,003,780	150,189	10,413
Tin.....	941,060	47,053	485
Other base metals and alloys.....	1,387,360	69,368	623
Boilers, machinery, mechanical apparatus, and appliances, and parts.....	7,937,880	396,894	6,273
Electrical machinery and apparatus, and articles for electro-technical use, and parts.....	5,840,660	292,033	-----
Railway and tramway rolling stock and material.....	430,600	21,530	872
Optical, measuring, precision, and other instruments and apparatus.....	2,480	124	-----
Chemical products.....	1,709,540	85,477	8,573
Explosives, fireworks, matches, and other inflammable materials.....	1,447,960	72,398	2,014
Rubber and manufactures.....	942,600	47,130	1,355

¹ Complete list available in my office, including a breakdown of exports by importing country.

² Computation based on current exchange rate of 50 francs to the dollar.

³ 1 metric ton is equal to 2,204.6 pounds.

Partial list of exports from United Kingdom during 1949 to Russia and satellite nations

Item	Amount in dollars ¹	Amount in thousands of pounds sterling	Quantity
Ball and roller bearings and parts.....	\$243,600	87	² 2,000
Iron, steel, and manufactures (total).....	12,140,800	4,336	³ 88,000
Steel bars and rods, not alloy.....	1,736,000	620	³ 20,000
Bars and rods of alloy steel.....	504,000	180	³ 1,000
Hoop and strip.....	422,800	151	³ 3,000
Railway and tramway construction material.....	708,400	253	³ 10,000
Barbed wire.....	420,000	150	³ 3,000
Cable and rope (except insulated telephone and telegraph cable).....	425,600	152	³ 1,000
Nonferrous metals and manufactures (total).....	4,062,800	1,451	-----
Aluminum and alloys.....	618,800	221	⁴ 21,000
Brass and other alloys of copper, other than nickel alloys.....	1,142,400	408	⁴ 63,000
Copper.....	694,400	248	⁴ 1,000
Electrical goods and apparatus.....	6,806,800	2,431	-----
Machinery (total, excluding ball and roller bearings and parts).....	45,172,400	16,133	⁴ 867,000
Electric generators.....	11,986,800	4,281	⁴ 181,000
Electrical machinery, other than motors and generators.....	2,864,400	1,023	⁴ 46,000
Machine tools (metal-working) other than portable power tools.....	5,138,000	1,835	⁴ 129,000
Vehicles (including locomotives, ships, and aircraft) (total).....	13,361,600	4,772	-----
Rubber tires for motor vehicles, other than motorcycles and tractors.....	229,600	82	9,000
Chassis for motor vehicles, with engines.....	1,660,400	593	1,000

¹ Computation based on present exchange rate of \$2.80 to the pound sterling.

² Hundredweight (112 pounds).

³ Long tons.

⁴ Hundredweight.

Partial list of exports from France during 1949 to Russia and satellite nations

Item	Amount in dollars ¹	Amount in thousands of francs	Metric tons
Chemicals:			
Inorganic.....	\$1,546,759	533,365	23,425
Organic.....	983,283	339,063	610
Rubber and rubber products.....	1,678,616	578,833	1,426
Steel-mill products, hot rolled, sheets and plates.....	4,198,881	1,447,690	41,696
Steel-mill products, cold rolled, tubular products, and wire.....	3,087,703	1,064,725	19,283
Aluminum, crude, and semimanufactures.....	369,245	127,326	815
Aluminum alloys.....	408,688	140,927	833
Lead and lead alloys.....	316,349	109,086	1,115
Metal manufactures.....	2,046,376	705,647	3,985
Machinery and apparatus.....	10,272,238	3,542,151	6,771
Machinery, electrical, and apparatus.....	2,015,239	694,910	525
Transportation equipment.....	8,281,011	2,855,521	7,913
Optical, surgical, scientific, and photographic instruments and apparatus.....	1,113,145	383,843	115

¹ Computation based on current exchange rate of 350 francs to the dollar.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, many of the same materials which are being sold to Russia and her satellites by Marshall plan countries are being given to these same countries by the United States under the Marshall plan.

For example more than \$26,000,000 worth of iron and steel mill materials and products have been sent by the United States to France under the Marshall plan. And last year, France shipped more than \$7,000,000 worth of steel-mill products, including hot rolled sheets and plates, to Russia and her satellite nations.

It may be said that that was last year; that that is water over the dam. What about this year?

A few days ago, I contacted officials of the Department of Commerce as to what progress had been made toward correcting the situation. The report I received was not encouraging. While I was advised that some progress had been made, Commerce Department officials made it clear that Marshall plan nations in Europe are still making substantial shipments of war materials to Russia and her satellites—materials which we are refusing to ship to those countries.

On Friday, July 14, two members of my staff inspected the latest statistics in the Department of Commerce on exports from Marshall plan nations to countries behind the iron curtain. They took some notes. Here are only a few of the things they found.

During the first 4 months of this year, the United Kingdom exported more than \$6,800,000 worth of electrical machinery to the Soviet Union. This represents nearly a 50 percent increase over British exports of electrical machinery to Russia during the first 4 months of 1949.

During the 4 months which ended April 30, 1950, the United Kingdom also sent to Russia more than \$1,087,000 worth of machine tools. This is almost 10 times as many machine tools as were exported by the United Kingdom to Russia during the first 4 months of 1949. In other words, in the first 4 months of this year, the United Kingdom accelerated her sales of machine tools to Russia 10 times over.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Vermont, who, I am aware, knows more about machine tools than probably any other Member of this body.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to suggest that there is a difference perhaps between the principle of the thing and the amount involved. It is not satisfactory to us to see Great Britain increasing her machine-tool export to Russia. I might suggest, however, that the amount of that export would do little more than equip a two- or three-hundred-man plant. So that the amount is inconsiderable. I do agree with the Senator as to the principle.

Mr. KEM. Could the Senator advise us how long it would take a two- or three-hundred man plant to turn out a 60-ton tank for shipment to Korea?

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not have the figures as to the number of man-hours that go into the making of a tank. But I surmise that it would not make much difference to the Korean campaign.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator mean that a few tanks would not make much difference in the Korean campaign?

Mr. FLANDERS. What I am saying is that the export of machine tools is in amount very small indeed. But I agree with the Senator as to the principle.

Mr. KEM. I defer to the knowledge of my distinguished friend from Vermont as to what constitutes a substantial amount of machine tools. As a mere layman, not being among the intelligentsia in that business, I should think that a shipment of a million dollars worth of machine tools in 4 months was quite a considerable amount. Regardless of that, what does the Senator from Vermont say about Great Britain increasing her shipments 10 times over in the 4 months which followed January 1, 1950?

Mr. FLANDERS. I have already agreed with the Senator from Missouri that the principle is more than doubtful—it is bad. But the amount involved was inconsiderable.

Mr. KEM. To me it is shocking, literally shocking, that such traffic should be going on when at the same time we are sending as gifts to Great Britain, great quantities of steel, some of which no doubt could be manufactured into the same kind of machine tools that are being sent to Russia.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has the figures of our shipments of steel to Great Britain.

Mr. KEM. The gifts?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, while a search is being made for the figures of the amount of steel sent by us to Great Britain, I should like to make an inquiry of the distinguished Senator from Missouri—and I should be glad to have him relay the question to the Senator from Vermont, because I also am a layman when it comes to knowledge of this particular subject. I have received information from the Appropriations Committee respecting some of the evidence presented to it. Cannot machine tools be used to provide other machine tools? Cannot the original machine tools be used as the seed, so to speak, for the development of machine tools which could be produced in abundance? I do not know how this procedure can be carried through unless the Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent that he may yield for that purpose.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to interrogate the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Vermont for that purpose?

Mr. KEM. Before the Senator from Vermont puts his question, I should like to give him the figure of the shipments from the United States, as shown by the ECA report for the period from April 8, 1948, to April 30, 1950. The shipments in

that period, that is the gifts of steel by the people of the United States to the Government of Britain, were \$27,528,000 worth.

I shall now be glad to have the Senator from Vermont propound any question he has in mind.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Missouri whether he will permit me, through his intermediation, to furnish some information to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to. The only thing any of us is interested in is the truth. I shall be glad to waive any rights I have under the Senate rules, in the interest of our joint search for truth.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to enunciate, sir, a profound truth, which is that the only inanimate thing which reproduces itself is a machine tool. That is in response to a request from the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KEM. Can the Senator from Vermont estimate the rate of fecundity on the part of this million dollars' worth of machine tools sent from England to Russia in the first 4 months of the present year?

Mr. FLANDERS. Of course, no one knows what those machine tools are to be used for. They can be used to make other machine tools. They can be used to make tanks. They can be used for repair shops on railroads. They can be used on hundreds and thousands of projects.

Mr. KEM. Could not they be used as models for other machine tools?

Mr. FLANDERS. That has been done long since. The Russians have their models and have made their copies.

Mr. KEM. We can feel sure then that our British friends are keeping them up to date.

Mr. FLANDERS. If they are searching for models, they had better not go to Great Britain; they should come here to the United States.

Mr. KEM. The Marshall plan has taken care of that, for under the Marshall plan we are not only making regular shipments of machine tools to Great Britain, but we are also sending Great Britain technical assistance; are we not?

Mr. FLANDERS. Not so far as I know, in the lines with which I am best acquainted.

We are inviting them to come here and watch our methods of production and our methods of organization and management. We are doing that, and I think it is a good thing.

I simply wish to return to the point that I agree completely with the Senator from Missouri that the principle of such shipments is wrong. I was only rejoicing—insofar as one can rejoice over something that is wrong—that the operation has not yet attained vast proportions.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should simply like to say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Vermont, that I hope we shall be in equal agreement when the vote is taken on this amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The information I sought has been provided by means of the statements made by the Senator from Missouri, in response to the questions which have been asked by the Senator from Vermont—which is a rather round-about means of obtaining information, I admit. What they have said is conclusive proof, it seems to me—and it is in accordance with the evidence adduced before the committee—that the shipment of machine tools provides the means not only whereby duplicates can be made, but, what is worse, whereby other machine tools can be made—tools which, in turn, might be capable of producing vast amounts of material which could be used not only on one front but on various fronts throughout the world, if need be.

I do not say that the machine tools the distinguished Senator has mentioned would be used for that purpose, but that is a possibility.

I am satisfied that if the country to which the tools went wanted to use them for that purpose, there would be nothing to stop that country from using them in that way.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, we all seem to be in agreement about this matter so far as Great Britain is concerned.

Suppose we consider some of the other countries:

Belgium has continued to make shipments of war material to Russia. During the period January through April sizable shipments of iron, steel, and tin plate have gone from Belgium to the U. S. S. R.

Italy is sending iron, steel, and machinery to the U. S. S. R.

Sweden's trade with Russia during January 1950 was nine times greater than it was in January 1949.

All too fresh in our minds is the fact that during World War II our ships and planes were blasted with scrap iron furnished by us to the Japs. Tens of thousands of young Americans were killed or maimed for life. Mr. President, history repeats itself: Now we are again supplying—this time indirectly—materials of war to an unfriendly nation. That nation, it is well known, supplied the tanks and the guns now blasting our young men along the Kum River in Korea. It is entirely possible, even probable, that many of the shipments of iron and steel from Marshall plan countries to Russia went into building the very same guns and tanks now killing our own boys.

When the most recent Marshall plan authorization bill was before the Senate I made this statement:

It is essential to our national security that this country continue to ban shipments of war material to the Soviet Union. It is tragically absurd for us to pour into western Europe vast quantities of war materials under the Marshall plan and the arms aid program, only to have our friends export the same materials to Russia and other countries behind the iron curtain.

Mr. President, it is shocking that, in view of the situation in Korea, Marshall plan countries are still permitting substantial shipments of war material to the Reds. Surely our allies will not con-

tinue to furnish materials to the Reds to kill young Americans who are fighting for a free world.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SENATE

Mr. President, if the fighting is confined to Korea, the United States may be able to ride out the present crisis without serious economic strain and the adoption of controls that a major war would entail. But there is no assurance that the fighting will be confined to Korea. Every dispatch from Korea carries a lesson. The dispatches tell a tale of the need for adequate preparedness against acts of Communist aggression not only there but in other parts of the world. Earlier today we heard the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] demand entire, complete mobilization of industry in the United States. If I correctly understand his meaning, that would call for complete controls over our entire economy.

Mr. President, in the last few days we have learned that our aircraft have become obsolete more rapidly than they have been replaced. It is now disclosed that we lack aircraft of a proper type for supporting ground troops. We now make the unhappy and surprising discovery that we lag behind in scientific research and development in certain military fields; for example, in the manufacture of bullet-repelling steel. We know to a certainty that our tanks are inferior.

We may need, and need badly, many things before too long: More manpower, more money, more and better weapons, more basic materials.

As the Washington News said on last Thursday:

Communism is winning its way by the sword. Why can't our policy makers get that through their heads?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. The quotation from the Washington News, just read by the Senator from Missouri, touches a point which I cannot let pass unchallenged. It is true that the armed forces of Russia have been a very potent tool in conquering the vast areas which Russia has conquered. Yet in her latest conquests and in those which she has almost made, she has not proceeded by means of the sword at all. To the contrary, her method in those cases has been to use propaganda.

Anyone who at any time says there is nothing but force involved in the Russian advance simply does not know what is going on, does not know what Russia is doing, and pays no attention to her methods and her policies. We should today encounter very much less danger, and have very much less fear of her armed power, had we been as wise, had we been as diligent, had we been as intelligent in the thought war as Russia has been. Let us not be blind to the means by which she has attained her power.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont for his very interesting comment. He has made some thought-provoking speeches on the Sen-

ate floor with reference to the necessity of carrying on propaganda behind the iron curtain. As the Senator knows, I have studied those speeches carefully, I have been very much interested in them, and I have asked the Senator questions about his ideas in that connection.

I think, however, that the Senator from Vermont has misinterpreted the quotation I just made from the Washington News. I think the editor of that newspaper had in mind that, since June 27, 1950, communism was winning its way with the sword. I think the Senator from Vermont will agree the statement as so interpreted is eminently correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that immediately following World War II Russia acquired 2,000 of the leading scientists of Germany; that, at the very time our country said we did not want them here, and when we were barring them from the United States, the Russians took them to Russia; and that, as a matter of fact, those scientists kept right on developing the weapons which Germany had been creating at the time the war ended?

Mr. KEM. I think that is undoubtedly so. It is as true as is the statement, if we may believe newspaper reports, that the bullet-repellent steel now used in the forepart of 60-ton Russian tanks is a discovery made by the same German scientists to whom the Senator from North Dakota alludes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. The net result is, is it not, that because of the action of our Government in refusing to admit those 2,000 scientists and engineers, or any of them, from Germany, hundreds of our boys are dying today? As the distinguished Senator from Missouri has said, the Russians have developed a steel-resistant tank which is superior to our tanks.

Mr. KEM. I think that conclusion is inescapable, I may say to the Senator. It made my blood run cold, within the past few days, to read reports from the Korean front, and to learn how our bullets fell off the Russian tanks like paper pellets, because they lacked sufficient size, speed, and power to penetrate the steel. Here we were, giving substance to 16 countries of western Europe, yet we were unable to give our boys, who were risking their lives in Korea, an even chance.

Mr. President, I do not suppose that since the Continental Army marched in the American Revolution has it occurred that the equipment of American troops was not at least equal to that which they were called upon to meet. I think that is a disgrace to this country. I think that that circumstance alone requires that this whole program be reviewed in the light of what we have learned within the past few days.

We have learned, Mr. President, that it is impossible to stop 60-ton tanks with cases of Coca-Cola or with cartons of cigarettes. This is no time for us to be boondoggling in western Europe. It is no time for our Government to be building a gambling casino in Le Harve or running a night club in Rome.

Senators may say that we should leave this to the sound judgment of the ECA. That would be an easy out; but is it sufficient? Would that discharge our constitutional obligation? Mr. President, we are on notice that ECA can err, and err very badly.

On June 13, 1950, William C. Foster, Deputy Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, appeared before the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Foster declared:

I am happy to tell the Appropriations Committee that, in my judgment, the trend of events in South Korea is more favorable than it has been at any time since the liberation of that country in 1945.

Then Mr. Foster said:

A rigorous training program has built up a well-disciplined army of 100,000 soldiers; one that is prepared to meet any challenge by North Korean forces.

Any Senator who is interested may read Mr. Foster's testimony in the record of the hearings of the Appropriations Committee, at pages 305 and 306.

That, then, was the considered opinion of the Deputy Administrator of the ECA, on June 13, just 11 days before the invasion of South Korea by Red forces. He said that South Korea had a well-disciplined army of 100,000 soldiers, prepared to meet any challenge by North Korean forces.

Subsequent events—the complete rout of South Korean forces—place Mr. Foster's testimony in bold relief. We must ask ourselves: Did the ECA have the slightest conception of the true picture of South Korea?

Other disconcerting question will come to the mind of Senators: Is the ECA better informed as to the situation in Western Europe than it was regarding the situation in Korea? Is the information given to the Congress by ECA regarding western Europe more accurate than it was regarding Korea?

ECA spends nearly \$300,000 a year for publicity in this country alone. Press agents and speech writers tell a pretty story of its accomplishments, and what the future will bring, if only the American taxpayers continue to foot the bills. But they find it increasingly necessary to keep up a constant barrage of handouts and addresses. Travelers are arriving home every day to raise grave doubts as to the results of the tinkling jingle of American gold.

The time has come—sooner than some of us anticipated—when the Senate must concern itself with facts—plain, hard, disagreeable facts. We are confronted face to face with the stark relentless, realities of a changing world. I hope that the Senate will examine the ECA appropriation with courage and foresight in light of the world-shaking events that have come about since the bill was reported to the Senate.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask a question of the junior Senator from Missouri. I wonder whether he had any feeling of dichotomy in the first two sentences of his very interesting talk in which he called for reducing ECA contributions and stimulating our allies abroad.

Mr. KEM. I had in mind that both things could be done at the same time, and that there was no inconsistency in the program. I had in mind that the great sum of \$1,950,000,000 should be ample to show our friends in western Europe our intention to uphold their hands and to stand by them, shoulder to shoulder and cheek by jowl. I had in mind that our friends in western Europe will have more confidence in our own intelligence and our own ability to stay the course of events if they know we are conducting our own affairs with prudence and foresight. I think the same will be true of our allies who are not beneficiaries of the Marshall plan.

Mr. FLANDERS. However, the difference does require a little explanation, does it not?

Mr. KEM. I do not think so. I think it would be self-evident to as keen a mind as that of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I merely wanted to make sure that the Senator felt he could correctly read the mental processes of our allies on the other side.

I come to another question. I ask the Senator from Missouri whether he has a feeling that the ECA has played no part in maintaining the peace of Europe up to this time.

Mr. KEM. I think it has perhaps done some good. I should like to think it has. But I am sure that the contribution which ECA has made is as nothing compared with the atomic bomb. If the Russians have not overrun western Europe, I am sure it has not been due to Coca Cola, cigarettes, and the casinos and night clubs we supplied in western Europe, but it has been due to the fear of the armed might of the United States, and more specifically to the knowledge which we possess of the atomic bomb, knowledge and the courage to use it, if and when the appropriate time rises.

Mr. FLANDERS. Does the Senator from Missouri, who has a keen eye for the picturesque in our operations abroad, feel that it is the atomic bomb which changed the prospects of the elections in Italy and France?

Mr. KEM. Yes. I am sure it sent many a doubting citizen to the polls to uphold the side espoused by the United States. I feel absolutely certain of that. I should like to say that I think the atomic bomb was the most powerful of all arguments for the American side. Whether the Honorable James C. Dunn, in presenting the matter to the people of Italy, referred to the atomic bomb, I do not know; but I am sure that there was no citizen of Italy so dense that he did not know about the atomic bomb and the effect it had on the entire world picture.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to refer my friend to the speech of Winston Churchill which he delivered at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology approximately a year ago, in which he said that the only thing—not the Marshall plan—which has protected Europe has been the atomic bomb of the United States. He repeated the statement several times in the course of his speech.

Mr. KEM. That is quite true. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his contribution. I should like to say that many reports from Europe indicate that the average citizen in western Europe regards the Marshall plan as evidence of a sort of weak-mindedness on the part of the people of the United States. He thinks we must have some ulterior motive, and he never has been influenced too much by our overgenerous gifts. He has realized, I think, that they were beyond our capacity, that as a matter of prudence we ought not to be sending them in such an amount. He has received our gifts with his fingers crossed. He wonders why we do not balance our own budget, instead of sending such sums to him.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from Missouri has the floor and has the privilege of yielding or not to the Senator from Vermont. I saw nothing in the press at the time, and nothing in the reports of those who were on the ground, to indicate that the atom bomb was a determining factor of any sort whatsoever in the elections in France and Italy. We do know, without question, as Mr. Churchill said, that it has been a deterrent factor, so far as the armed invasion of western Europe is concerned; but Russia's invasion of western Europe was undertaken not as an armed invasion, primarily, but as an invasion by Communist ideas and ideals, and we very narrowly escaped the danger of Italy and France going under. I am sure history will show that the Marshall plan was a prime factor in averting that great danger.

Furthermore, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri whether he thinks it was the atom bomb which increased so greatly and so favorably the productive output of western Europe.

Mr. KEM. I do not think the atom bomb has anything to do with the industrial output. I believe recovery in western Europe has been largely due to the ability of the people of western Europe to recover after a devastating war. That has been shown time and again in the course of history. There is no uniqueness about what the people of western Europe have done this time. France has been devastated time and time again by invading armies, and yet the people of the world have often marveled at the recuperative powers of the French people. The fact that we have spent some money there does not mean that her recovery is entirely due to that. It means that a natural economic process has been carried on.

I have invited the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the fact that

whatever I may think about the Marshall plan and whatever I may have said about it in the past, what I am suggesting today is a reduction of the Marshall plan appropriation to \$1,950,000,000. I am presenting that as the outside figure of what I think the limit should be, and as far as we should go, in view of the exigencies at home and the demands upon ourselves to equip and maintain our soldiers at the front.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would still like to go back to the previous discussion in order to find out whether or not it is really true that the Senator from Missouri feels the Marshall plan played no important part in the economic recovery of Europe.

Mr. KEM. If it will make the Senator from Vermont feel any better, I shall be very glad to say that it played a part. As a matter of fact, I suppose it did. I never said it did not. It would be strange if the pouring into any land of such tremendous sums of money did not do some good to the economy. To say otherwise would be foolish. I have no ambition to cut that kind of figure on the floor of the Senate.

What I have said and what I say now is that these gifts are no long-time solution to the problem. As soon as we stop making gifts, or as soon as we show any hesitancy in making gifts, the people over there will say to us, "Well, we are sorry, and just as sorry as we can be, but if you don't send us this money, we will have to go Communist." That is inevitable, Mr. President. We shall have to meet this issue. The point I make is that with a debt of \$257,000,000,000 the American people cannot continue year after year to bribe the people of the 16 countries in western Europe not to go Communist.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to interrogate the Senator still further. My reason for pressing the question as to whether or not the Senator from Missouri felt that the money spent up to now had been well spent was to get some gauge for my own use as to the value of his judgment that we could now do with any other certain amount that that proposed. If the Senator belittles the political and economic effect of the Marshall plan in Europe to date, I would have to say to the Senator that I fear I cannot trust his judgment.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Missouri is very anxious to retain the confidence of the Senator from Vermont. The Senator asked me if I thought the Marshall plan aid had made any contribution to the recovery of western Europe. I admitted it had. Then the Senator undertook to say that the Senator from Missouri admitted that the Marshall plan money had been well spent. Of course that is an entirely different matter. In my opinion, much of the Marshall plan money has utterly been wasted. I believe much of it has gone down the drain forever and has accomplished no appreciable good of any kind. It has made some contribution to the recovery in western Europe. However, if, in order to retain the confidence of the Senator from Vermont, which I am very anxious to do—

Mr. FLANDERS. Not the personal confidence or affection, but merely guidance on this particular legislation.

Mr. KEM. If, in order to do that, it is necessary for me to admit that I think the ECA money has been well spent, the Senator from Vermont and I, in a figurative sense, will have to part company. I cannot go along with him on that. I shall be glad to give him a bill of particulars on that point. I shall show him the many respects in which I feel that money of the American taxpayers has been wasted in western Europe.

Mr. FLANDERS. Does the Senator from Missouri feel that in that respect it is much different from many appropriations which we make on the floor of the Senate for undertakings inside the borders of our own country?

Mr. KEM. I should hate to say that every appropriation we have made has been as ill advised as I regard ECA. I will tell the Senator what I think about ECA. The Senator has spoken about what will be the place of ECA in history. I shall be glad to give the Senator the benefit of my opinion for what it is worth. In my opinion it will be regarded in history as we now regard the tulip craze, the South Sea bubble, the Mississippi bubble, the witchcraft mania in Salem, or the Florida land boom of a few years ago. I think ECA will go down in history as one of the mass delusions which seize upon the minds of men from time to time and which only time will erase, or correct. I have expressed this opinion in the Senate before. I see no reason to change it today.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to say to the Senator from Missouri that he has completely cleared my mind as to his position, but has done very little to persuade me in joining him in his position. I should like to conclude this little colloquy, so far as I am concerned, by stating as my conviction that had it not been for ECA, and its economic and political results, the Russian Army would now be washing its socks with salt water soap in the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. KEM. The Senator has explained his position very neatly. When we started our colloquy I did not have the slightest idea that I would change the opinion of the Senator from Vermont. The Senator from Vermont is not a politician. If he were I know he would cling tenaciously to the first principle of a politician, namely, "Never admit that you are wrong." I do not expect to convince the Senator from Vermont. Perhaps I may be more successful in prophecy than in persuasion with respect to some of my other brethren here. At any rate, Mr. President, I have made a record of my views for better or worse. It will be here in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all time. Those who follow the Senator from Vermont and me may pass judgment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that we shall soon find out how much good the Marshall plan has done when we see how many ground troops the countries who

have received benefits under the Marshall plan will send to Korea in response to the request of the Secretary General of the United Nations? Does not the distinguished Senator from Missouri believe that in that response we shall have a part of the proof?

Mr. KEM. I do not wish to cast the slightest aspersion on the good intentions of our allies. I believe they will support us. I hope they will. We need their help. I believe we shall get it. We know that in two world wars some of them have been loyal and faithful allies. However, I want to say that I think they would have more confidence in coming to our aid if they believed we are keeping our own economy on a sound basis.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. I have not heard all the Senator's very able address, but I have heard enough of it to become very greatly interested in it. Is it not important for America in this critical hour to keep its financial condition as sound as it possibly can?

Mr. KEM. I feel certain that that is so. As I said earlier, there is no point to our trying to maintain free institutions abroad, in the lands beyond the seas, if we are to jeopardize our own free institutions. There is nothing in the record of the past to indicate that we can bankrupt our Government and at the same time maintain our free institutions.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield further to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Until we can ascertain how serious our present condition is, is it not necessary to economize all along the line, not only in our contributions to ECA, but in our public works and things of that character at home.

Mr. KEM. I think it is necessary, indeed. As I have indicated before, the major part of the gifts proposed to be made under the pending bill would go into public improvements in the countries of western Europe, which have no reference at all to the emergency in which we now find ourselves. I voted for the military-assistance bill when it was before the Senate recently. I voted for it without comment. So far as arming our allies is concerned, that is an entirely different matter. I am not talking about that. I hope no one will get the idea that I am talking about that. My remarks are directed solely and exclusively to economic assistance to western Europe.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not a fact that here in the United States we are away behind in the construction of roads, the improvement of rivers and harbors, and matters of that kind, and that we will need those things badly if we become involved in a total war, in order to attain the maximum of agricultural, mining, and manufactured products, necessary for the conduct of a total war?

Mr. KEM. I believe that to be true beyond question. We are now draining the Zuider Zee in Holland at the expense of American taxpayers. I think that is costing in the neighborhood of \$37,000,000. We are building extensive multilane highways in many countries of western Europe. We are building great viaducts and aqueducts. We are building a great hydroelectric plant in Italy. A few days ago one of our colleagues told me that he was in Rome last summer and saw a great railroad terminal under construction. He inquired where the money came from and was told that \$4,000,000 came from the Marshall plan. And so it goes.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

INCLUSION OF SPAIN IN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Senate and the country a news item from Madrid, dated July 16, by the International News Service, which appeared this morning in the public press. I quote the article:

FRANCO REVOKES ALL ARMY LEAVES

Usually reliable sources said tonight that Generalissimo Franco has ordered all military leaves canceled and set the stage for the calling up of four army classes. Franco and his cabinet devoted most of their meeting Friday to a discussion of the Korean war and its effect on the international situation.

Mr. President, that is a news item which is enough to make the so-called liberals sick. This country has refused to aid and assist Franco. This country has refused to aid and assist the peoples of western Europe who oppose communism, and who, by the use of military force, will oppose the sweep of communism over western Europe.

Today western Europe is a void, a vacuum, because the United States has not allied herself with the two keystones, Germany and Spain, to prevent the spread of communism. Consistently, at the behest of the left wing, we have refused to arm and to assist them.

Mr. President, we find that although we called on the United Nations for military assistance in the form of ground troops in Korea, up until last night none of those countries had agreed to assist. Yet we find Spain, a country which does not even belong to the United Nations, holding Cabinet meetings and calling up four classes of her army to meet the international crisis.

Mr. President, if we had a trained army of Germans and a trained and equipped Spanish army, five of those divisions would be equal to 250,000 Chinese Communists. If this country is to live, it must build up its defenses, and it must ally itself with and assist the peoples of the world who will really take up arms to oppose communism.

In Europe Spain has been the bulwark against communism, and I say that our conduct toward her should be viewed with shame by the American people. It should shame our leaders, who are willing further to temporize with communism. They weaken this country when they do not assist Spain, but in order to appease certain left-wing pressure groups, certain radical elements of this

Senator McMAHON. I would like to point it out because a lot of people would like to point out something else.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia indulge me for a moment, to make a comment in connection with the statement just made by the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am much interested in the statement the Senator from Connecticut has made. I have been similarly misquoted on the subject, although I am not in a class with the Senator from Connecticut as an authority in that field.

A few days ago I ventured to suggest that the President should give General MacArthur authority, if he deemed it expedient, to use the atom bomb. As very much of an amateur in this matter, I did not venture to express an opinion as to whether or not it was wise to do so.

I read with great interest what was reported as being an expression of opinion by the Senator from Connecticut, who has given a great deal of study to the matter. I wanted my own position to be quite clear, namely, that I have not expressed an opinion as to whether the atom bomb should or should not be used, but merely that inasmuch as we have spent billions in developing the atom bomb, and inasmuch as at the present time our boys are dying because of an inadequate defense, the President should have authority in his discretion to direct that the atom bomb be used.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the first amendment under the agricultural section of the bill may be stated at this time. We have been on that section of the bill all day, but the amendment has not yet been discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter VI—Department of Agriculture—Title I—Research and Marketing Act of 1946," on page 168, after line 3, to strike out:

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of section 9 of title I and title II of the act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 427, 427h, 427j, 1621-1629), as follows:

For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9 of the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the act of August 14, 1946, \$5,000,000;

For the improvement and development, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the "Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946" (title II of the act of August 14, 1946, as amended), including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such act of August 14,

1946, \$6,000,000: *Provided*, That not less than \$650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.

In all, \$11,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of \$15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed \$29,000.

And on page 169, after line 24, to insert:

To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products under the provisions of title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1621-1629), including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such Act of August 14, 1946, \$6,000,000: *Provided*, That not less than \$650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, last week the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], formerly Secretary of Agriculture, expressed some concern about the change in the language of the appropriation affecting the funds for the Research and Marketing Act. I had requested the Department of Agriculture to furnish me with a statement as to its construction of the effect of this language. Let me read at this time an extract from that statement:

The action taken by the Senate Committee on Appropriations with regard to the

transfer of the appropriation for section 9 of the Research and Marketing Act to the appropriation for other payments to State Experiment Stations in no way changes any provisions of the act or procedures for its administration. The research administrator has had the responsibility of administering the Research and Marketing Act. He retains that responsibility by the committee action since the Office of Experiment Stations is under his supervision. The separate identity of this section is maintained, the authorizations remain the same, there is the same distribution of funds by prescribed formulas to the different States, and the research program remains the same down to the last project. The provisions for regional research in section 9 and marketing research in section 11 remain unchanged. The law provides direct payment to the State Experiment Stations of the funds appropriated under section 9 and the stations have authority to initiate and conduct research authorized by section 1 of the act using such funds. The act itself, in section 9 (c) also states that this section is to be administered by the Office of Experiment Stations and the transfer of section 9 to the Office of Experiment Stations will continue the administrative procedure which has been in effect from the beginning. The committee action is consistent with these provisions of the act and is in the interest of simplifying budgetary, administrative, and fiscal procedures without in any way changing the evident intent of Congress as stated in the act. This action was recommended by the Land Grant College Association and by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE HOUSE AND SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES RELATING TO SECTIONS 9 AND 10 OF THE RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT

The Appropriation Committees of both the Senate and House, as well as the Bureau of the Budget and the Department, have had difficulty since the initiation of the program under the Research and Marketing Act in clearly distinguishing between activities carried on under regular funds and those carried on with funds from sections 9 and 10 of the Research and Marketing Act. Because of this, the Congress recommended in April 1949 that the Department study the matter and recommend consolidation where needed. (See Report No. 384, on H. R. 3997 making appropriations for fiscal year 1950, House of Representatives, 81st Cong., 1st sess., p. 3.)

Subsequently, as of July 30, 1949, when the former Administrator of the Research and Marketing Act left the Department, responsibility for administration of the act was assigned to the Agricultural Research Administration. This Administration includes six Bureaus of the Department and the Office of Experiment Stations.

As a result of the recommendation from Congress, the Department and the State Experiment Stations thoroughly studied the questions involved and the Department presented to the agricultural subcommittees of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for their consideration in connection with hearings on this bill, statements showing the relationship of work performed under sections 9 and 10 of the Research and Marketing Act, and that carried out under the other research appropriations of the Department. (See Hearings, House of Representatives, on the Department of Agriculture Appropriations for 1951, pt. 1, pp. 153 to 155.)

[The action taken by the Senate Committee on Appropriations with regard to the transfer of the appropriation for section 9 of the Research and Marketing Act to the appropriation for other payments to State Experiment Stations in no way changes any provisions of the act or procedures for its administration. The Research Administrator has had the responsibility of administering the Research and Marketing Act. He retains that responsibility by the committee action since the Office of Experiment Stations is under his supervision. The separate identity of this section is maintained, the authorizations remain the same, there is the same distribution of funds by prescribed formulas to the different States, and the research program remains the same down to the last project.] The provisions for regional research in section 9 and marketing research in section 11 remain unchanged. The law provides direct payment to the State Experiment Stations of the funds appropriated under section 9 and the stations have authority to initiate and conduct research authorized by section 1 of the act using such funds. The act itself, in section 9 (c) also states that this section is to be administered by the Office of Experiment Stations and the transfer of section 9 to the Office of Experiment Stations will continue the administrative procedure which has been in effect from the beginning. The committee action is consistent with these provisions of the act and is in the interest of simplifying budgetary, administrative, and fiscal procedures without in any way changing the evident intent of Congress as stated in the act. This action was recommended by the Land Grant College Association and by the Department of Agriculture.

Furthermore, the committee's action is consistent with the actions taken by the House in consolidating the appropriation for section 10 of the Research and Marketing Act with the regular appropriations for the various research bureaus and agencies of the Department.

The Research and Marketing Act was in fact two acts that were tied together for legislative convenience. Title I of the act was an amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, while title II was the "Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946."

The action of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the action of the House are consistent with the provisions of the Research and Marketing Act and with the intent of Congress. The separate identity of title II, the "Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946" has been preserved in a separate appropriation. Since title I is an amendment of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, the appropriation for section 9 of this title is combined in the same appropriation with other Bankhead-Jones funds for State experiment stations, and the appropriation for section 10 is combined with other Department appropriations financing similar activities. The provisions for advisory committees in the Research and Marketing Act have been retained and the Senate report as well as the report of the House on this bill points out that Congress expects that the functions of these committees shall extend to all research funds in the Department, rather than being limited to the Research and Marketing Act. Likewise, the provisions for contract research under section 10 (a) are retained and this bill provides a specific amount for contracts.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator from Georgia feel that the statement he has just read completely guarantees that the Research and Marketing Act funds

will be used as contemplated in the original Research and Marketing Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department of Agriculture says so explicitly; and in view of its statement, which is to be printed at this point in the RECORD, it is my judgment that the Department of Agriculture will follow this course.

Certainly, if the Department does not do so, Congress will be in session in January, and it will not be a very difficult matter for Congress to restore the section, so as to make it read in the way it reads at the present time.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am quite sure the Senator from Georgia recognizes that at the time when the Research and Marketing Act was passed, there was a desire to have these funds administered by the land-grant colleges. However, the Congress decided otherwise, and placed the responsibility in the Department of Agriculture. The land-grant colleges have not been completely happy about that decision.

I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether he is aware that the Research and Marketing Act Advisory Committee chairmen, meeting in Washington, D. C., on June 20, 21, and 22, studied the Research Marketing Act in its operations, studied this very question, and in their recommendations—I refer specifically to recommendation No. 9, which is carried on page 2 of the report to the Secretary of Agriculture from the Research and Marketing Act Advisory Committee chairmen—said as follows:

The Research and Marketing Act has done much to stimulate the research, service, and educational work in agriculture.

I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Georgia to the next sentence, in particular:

To the maximum extent possible, separate identity of the RMA funds and their application should be maintained.

I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia is a little disturbed over the fact that these men, whose responsibility it is to make sure that the Research and Marketing Act funds are used in ways that are useful to agriculture, take a position opposite to that taken in this connection in the research and marketing appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, frankness compels me to state that I have not seen the statement from which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has just read. It has not previously been called to my attention. It is altogether likely that a copy of the statement reached my office; but we receive so much printed matter that I have not seen it.

I think it very likely, Mr. President, that the Advisory Committee chairman and advisory boards, on whose advice Congress depends largely in connection with the distribution of these funds, has made that statement.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure the Senator from Georgia understands my view of this matter, and in regard to his position. As I said twice the other day, the Department of Agriculture has no better friend on the floor of the Senate or in

the Congress as a whole than the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia; and I know that the Research and Marketing Act has no better friend in the Senate than he.

Therefore, I am trying to make sure that everyone is put on notice that the Senate certainly expects the Research and Marketing Act to be administered as it has been, and as it was originally conceived.

Let me call attention to the fact that recently, in the set-up in the Department of Agriculture, the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Administration has been given full responsibility for administering the Research and Marketing Act. Although Dr. Cardon, who has been given this responsibility, is an unusually outstanding person and a very competent man, nevertheless that action reverses the former tendency, namely, to have a separate administration of the Research and Marketing Act.

I am willing to take at face value what is said in the statement submitted to the distinguished Senator from Georgia by the Department of Agriculture. I am quite willing to assume that this will be administered exactly as the Department has explained the matter to the Senator from Georgia.

I feel that the recommendations of the chairmen of the advisory committees might well be made a part of the RECORD at this point, if the Senator from Georgia will permit me to make that request at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the recommendations and report of the Research and Marketing Act Advisory Committee chairmen, who met in Washington on June 20 to 22. The recommendations include recommendation No. 9, to which I have referred, in which it is pointed out that the research funds should have separate identity, and should not be merged with the other funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE RMA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CHAIRMAN, JUNE 20-22, 1950, WASHINGTON,
D. C.

In the passage of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, Congress recognized the need for keeping the program close to the people it serves when it authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to establish appropriate committees including representatives of producers, industry, government and science to assist in effectuating specific research and service programs. In accordance with this legislation, the Secretary has established 20 commodity and functional committees to assist in developing and analyzing research and service programs. In addition there have been four State agency committees established to assist in the development of this program.

Members of these committees represent broad groups interested in the outcome of agricultural research and service work. They are familiar with the problems faced by these groups in particular parts of industry or of the country. They are expected to see that the Department becomes fully cognizant of these problems.

Congress in legislative acts has defined the basic objectives and general nature of the Department's program. Personnel of the Department are responsible, through administrative channels, to Congress. However, within the broad framework established by Congress, there is wide latitude for administrative judgment in determining what specific types of work should be undertaken. Advice for well-informed citizen groups provides a sound basis for administrative decisions. It should result in greater returns for money expended and a program consistent with the interests of the public as a whole.

After review of these programs the group of RMA Committee chairmen at their meeting in Washington, June 20-22, 1950, expressed general satisfaction regarding the functioning of the programs under the Research and Marketing Act. The advisory committees are serving a useful purpose in this general plan of research and such committees should be continued. The following recommendations and questions are presented, looking toward further progress and general improvement in the program:

PART I—RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Advisory committees should assist the Department in maintaining a balance between fundamental and applied research. Research should be directed toward practical operating problems as well as fundamental research.

2. There should be some research aimed at providing background data to serve as a basis for broad agricultural policy.

3. Research projects should be specifically outlined by the Department, showing objectives, and committees should be advised of related or similar projects being conducted in the same field by the Department, by State agencies, and, to the greatest extent possible, by industry. There should be complete cooperation between State and Federal agencies and, where possible, between governmental and industrial agencies.

4. Work under contract should be used and expanded as far as practicable to better effectuate the purposes of the act.

5. Projects should be completed and closed when the work is done, or when it is determined after consultation with the interested subject matter committee that the results are not practical, that further work is unnecessary, or would be of little value as fundamental research.

6. There should be an expansion of extension, education, and service work, looking toward wide distribution and commercial application of the results of research and the adoption of findings. Generally much of the research work will become valuable only when it has been applied to the problems of production and distribution.

7. Training programs should be encouraged, particularly by State institutions in the field of marketing and distribution, as well as in other technical fields to develop qualified personnel which will be needed in the growth of research work under this act.

8. All segments of the trade, from the producer to the consumer, should be encouraged to engage as much as possible in needed research with their own funds. This applies particularly to private corporations, trade and producer associations, various State and local commissions and other organizations which should be encouraged to conduct practical research as a supplemental and in addition to the research work being done in the Department.

9. The Research and Marketing Act has done much to stimulate the research, service, and educational work in agriculture. To the maximum extent possible separate identity of the RMA funds and their application should be maintained. Research is a continuing process and it is urged that adequate funds be made available by the Congress to

continue and expand the program in accordance with the original provisions of the act.

10. Flexibility in use of funds is essential to provide for emergency situations and to insure maximum efficiency in the application of the funds.

11. Margin studies should include costs in relation to situations or conditions rather than margins alone.

12. With growing responsibilities and scope of work, additional funds for expanded staff work are necessary in order adequately to service the work of the committees and maintain the supervisory and correlative work necessary for maximum efficiency.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask, also—and I now request such unanimous consent—that the list of members of the Agricultural Research Policy Committee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE

Dr. John D. Black, professor of agricultural economics, Harvard University, 205 Littauer Center, Cambridge, Mass.

A. A. Brock, director, department of agriculture, State of California, State Office Building No. 1, Sacramento, Calif.

Robert R. Coker, vice president, Coker's Pedigreed Seed Co., Hartsville, S. C.

Dr. John H. Davis, executive secretary, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

Albert S. Goss, master, the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

Dr. C. G. King, scientific director, the Nutrition Foundation, Inc., Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.

Albert K. Mitchell, Albert, N. Mex.

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

Harry J. Reed, dean and director, School of Agriculture, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

Mrs. Raymond Sayre, president, the Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Ackworth, Iowa.

Dean Stanley, president, Stanley Fruit Co., 626 Security Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

Executive secretary: Henry G. Herrell, Agricultural Research Administration, United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am going to say, as I said to the Senator from Georgia, I think a point of order would lie against this change. I do not intend to raise a point of order. I prefer to depend upon the assurances given by the Department of Agriculture in its statement to the Senator from Georgia and his assurances to the Senate that it is the intention to preserve the integrity of these funds and not let them become mixed with the ordinary funds granted to the experiment stations.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall not discuss the point of order, because that question is moot in view of the statement of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I shall express my appreciation of his kindly reference to the Senator from Georgia. I reiterate what I have said before on this floor that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is one of the outstanding—if not the outstanding—Secretaries of Agriculture since that position was created. I am sure that we share the common hope and desire that the activities

of the Research and Marketing Administration will proceed as contemplated by the Congress when the act was passed, and that there will be no change by administrative action in the Department of Agriculture of any part of the functioning of the research work by virtue of this change in language, which we understand is solely to simplify the book-keeping and budgetary procedures within the Department of Agriculture.

The Senate committee, in its efforts to sustain the Advisory Committee, made quite a lengthy statement in the committee report urging that the Advisory Committee be given greater authority and more information, to enable those from outside the Department who view this matter perhaps from a little different light, because they have not been living so close to it for so many years, to take a larger part in the activities of the Research and Marketing Administration.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have one other brief statement, after which I shall be delighted to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for but one question, at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator about to leave this subject and go to something else, or will he continue to discuss this amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. We are still on the first amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall wait until the Senator is through, if he wants to offer a further observation regarding the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to make a brief observation; yes.

Recently I stated I was disappointed in the results which had been achieved to date in these activities. That language was perhaps too strong. I should have said that I was unhappy because there had not been more outstanding achievements. The Department sent me two booklets dealing at length with examples of the progress which has been achieved under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. I may say the pamphlets show that great progress has been made, and that Senators who are interested in the subject would find them interesting reading, if they could find time to look into them, because there have been certain accomplishments which have been notable.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very glad that the Senator from Georgia put that statement into the RECORD. He will remember that the act was passed at a time when it was impossible to get the money which was needed. That was impossible until very recently. I think the men inside the Department of Agriculture, those connected with the land-

grant colleges, and persons in private industry have done a very fine job of getting these projects started. I would commend the activities of the Department of Agriculture, certainly those in recent months, for the fine job which has been done. I am particularly happy that independent groups have come forward and made their proposals, thereby making it possible for the Department to coordinate its work with what private industry is doing. I may refer particularly to the great activity of the National Cotton Council for Research in undertaking research in cotton mills. Cotton research was to some extent tied in with the work of the land-grant colleges, and finally with the work of the Department of Agriculture itself.

I am glad the Senator from Georgia has had an opportunity to look at what they have accomplished, because I think it is a rather impressive study—not because of what they have thus far achieved, but because of the sound way in which they are planning their work and looking into the future. I have nothing but praise for the work the Department is doing at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has stated it much better than I could. I may further point out that under the act an appropriation of \$61,000,000 would have been authorized for the fiscal year 1951. In the great desire for economy, we have only requested appropriations of \$19,000,000, which is less than one-third of the authorizations of the act.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Referring to the observation made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the former Secretary of Agriculture, I did not quite catch the significance of his observation when he stated, if I heard him correctly, that he would not raise a point of order against this provision, on the assurance that the act would be administered, as I take it, as explained by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I should merely like to ask a question, through the Senator from Georgia, if I may reach the Senator from New Mexico in that way. Is there any apprehension upon his part that it might not be administered properly? Why the observation? I am as much interested as is the Senator from Georgia or the Senator from New Mexico in seeing to it that the research laboratories are able to conduct proper research. I am wondering whether there is anything in the Senator's mind which even indicates that under this new language of the bill that work might not be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without my losing the floor, I may yield to the Senator from New Mexico for the purpose of his replying to the question of the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely want to assure the distinguished majority leader that I saw, as I glanced at the language, as I was examining the bill, that there might be some significance in the fact that appropriations which had been made heretofore to the Department of Agriculture and by the Department then granted to the land-grant colleges were being changed by the fact that the money was now going directly to the land-grant colleges. I wondered whether that meant the termination of the over-all supervision by the Department of Agriculture with respect to this project.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the distinguished Senator, I think that is a very pertinent question. It is one of the questions I asked when this legislation came up.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that when the original survey was made of research projects now going on, the Department of Agriculture acquired examples, running into the thousands of pages, of agricultural research then being done in the United States; first of all, by the Department itself; secondly, by the land-grant colleges; third, by the Office of Experiment Stations; and then by private industry. It was found, for example, that in one State the very same problem was being studied that was being studied in another State through the granting of Federal funds. That is not wholly bad. Frequently it is desirable to pursue independently the same type of research in two States. But, very frequently, it is desirable to have somebody at the top knowing exactly what is going on.

Therefore, when I saw this language which I thought might take it away from the Department, I raised the question with the distinguished Senator from Georgia. He then took it up with the Department, because the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Georgia, and I had the same desire to make sure that the Research and Marketing Act would succeed. The reply which came to him from the Department of Agriculture—he supplied me with a copy of it—satisfied him and it satisfies me, as long as the Senator from Georgia is watching this particular point.

Mr. WHERRY. In order that the RECORD may be clear relative to this matter, I may say it is my understanding that this language is added for no other reason than as a bookkeeping proposition which mechanically helps accomplish what has been suggested. It in no way impairs, but might to the nth degree bring about what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has just mentioned. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota raised some question about research activities relative to wheat straw. I had happened to mention research in the use of wood

waste materials. The Department, in order to show that the work has been done, has sent me quite a list of pamphlets relative to wood waste, and also relative to the waste of wheat straw. I am sure the Senator from North Dakota will be glad to see them.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator have any objection to placing in the RECORD for reference the titles of the two pamphlets to which he referred, in order that any farmer who desires to obtain them may have reference to them?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to do that. One of them is Appendix 1, "Examples of Progress Under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946," issued May 25, 1950. The second is Appendix 2, "A List of Publications Reporting Results of Work Under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946," dated the same date.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I make a further inquiry?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Does the distinguished Senator know whether they are available to other Senators?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. If the Senator will have one of his assistants call up the Department, the Department will have the documents on the Senator's desk in the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment beginning on page 168, after line 3, striking out certain language and inserting other language ending on page 169, line 25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural Economics," on page 171, line 16, after the word "trends", to strike out "\$2,600,000" and insert "\$2,720,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last year Congress appropriated for this purpose \$2,621,000. The House Appropriations Committee recommended a cut of \$21,000, which brought the figure to \$2,600,000. The Senate committee has raised it to \$2,720,000. That is an increase of \$120,000 over the House figure, and is virtually an increase of \$100,000 over the amount appropriated last year. In view of the war situation, it seems to me we should make reductions in funds of this kind. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 172, line 7, after "(7 U. S. C. 951-957)", to strike out "and data on farm construction as provided by title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171), \$2,725,000" and insert "\$2,904,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last year Congress appropriated \$2,817,000 for this purpose. The House bill cut the

figure to \$2,725,000. The Senate committee has proposed \$2,904,000. This is an increase of \$86,000 over the appropriation of last year, and an increase of \$179,000 over the House figure. It also carries with it the elimination of funds to carry out the provisions of research on farm construction. So we are giving this group more money with which to do less work. I hope the committee amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia whether the amendment involves a pay increase? Is it approximately the same figure as that provided last year?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this item includes the pay adjustment costs which were authorized through the pay-increase act which was passed last year. When we take into consideration the pay adjustments under the Federal Employees Compensation Act which was enacted last year, with the sums appropriated, there is less money available for this purpose in the coming fiscal year than there was in the past fiscal year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the proceedings, because there will be many of these proposals, but, as a general principle, it seems to me we should have the agencies absorb the salary increases by a decrease in personnel. The appropriation called for is an increase of \$86,000 over last year which should help to some extent but the rest should be absorbed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to point out that this item is substantially below the budget estimate, and it does not allow all the pay increases. The Department is absorbing and has absorbed a part of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 172, line 7.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Agricultural Research Administration—Office of Administrator," on page 172, line 19, after the word "of", to strike out "Advisory Committee" and insert "advisory committees."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 174, to strike out:

WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS, AGRICULTURAL
RESEARCH CENTER

For the establishment of a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for furnishing facilities and services by the Agricultural Research Center to Government agencies, \$300,000. Said fund shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations or other funds to cover the charges for such facilities and services, including handling and related charges, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs), for supplies, equipment and materials, stores of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building construction, alterations, and repair, and applicable appropriations or other funds may also be charged their proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the Center not covered by the annual appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska," on page 175, line 10, after the word "Alaska", to strike out "\$260,000" and insert "\$280,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment, was under the subhead "Office of Experiment Stations," on page 175, line 14, after the word "advance", to insert "where applicable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 175, line 24, after "(7 U. S. C. 427-427g)", to strike out "\$2,863,708" and insert "Sections 3 and 5, \$2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11 of said act as added by the act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427h, 427j), including administration by the Office of Experiment Stations in the United States Department of Agriculture, \$5,000,000, no part of which latter amount shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of \$15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed \$29,000;".

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I be privileged to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is an appropriation of \$5,000,000 to carry out the purposes authorized under the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1945, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will permit me, this is transferred from a previous amendment and placed at this point. It is the amendment as to which I raised the question awhile ago. It was previously carried under the research and marketing operations, and it will be recognized from the earlier amendment that it is a transfer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 176, line 17, after the word "Alaska", to strike out "\$27,500" and insert "\$37,500", and in line 21, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "\$7,406,208" and insert "\$12,416,208."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if where the bill mentions the amounts which shall be available to Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, it does not also include agricultural experimental work which should be done in the Virgin Islands. In other words, are the Virgin Islands continued as a part of Puerto Rico in the operation of the experimental station?

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will not hold me strictly to this, but I believe it does not include the Virgin Islands, because income-tax payments from the Virgin Islands are not transferred to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is altogether correct. So far as I am advised,

there is no experiment station in the Virgin Islands. There is one in Puerto Rico. I conclude that a great deal of the material gathered in Puerto Rico would be available to the Virgin Islands. Their research in agriculture would be along similar lines. They have practically the same agricultural economy.

Mr. BUTLER. It is true that the Puerto Rico station is approximately 40 miles from the Virgin Islands, and the experimental work done in Puerto Rico does contribute to the economy of the Virgin Islands, but the Virgin Islands are not mentioned. I think the Virgin Islands receive the benefit of much of the experimental work conducted in Puerto Rico, but I should like to have it understood that the Puerto Rico station is also responsible for experimental work in the Virgin Islands as well as in Puerto Rico.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska may be entirely correct, and, in view of his past experience as former chairman of the committee dealing with the islands, he undoubtedly is correct. But I know of no authorization for that purpose. It would be necessary to pass specific legislation for an experiment station in Puerto Rico. There is none in the Virgin Islands of which I have any knowledge.

Mr. BUTLER. I am not asking that the appropriation be increased; I do not believe it is necessary; but I think it is necessary for Congress to understand that the station in Puerto Rico serves the Virgin Islands as well as Puerto Rico.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think any information developed should be available to the Virgin Islands.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to address a question to the Senator from Nebraska. I happened to have been with him on an inspection trip in the Virgin Islands, during the course of which we both visited an experimental farm which was operated either by the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior. My inquiry is whether the Senator from Nebraska can identify the department which was responsible for the experimental work.

Mr. BUTLER. The experimental farm which has been conducted in the Virgin Islands is conducted under the general supervision of the Department of the Interior jointly with the Virgin Islands government. I do not believe that the Department of Agriculture is officially connected with the experimental farm in the Virgin Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 176, line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses," on page 177, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "December" and insert "September," and in line 8, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "\$237,500" and insert "\$252,500."

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics," on page 178, line 9, after the word "subjects", to strike

out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$1,763,200."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as the text of the bill indicates, this represents an increase of \$263,000 above the amount appropriated by the House. It is a slight increase of \$14,000 above the amount appropriated last year. I should like to read from the House report, at page 130, as follows:

The funds for this Bureau have increased from \$360,000 in 1941 to approximately \$1,800,000 in 1950, including Research and Marketing Act and special research fund allotments. The committee believes that continued increases in appropriations for the work of this Bureau cannot be justified at this time, and the survey of rural family living expenses cannot be provided for, and that development of farmhouse plans is adequately covered by the regular work of this and other bureaus.

The committee expects this Bureau to make a thorough reevaluation of all of its activities during the next year to make certain that attention is devoted only to the most essential research work in the field of human nutrition and home economics.

Mr. President, in view of the need for great budgetary stringency and the prospect of greatly increased war appropriations, I hope the committee amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 178, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Animal Industry—Salaries and expenses," on page 178, line 23, after the word "Hatcheries", to strike out "\$2,250,000" and insert "\$2,319,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an increase of \$69,000 above the House bill. It seems to me that the House appropriation of \$2,250,000,000 should be sufficient. The Senate committee report speaks of provision for repairs, reconditioning, and replacement of facilities. In view of the current situation it seems to me that the facilities could be allowed to remain as they are for a while. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman in charge of this section of the bill if the bill includes an appropriation for salaries of meat inspectors located in terminal markets.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a separate item, which has not yet been reached. We did not alter the House figure with respect to the Meat Inspection Service.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the committee increase the amount?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it did not. The House allowed the budgetary estimates except to the extent of some \$50,000. I may say that the excitement about meat inspectors grew out of the so-called Taber-Thomas amendment, which proposed to cut 429 meat inspectors from the Service. That provision has been stricken from the bill. The Meat Inspection Service is adequately provided for.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the phase in which I was interested.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Meat Inspection Service is adequately provided for in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 178, line 23.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 179, line 1, after the word "products," to strike out "\$1,300,000" and insert "\$1,350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 179, line 15, after the figures "\$7,950,000", to strike out the comma and "including not to exceed \$30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of four buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment on page 179, on line 15, which I should like the clerk to report. It deals with the Meat Inspection Service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I understand, we must conclude consideration of committee amendments before taking up individual amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment, which deals with the text of the bill, is not in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The amendment would add only a small amount to the \$7,950,000 figure, which was the amount provided by the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I believe such an amendment would not be in order at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment, being an amendment to the text of the bill, is not in order at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would my amendment be in order after the section now under consideration is disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment would be in order after the disposition of the committee amendments.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Washington must leave the city, I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to submit the amendment at this time. He must leave for his home State.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator desires to leave, I have no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thought this would be a good time to bring up an amendment with reference to the Meat Inspection Service.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not accede to the Senator's request on those grounds.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I can wait until later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington withdraws his amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, at this time I should like to submit an amendment which I intend to propose. It is on page 472. I realize that is far from the page which we are now discussing. The amendment relates to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I thought it could be presented at this

time. I send the amendment to the desk and I ask that the Clerk read it. I also ask that an explanation of the amendment may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I may say that in attempting to make it possible for the Commodity Credit Corporation to deal with some of its problems, inadvertently no provision was made that the Corporation shall not be subject to the apportionment procedure. I should like to present the amendment at this time and to have the explanation printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table. Unanimous consent is requested that the amendment be read. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

One page 472, strike out all after the word "States" and the period in line 1 down to and including line 7 and in lieu thereof insert the following: "No funds (other than funds for administrative expenses) available for price support, surplus removal, and related operations, with respect to agricultural commodities shall be subject to apportionment pursuant to this section."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico that his explanatory statement be printed in the RECORD at this point?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION

The Secretary of Agriculture, through Commodity Credit Corporation and other means available to him, is required or authorized to make available price support on agricultural commodities and to engage in surplus removal operations with respect to agricultural commodities. The nature of these operations makes it impracticable to apportion the funds available therefor, since the extent or character of the operations must necessarily be related to supply and market conditions, and such conditions cannot be foreseen with any degree of certainty, but instead, are dependent upon weather, general economic conditions, and other fluctuating factors. Accordingly, it is believed that the price support operations and the surplus removal operations and other related programs with respect to agricultural commodities should be excluded from the provisions for apportionment. The operations which would thus be removed from the provisions requiring apportionment would include operations such as programs undertaken by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 32 (the act of August 24, 1935, Public Law 320, 74th Cong., as amended) and the price-support program, the supply program, the foreign purchase program, the commodity export program, and the storage facilities program, as described in the Commodity Credit Corporation's budget program for the fiscal year 1951.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in view of the parliamentary situation, I shall not ask for a vote on my amendment at this point. However, I should like to discuss it for about 5 minutes, inasmuch as both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are interested in it. In answer to inquiry from the Senator from

Nebraska, the Senator from Georgia has made the statement that he thought the House amount was adequate with respect to salaries for Federal meat inspectors. It may be that the committee heard evidence to that effect. However, the amendment I am suggesting clearly points out that reductions which would result would cripple stock inspections at certain points. My amendment would add \$2,500 to the bill. It would be added for the purpose of employing a part-time veterinarian in the Union Stockyards at Seattle. The Department of Agriculture tells me that the budgetary requirement and the amount in the committee bill would not allow for such part-time inspection service. It would leave the Seattle Union Stockyards without any inspection at all. In view of the fact that we have reduced the import duty on Canadian beef from 6 to 3 cents a pound, there has developed some very serious competition to the packers in the Seattle area. Immediately after the Federal inspection was discontinued the Canadians started shipping their cattle into the United States as dressed beef instead of as beef on the hoof. Shipments on the hoof, of course, would give the slaughtering and packing business to Seattle firms, but unless this small amount of \$2,500 for a part-time veterinarian is provided the cattle will not be shipped into the Seattle Union Stockyards.

Another important point involved is that without Federal inspection livestock can be shipped from Canada to the United States only on direct assignment for slaughtering. With Federal inspection such livestock can be shipped for resale.

It may be that enough money is included in the appropriation, but all my information is that the Seattle Union Stockyards will be without the services of a part-time veterinarian, and it seems to me to be very false economy from the standpoint of public health not to have a sufficient amount to make possible a part-time veterinarian in that area. It is not too large a stockyard. It does not compare with the Omaha, Chicago, Kansas City, and South St. Paul stockyards, but it is an important union stockyard for our section of the country.

Mr. President, I do not know why it is, but it seems to me that every year since I have been a Member of Congress we have been confronted with the appropriation for Federal meat inspectors. If it is not the Weather Bureau it is the Federal Meat Inspection Service, and every year we have to make the attempt to restore very minute amounts to keep the inspection alive.

I do not know what the situation is in the other stockyards, but I am going to ask for \$2,500 so that the inspection service can be kept alive in the Seattle Union Stockyard. I hope the Senator from Georgia, in view of this particular situation, may accept the amendment, take it to conference, and see whether or not this amount is adequate. The decreased appropriation in the bill does not amount

to much, but it does stop all Federal inspection in that particular stockyard.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I could not accept the amendment without having some idea the Department as to the effect it would have on the other stockyards. I daresay a number of other stockyards are situated about like the one in Seattle, and if we agreed to give a part-time inspector to Seattle, we would certainly be bound to give such inspectors to the other stockyards similarly situated.

This bill carries \$12,800,000 for meat inspection. That is \$159,000 below the Budget estimate. It seems to me that with appropriation of \$12,800,000, we ought to be able to save the \$159,000 by which the House decreased the Budget estimate of \$12,959,000.

I shall be glad to get a statement as to whether the other stockyards are similarly situated, but I could not agree to accept the amendment at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I brought the matter up because the situation is such that the amount provided, it is said, is not sufficient to keep a part-time man in the stockyards in Seattle. The officials say that it is because of the budget ceiling. They did not present a formal request to the committee to keep this place alive. There may be other like cases.

I hope that for the sake of saving \$2,500 a stockyard serving a great area will not be denied the right of Federal inspection, because it has even this further effect, that the Canadians, instead of sending their cattle to Seattle on the hoof to be slaughtered, are sending their dressed beef. With inspection, the tendency is to send the cattle from Canada into the Seattle Union Stockyards for consumption in that area.

Mr. President, I shall not submit the amendment until the parliamentary situation is favorable, but I thought this was a good time to bring up the subject of Federal meat inspectors.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator makes a very appealing case. The agricultural appropriation affords more opportunities for appealing pleas than any other single feature in the entire bill. At one time I counted them and found there are 1,863 different activities under this chapter of the bill. Some of those 1,863 activities are carried in every State in the Union. There has never been any instance where those within the States have not desired to have their services improved. Of course we all hear about those things in the Nation's Capital, because it is our responsibility to represent our people.

I should like very much to be able to accept the Senator's amendment, but I cannot do it if it is going to result in discrimination against any other stockyard that is similarly situated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am not familiar with what the effect would be on other stockyards. If the Department says that because of the budget limitation they cannot assign an inspector to Seattle, a great area of the

country served by one union stockyard would be denied the right of inspection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator know whether there are other inspectors there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are none there.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department ought to assign one to that area, because they have, I believe, approximately, 4,000 inspectors.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am deeply interested in the discussion taking place between the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Georgia. I wish to repeat the statement that the United States Department of Agriculture Inspection Division operates almost solely for the protection of the health of American citizens, and I think it is an extremely important service to be continued for the benefit of the people as a whole.

I am surprised that there is any question that \$2,500 cannot be available out of a total of \$12,800,000 for the services referred to, but I am willing to take the word of the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, who has the bill in charge, that the Taber amendment is not being considered in connection with this particular item.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the Taber item is not in the bill. By committee action it was stricken out. There is nothing in the appropriation for this item that brought about the drastic reduction in meat inspectors, as to which we all received innumerable telegrams. The Taber-Thomas amendment would have resulted in dropping four-hundred-odd meat inspectors. As I have said, I think there is a total of nearly 4,000. I am told by the clerk of the committee that there are 3,220. They are provided for in this bill. That being the case, it seems to me that the Senator from Washington could get a part-time inspector, and I should be delighted to join with him in making a representation to the Department of Agriculture, so that there could be at least one part-time inspector assigned to the Seattle area.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator and in view of the facts that there are some 3,300 inspectors, it seems to me that what the Senator says is correct. I shall talk to the Department again and see if we cannot get one for the Seattle area, at least one, perhaps a full-time inspector.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator could get at least a part-time one, I believe.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It seems to me we have the same problem as to meat inspection coming up all the time. I know it has been coming up since I have been a Member of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement showing the situation in the Seattle area, together with a letter from Henry J. Kruse, president of the Seattle Packing Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

I am offering an amendment proposing the addition of \$2,500 to funds provided in the bill for the item "Animal disease control and eradication," under the Bureau of Animal Industry.

In line 15, page 179, I propose to strike out the figure "\$7,950,000" and insert in lieu thereof \$7,952,500."

This addition of \$2,500 is urgently needed to provide Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards. I have talked to the Department of Agriculture informally about the need for Federal inspection at the Seattle yards. The Department agrees that Federal inspection is highly desirable, but because of the budget ceiling was unable to present a formal request to the committee.

Through 1946 the Seattle yard had Federal inspection. The Eightieth Congress cut rather drastically funds allotted the Bureau of Animal Industry, and, in consequence, Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards was discontinued. Inasmuch as these yards do not now have inspection, there is a tendency for cattle, particularly feeder stock, to be diverted to other areas.

In addition, serious competition has developed for Seattle packers from the Canadians. Immediately after Federal inspection was discontinued, Canadians started shipping their cattle into the Pacific Northwest in the form of dressed beef rather than on the hoof.

A current factor in this influx of dressed beef was the tariff reduction, effective January 1, 1948, from 6 to 3 cents per pound. Both management and labor in the meat packing industry believe that restoration of Federal inspection will encourage the shipments to come in the form of livestock rather than dressed beef.

Shipments on the hoof will give the slaughtering and packing business to United States firms and workers, and would go some distance toward cushioning the competitive effects of this particular type of Canadian import.

The important point is that without Federal inspection, livestock can only be shipped from Canada to the United States on direct consignment to a slaughter. With Federal inspection, such livestock can be shipped for resale.

It is obvious that there is great merit in making it possible for the Bureau of Animal Industry to restore Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards. The amount involved is only \$2,500—just enough to pay the half-time salary of a qualified veterinarian.

I hope the Senate will adopt this amendment.

SEATTLE PACKING CO.,

Seattle, Wash., June 30, 1950.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Although the Department of Agriculture recognizes the need for restoring Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards, it is unable to do so because of a shortage of funds. The Department estimates, however, that only \$2,500 is needed to restore the Federal inspection at Seattle as only the part-time services of one veterinarian is required. It is, therefore, suggested that you obtain an appropriation of \$2,500 for this purpose. This is important to the Northwest for the following reasons.

Increased control of livestock diseases is a protection to the general public. With Federal inspection the Seattle Union Stockyards would be assured that a veterinarian would

be in charge and that adequate inspection with regard to communicable diseases would be in effect.

Livestock producers will be better served under Federal inspection. At the present time the Northwest is served by only two Federal-inspected yards. These are located at Spokane and Portland. Under State law, health requirements are enforced by the Brand Division which require that all female stock be tested and tagged when sold, except when sold to a packer for slaughter or for resale at a federally inspected yard.

Since a federally inspected yard has a veterinarian on duty, the additional expense and delay required by testing female cattle is avoided. Inasmuch as the Seattle Union Stockyards are not now inspected, livestock producers tend to make their shipments either to Spokane or to Portland.

Slaughter in the Northwest area would increase. Since reductions in the tariff on meat from Canada to the United States from 6 to 3 cents per pound effective January 1, 1948, and the termination of shipments from Canada to the United Kingdom, meat importations to the United States have been greatly increased. Due to higher wage rates, expenses, etc., in the United States, most of this importation is now in the form of meat that is dressed. It would be desirable to have it come in the form of livestock so that the slaughter and processing could be performed here. Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards would therefore greatly facilitate the movement of livestock from Canada. Without Federal inspection livestock can only be shipped on direct consignment to a slaughterer. Whereas, under Federal control such livestock could be shipped for resale. This would increase the flow of Canadian cattle and would help the packers in that area to meet the competition of Canadian packers. This competition has been particularly severe in the Seattle area since the reduction in tariff duty.

Very respectfully yours,

HENRY J. KRAUSE,
President, Seattle Packing Co.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Washington whether any slaughtering is done in the union stockyard at Seattle.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. THYE. There is slaughtering there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is much slaughtering, but because of the lack of meat inspection, the cattle on the hoof have not been coming in, and the dressed beef has been coming in.

Mr. THYE. It seems to me very strange that the Department of Agriculture would permit slaughtering to take place and not have a meat inspector on hand. If that is the situation in Seattle, I would join with the Senator from Washington in asking that the Department of Agriculture assign a meat inspector from the regular appropriation, or join the Senator in seeking to have allowed the amount he has requested. It seems to me to be incredible that the Department of Agriculture does not have one of its meat inspectors at a point of slaughter.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We never have been able to get one.

Mr. THYE. I cannot imagine that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the Senator's interest. We never have been able to get one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, on agreeing to the amendment on page 179, line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Dairy Industry," on page 182, line 14, after the word "butter", to insert "not to exceed \$100,000 for construction of 10 or more housing units for employees"; and in line 15, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$1,600,000" and insert "\$1,735,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment provides an increase of \$135,000 above the amount appropriated by the House. Apparently it is for two purposes: \$35,000 for repairs, and \$100,000 for housing facilities, that is, 10 houses for personnel. The personnel of this bureau, as I understand, are in Maryland near Greenbelt, and the House committee in turning down the recommendation to build 10 houses said that in their judgment it is quite possible that these employees might find housing at the Greenbelt housing project. In view of the need for economy, I hope the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the amendment. I do not see why we should build houses at the place designated at \$10,000 apiece.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, \$35,000 is what the committee allowed of a total of \$125,000 requested for repair and reconditioning of physical facilities at field stations. There have been no repairs made in any of the various field stations of the far-flung experimental organization of the Department of Agriculture since 1941, except emergency repairs. There has been very little painting done. The Government of the United States has an enormous investment in all these operations. We have allowed about 15 to 20 percent of the budget estimates for repairs in each instance. We did not allow the full amount. We allowed just sufficient to make the most emergent repairs and to prevent the deterioration and loss of capital investment.

Now as to the question asked by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. The \$100,000 was asked for, for the purpose of constructing 10 houses at Beltsville to take care of the labor that is employed at the dairy there. The testimony showed that there were no houses available, and that the men working at the dairy have to get to work very early in the morning, and oftentimes have to work very late at night. The Department could not obtain for the labor wage scale workers, who would have to get up in Washington perhaps at 2:30 or 3 o'clock in the morning and go all the way to Beltsville to reach their place of work.

It is a nonrecurring item, and the houses will be self-liquidating, because rent is charged for them. The rent that is paid for these houses will eventually liquidate this \$100,000 item. I do not think it is going to affect the whole universal scheme of salvation if we refuse to appropriate this \$135,000, but I think it is a good business deal to appropriate it, because there is an enormous turnover in employment at the dairy. The work is very important. The research work carried on there with respect to

dairying and livestock is of vital concern to every person in the United States who owns a cow; and a great many people own cows.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, considerable testimony was heard by the committee as to why the sum in question should be allowed. The able Senator from Georgia has stated the situation very ably. The men employed in the dairy division must be there early and late. A great amount of expense would be incurred by a man who had to drive from his home in Washington to the experiment station, and then home again. Many of the employees, in fact, do not possess automobiles. Therefore, they are under a handicap in going to and from their home in the city. I believe the amount of \$100,000 is reasonable. The cost is only \$10,000 a unit. Much thought and consideration and discussion was given to this item at the time it was considered. It was finally agreed to in committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I wish to reiterate that the amount in question will amortize itself. The houses will pay for themselves from the rents collected.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. In order to clarify the situation in my own mind, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. He said the project will amortize itself. If and when the houses are built, will the rentals received from the properties revert to the Treasury or to the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite sure the money will go to the Treasury, unless there is an act to the contrary which deals specifically with this particular subject. A cow is occasionally sold at Beltsville, and the proceeds go to the Treasury.

Mr. FREAR. Then the Department of Agriculture would not have the authority to expand the rentals?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if it is not true that Beltsville, Md., where the Bureau of Dairy Industry has its station, is just a mile or so from Greenbelt, where a town of 7,400 persons has been built as a housing project?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not really apprised as to the distance between Greenbelt and Beltsville. I do know that the Department of Agriculture does not own any homes in Greenbelt, and that it is some distance from Beltsville.

Mr. President, the evidence on this subject is very convincing. I may say that I had overlooked the fact that we took testimony on this matter. It shows that prior to the submission of budget estimates the possibilities of obtaining such housing in the surrounding area, including the town of Greenbelt, had been fully explored, but without success.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 182, lines 14 and 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry," on page 182, line 25, after the word "thereof", to strike out "\$7,750,000" and insert "\$8,500,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an increase of \$750,000 above the amount appropriated by the House. It is an increase of \$105,000 above the amount Congress appropriated last year. In view of the need for economy, I suggest that it would be much better if we reject the committee amendment and save \$750,000.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2591) to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in arthritis and rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy and blindness, and other diseases, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PRIEST, Mr. BIEMILLER, Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma, Mr. WOLVERTON, and Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr., were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

(At this point Mr. MORSE addressed the Senate on the subject of recent increases in food prices. At his request, and, by unanimous consent, his remarks were ordered to be printed in today's RECORD at the conclusion of the debate on the general appropriation bill.)

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 182, line 25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering," on page 183, line 24, after the words "crops", to strike out "\$3,400,000" and insert "\$3,475,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an increase of \$125,000 for research in the field of fruits, vegetable, and specialty crops.

May I ask why the increase is to be put into effect?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this item includes \$50,000 of the estimated \$190,000 for repairs and reconditioning of physical facilities at field stations to strengthen the research program; \$60,000 for research work on vegetable sources for the new drug, cortisone, and \$15,000 additional to provide a total of \$40,000 for gladiolus research. Those are the three items that go to make up the increase of \$125,000. As I have stated

heretofore, there has been no substantial repair work done on these field stations for 8 or 10 years. Certainly no one can challenge the importance of cortisone. It is a drug recently discovered which has proved to be a boon to humanity suffering from rheumatism and arthritis. It now comes from the gall bladders of animals, I believe, and it takes 10,000 cows to supply enough to treat one case. There have been some amazing developments, and it would be worth while to appropriate a much greater sum than the one in question in order to discover additional sources of supply so as to secure adequate quantities of cortisone.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is the distinguished Senator from Georgia giving a justification for the increase in the appropriation referred to at the bottom of page 183? If so, I am afraid that I must oppose it, not because I do not like it, but because of the general need for economy.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the item which I was discussing and attempting to explain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 184, line 3, after the word "plants", to strike out "\$2,950,000" and insert "\$3,075,000."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to try to answer the question.

Mr. FREAR. I notice that \$40,000 is to be appropriated for research in connection with gladioli. Is the gladioli industry in this country sufficiently large for the Federal Government to appropriate \$40,000 for research?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, evidence before the committee in the past 2 or 3 years has disclosed some facts in connection with the gladioli industry which were rather amazing to one who is not familiar with it. It is a \$110,000,000 industry. Tens of thousands of small producers who own and operate florist shops produce their own gladioli and sell them in those shops. A new disease has appeared, of which no knowledge had been had heretofore. It threatens to wipe out the only source of livelihood of these thousands of farmers and to seriously impair the opportunity for livelihood of thousands of small operators of flower shops. In my judgment, the appropriation is completely justified. When we have a spectacular attack upon the corn crop by the corn borer, we do not hesitate to appropriate fifteen or twenty million dollars with which to combat it. The amount appropriated here for the gladioli industry is not disproportionate with what we are doing in other lines of agriculture.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to observe that the reduction in income tax paid by one producer of gladioli in the State of Florida for last year was a good deal more than the total amount that

is involved in this appropriation. That reduction in income-tax payment was caused solely by the attack on the gladioli crop by this new disease which we wish to combat through this experimentation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some progress has been made, and we hope we may be able to conquer the disease.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 184, line 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 184, line 6, after the word "control", to strike out "\$450,000" and insert "\$455,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 184, line 18, after the word "management", to strike out "\$2,680,000" and insert "\$2,767,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 185, line 6, after the word "products", to strike out "\$1,120,000" and insert "\$1,140,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Salaries and expenses," on page 186, line 22, after the word "application", to strike out "\$4,100,000" and insert "\$4,165,000"; and on page 187, line 2, after the word "expended", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That \$50,000 shall be transferred to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for investigations and studies of effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on human health."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 188, line 6, after "(7 U. S. C. 166)", to strike out "\$4,185,900" and insert "\$4,651,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 189, line 11, after "(7 U. S. C. 147a)", to strike out "\$2,325,000" and insert "\$2,384,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases", on page 189, line 21, after the word "citizens", to strike out "\$850,000" and insert "\$2,350,000"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "of which \$1,500,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said joint resolution only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Control of forest pests," on page 190, line 19, after "(7 U. S. C. 147a)", to strike out "\$539,500" and insert "\$590,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 190, line 22, after "(16 U. S. C., Supp. I, 594-1-594-5)", to strike out "\$900,000" and insert "\$1,900,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "of which \$1,000,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said act only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions."

tent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 191, line 6, after "(16 U. S. C. 594a)", to strike out "\$3,280,000" and insert "\$3,700,000"; in the same line, after the word "amount", to strike out "\$508,750" and insert "\$565,350"; in line 12, after the word "States", to strike out "\$1,727,800" and insert "\$1,947,150"; and in line 14, after the word "and", to strike out "\$1,043,450" and insert "\$1,187,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Service," on page 195, line 1, after the word "forests", to strike out "\$26,890,000" and insert "\$29,320,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 195, after line 4, to insert:

Cooperative range improvements: For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forest lands, pursuant to section 12 of the act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law No. 478), \$750,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 196, line 9, after the figures "\$1,300,000", to insert "of which \$30,000 shall be made available for the establishment of a forest utilization service unit in the Southwest."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before we reach line 9, I should like to send to the desk an amendment which proposes an insertion on line 6 on page 196.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Apparently the Senator's proposed amendment is an amendment to the text of the bill. Therefore it is not in order at this time.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 196, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 196, line 14, after "section 10", to strike out "\$880,000" and insert "\$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest development—Roads and trails," on page 196, line 22, after the word "administration", to strike out "\$10,348,000" and insert "\$12,000,000."

Mr. MURRAY. I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 196, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "\$12,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$14,500,000."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, this amendment is necessary because of the construction of Hungry Horse Dam in Montana. The cost of the construction is \$108,000,000. As a result of the construction of this dam, highways, and roads in the forest have been destroyed. Therefore it will be necessary to build new roads to take the place of the roads which have been covered up. The logging and timber industry is the most important industry in the area, and it is absolutely necessary to construct these

roads in order to protect the industry. As I understand, the Bureau of Reclamation has authority to construct new roads whenever old roads are destroyed. However, they are limited with respect to the character of roads that may be constructed under such circumstances. The roads which it will be necessary to construct in this case are of a character which will require expensive construction. They are to be constructed on the side of hills.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not customary to include the cost of relocating highways in the cost of the dam itself? I wonder why the cost of relocating highways for a dam should be put in an agricultural appropriation bill. So far as I know they are always put in the appropriation for the dam itself.

Mr. MURRAY. The item now before the Senate is under the title "Forest Development Roads and Trails." The roads to which I refer are forest roads.

Mr. AIKEN. Even if a forest road is destroyed by the construction of a dam, it would have to be replaced by the agency of the Government which constructed the dam.

Mr. MURRAY. The agency of Government is limited in the amount of funds which it can expend in the construction of a road. The specific road I have in mind is of a character which requires very expensive work, because it is on the side of a mountain. It is a road 52 miles long on the west side of the reservoir, and it must be built in order to make the national forest timber accessible. The timber products from the mills in this area are worth more than one and a half million dollars a year to the local industries. Wages alone amount to about \$1,000,000 a year. In the construction of the Hungry Horse project the Bureau of Reclamation has stated that it may request appropriations to replace roads which will be inundated or damaged by the reservoir, but not for roads of higher standards or involving superior construction not required in connection with construction of the project.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator from Montana whether he came before the committee in connection with this amendment, or whether he got a budget estimate for it?

Mr. MURRAY. Apparently it was—

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not believe it has ever come before the committee. We are reading the appropriation bill for committee amendments, and I hope the Senator will withhold his amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. I am satisfied to withhold it. However, it may be that we could complete its consideration at this time. We have spent some time on it already.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was this proposed amendment laid before the committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. MURRAY. This additional amount is necessary because of the special conditions which exist. The special conditions result from the construction of this huge dam, which has cut off the

roads which were previously in use. In order to continue the lumber and milling industry it is necessary to construct this road. As I understand, in the construction of the Hungry Horse project the Bureau of Reclamation has stated that it may request appropriations to replace roads, but not for roads of higher standards or involving superior construction not required in connection with the construction of the project. A survey is now under way to determine the location and cost of the road and the amount which the Reclamation Bureau is authorized to finance.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, my reason for questioning the Senator from Montana as I did was because I thought it might be establishing an undesirable precedent if we undertook to charge the costs of work of this nature to the Department of Agriculture, when the cost is really necessitated by the operations of some other Department of Government. I am not questioning the need of the road, because I do not know anything about it. I merely questioned whether this is the part of the appropriation bill where the amendment shall be added.

Mr. MURRAY. The Department of Agriculture has jurisdiction over forest roads and trails.

Mr. AIKEN. Is this a forest road or an access road? The Senator has said there is a million and a half dollars worth of timber a year coming from the forest in this area. I think provision for access roads is included under some other appropriation.

Mr. MURRAY. This amendment is not for building a new road to give access to the timber. The business involved has been in existence for a number of years, and it is a very important industry in that section, amounting to many million dollars. With the roads now cut off as a result of the construction of the dam, it is necessary speedily to provide a new road.

Mr. AIKEN. I still think it should be charged to the cost of the dam, instead of as an agricultural appropriation.

Mr. MURRAY. The Bureau of Reclamation is assuming that part of the cost which it is able to take under the Bureau of Reclamation law. The cost of the road is now being studied, and it is estimated at \$4,000,000. The share of the Bureau of Reclamation is estimated at from one and a half to two million. To make certain that funds are available to build a road of the necessary standard, two and a half million dollars should be added to the Forest Service appropriations at this point. To the appropriation of \$12,000,000 provided in the bill, we are asking that two and a half million be added to order to make provision for the road.

Mr. AIKEN. Does this request come from the Forest Service?

Mr. MURRAY. I understand it has the approval of the Department. I have not any evidence of it here, but I know they have talked to me and have talked to my office about it, and the amendment was prepared for me by the Department.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator yield, so that I may ask the Senator from Georgia if the Forest Service requested this appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not doubt that the Forest Service would like to get all the money it could for roads and trails, but it did not especially request this appropriation, because it could not. It has a limitation on its budget estimates.

I have a brief statement to make in connection with the amendment when the Senator from Montana concludes.

Mr. MURRAY. I submit the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield so that I may address a question to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Can the Senator advise the Senate as to whether the proposed increase of two and one-half million would be supported by the authorization, or whether the \$12,000,000 completely uses up the authorization?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot say as to that. I think there is adequate authorization to take care of the two and a half million dollars, but I hope the Senate will not approve the amendment. It is entirely out of line with anything else in the bill, proposing as it does to appropriate two and a half million dollars for one immediate project, for something which sounds almost suspiciously like a superhighway. There is nothing that causes us more trouble than forest roads and trails. There are innumerable forests scattered throughout the United States, and in all of them roads are desired. I do not doubt we could spend \$20,000,000 on forest roads, to the detriment of the people living in the communities adjacent to them, and those who go into the forests for fishing and recreational purposes.

Mr. President, it is certainly all out of reason to ask two and a half million dollars above the Budget estimate for one road, even though it be one leading to a project so important as is the Hungry Horse Dam. This road ought to be built, if built at all, by funds that come from the same source and are used for the same purposes for which the dam is constructed, and the Forest Development Road and Trail item should not be loaded up with such an item. It is not justified or sustained by any budget estimate.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to add a word about the amendment. It properly belongs under the appropriation for the Interior Department, Bureau of Reclamation. All States have projects, perhaps on smaller scales than the one referred to by the Senator from Montana. In my own State there are some where there are parks nearby, and roads are needed. The money for the proposed road should come under the appropriation authorized for the dam.

I am opposed to the amendment for another reason. The agricultural bill already contains a vast sum of money, and the public looks upon it as an appropriation for agriculture. If one made an analysis he would find that probably only about one-third of the money appropriated goes to agriculture. If this proposed appropriation is added, for another item which is not at all agricultural in nature, it only increases the amount apparently appropriated for ag-

riculture but looked upon by the public sometimes as a subsidy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment to the committee amendment, striking out the figure "\$12,000,000" on line 22, page 196, and substituting "\$6,000,000"; in other words, to cut the appropriation in half.

Last year we spent a little over \$10,000,000 for the item of forest roads and trails. The House provided the same appropriation for the coming year as was made last year. The Senate committee raised the figure by \$1,600,000.

Mr. President, I have been going back over the history of appropriations and expenditures for roads in national forests and national parks, and I find very large sums spent over the years. In view of the national emergency, it seems to me we should slow up on road construction, and save \$6,000,000 on this item, and that is the effect of my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Acquisition of lands for national forests," on page 197, line 14, after "(16 U. S. C. 513-519, 521)", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$401,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Farm and other private forestry cooperation," on page 199, line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$490,382" and insert "\$785,034"; in line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$671,392" and insert "\$449,200"; and in line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$138,226" and insert "\$65,766."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Flood control," on page 200, line 3, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$10,750,000" and insert "\$9,880,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the committee for making a reduction below of approximately a million dollars the amount provided by the House. I am informed, however, that of the final figure of about \$9,900,000, which is being recommended for flood control in the Columbia Basin area, \$1,900,000 is for planning, leaving about \$8,000,000 for construction.

Mr. President, the word "planning" seems to have a mesmeric influence upon Congress, causing us to appropriate very large sums for planning. In view of the national emergency, I hope that the committee will persevere in its good work, and will consent to a reduction in the

appropriation to \$8,880,000, which will leave approximately \$8,000,000 for construction, but will reduce the total for planning from \$1,900,000 to nine-tenths of a million dollars. I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret very much that I would not feel authorized to accept the amendment. If there is any justification for a reduction in this item, it should be applied to the construction item and not to the planning item.

Mr. President, the planning item involves a Nation-wide plan to prevent the siltation of all of the vast reservoirs we are building at such enormous cost all over the United States. The jurisdiction of the Board of Army Engineers does not extend beyond the immediate watershed on which a dam is located. The Soil Conservation Service undertakes to draw plans for all the tributaries to the main streams so as to prevent the loss of fertile soil from thousands of acres of land to which we look for that which we eat and wear, as well as to prevent impairment of the investment of the United States in the main reservoirs. The truth of the matter is that we are probably 20 years behind now with our planning. The planning is going forward. It is not limited to the Columbia River. Surveys are being made upon thousands of small streams throughout the entire United States. I do not believe there is any item in the bill which is more inextricably connected with the future welfare of the United States and the sources of our food and fiber and the preservation of our soil resources than this planning item. I hope the Senate will reject the Senator's amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 200, line 3.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Soil Conservation Service," on page 201, after line 17, to strike out the subhead "Salaries and expenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 202, line 14, after the word "information", to strike out "\$52,900,000" and insert "\$52,400,000."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to give me an explanation as to why this cut was made, and whether or not the cut will fundamentally affect the soil-conservation programs which are being planned at the present time. I have received a number of letters from persons in Minnesota who are vitally interested in soil-conservation activities, in which they have told me that a cut in the budget amount would jeopardize their plans of operation, including more areas and more

counties being brought in under the program of the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may state that there is no cut in the budget item, because the figure allowed by the Senate committee is approximately one-half million dollars above the Bureau of the Budget estimate. This is the one item where the House allowed the Department \$1,000,000 above the Budget estimate. Since the House had allowed \$1,000,000 above the Budget, it seemed that if there was any place where we could cut the bill by reducing in part of this increase above the Budget estimate, it was here. It is true there have been a number of new soil-conservation districts organized, and they do not have all the technical staff they should have. But splendid progress is being made in the soil-conservation districts.

It is not the kind of thing that can be done overnight. Plans must be drawn, and then the farmers must be induced to accept the plans. Then there may be required a 20-year program on one farm in order to complete the plans. It would be highly desirable, if conditions were not so difficult with respect to public funds, to increase this item about \$4,000,000 and give all the soil conservation districts all the technical help they need. But I believe that by the proper use of the large number of technical soil conservation operators the service has, if it distributes them properly, this work can be carried out without any damage whatever resulting from this modest cut.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator, because I think the people of Minnesota recognize that the Senator from Georgia is an outstanding expert in this field. I wanted the RECORD to show exactly what his observations on this subject were.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not an expert, but I am an ardent advocate of soil conservation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 202, line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land," on page 203, line 2, after the word "note", to strike out "\$1,490,000" and insert "\$1,665,175."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Water conservation and utilization projects," on page 203, line 10, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$400,000 and insert "\$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Production and Marketing Administration—Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," on page 203, line 23, after the word "States", to strike out "\$282,500,000" and insert "\$283,000,000"; and on page 206, line 2, after the word "States", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the agricultural-conservation program for any county may be allotted to the Soil Con-

servation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural-conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Sugar Act," on page 207, line 23, after "(7 U. S. C. 1001-1160)", to strike out "\$60,000,000" and insert "\$63,750,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I assume that the amounts which we appropriate under the sugar act are more or less prescribed by the act itself?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Illinois is correct. Of course, the Senator knows that these funds are derived from a special processing tax upon sugar, and are set apart as payments to the sugar producers in this country. If the sugar production does not warrant the payment of this amount, which is materially below the budget, I will say the remainder is returned to the Treasury. In no years has there been paid to the producers of cane sugar and beet sugar of this country the entire amount collected from the special processing tax which is imposed for their benefit.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I notice that the House appropriated \$60,000,000, which was the amount appropriated for the last fiscal year. I think that should be sufficient, and I shall oppose the committee amendment. The Senate committee apparently divided the difference between the appropriation by the House and the recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. RUSSELL. The House appropriated the amount which was appropriated last year. The Bureau of the Budget allowed \$67,500,000. I do not think that much money will be needed, but out of an abundance of precaution we did allow half of the increase in the budget estimate, which is \$3,750,000, which, as I say, is derived from the special processing tax imposed upon sugar for the benefit of the producers of sugar in this country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not within the province of the Appropriations Committee, but does the Senator know if the appropriate committee has considered the possibility of expanding the production of sugar further, in order to meet some of the shortages which have recently occurred in our cities?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not an expert on sugar. I see present the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], both of whom represent States which produce large quantities of sugar. I may say that the very purpose of these payments is to increase domestic production of sugar. In the last 50 or 60 years we have never produced more than a small percentage of the sugar consumed in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Georgia has referred to the fact that only a small percentage of the sugar consumed in the United States is produced in this country. I may point out that about 28 percent of the sugar consumed

in the United States is produced in the continental United States. The remainder is imported from our possessions, and from Cuba and other foreign countries.

As the distinguished Senator from Illinois has correctly stated the amount provided is to pay conditional payments to sugar growers pursuant to existing law.

As the Senator in charge of the pending chapter has stated the appropriation requested is \$3,750,000 under the budget estimate. Should the amount herein appropriated be in excess of the sum required to meet conditional payments to sugar growers such excess will revert to the Treasury.

Mr. President, I trust that the recommended appropriation will not be disturbed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Seventy-two percent of the sugar consumed in the United States is off-shore sugar. The purpose of the tax, as I said, is to increase the domestic production of sugar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know that the domestic production is tied in with the international agreements with respect to production of sugar in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and so forth. But I think the needs of consumers should be given due weight in this matter, because the effect of the international sugar cartel, enforced by international agreements and by national law, has been greatly to boost the price of sugar for city consumers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 207, line 23.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the amendment which has just been agreed to the one which comes under the heading "Sugar Act"?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. As I previously stated, the committee saw fit to approve an increase of \$3,750,000 in the amount available for payments to sugar producers.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the amendment provide for any change in the basic Sugar Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the amendment makes no change in the basic Sugar Act whatever. Such action could not be taken in connection with an appropriation bill. Separate legislation would be required to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to say that the act should be amended so the rights of consumers of sugar could receive greater recognition.

Mr. RUSSELL. What the Senator said was obiter. He merely observed that the law should be changed for the benefit of consumers.

Mr. WHERRY. That would require amendment of the substantive law.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marketing services," on page 208, line 20, after the word "products", to strike out "\$2,050,000" and insert "\$2,187,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 211, line 23, after "(7 U. S. C. 135-135k)", to strike out "\$3,550,000" and insert "\$3,495,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Crop Insurance Corporation," on page 212, line 6, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$6,854,000" and insert "\$7,204,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses," on page 212, line 14, after the word "reports", to strike out "\$8,150,000" and insert "\$8,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Loan authorization," on page 212, line 21, after the word "program", to strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$40,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. This amendment would increase by \$15,000,000 the authorization for rural telephones.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. We increased the loan authorization from \$25,000,000 to \$40,000,000 for the rural-telephone program which was authorized by an act of last year. It is still \$10,000,000 below the budget estimate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 212, line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MYERS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record, in connection with the REA amendment, which I understand appears on page 212, a statement I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement of Mr. MYERS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

Within the last few weeks, this country has come face to face with a test that may well be as crucial as any in our entire history. In the final analysis—whether the decision is achieved now or some day in the future—it is a test of strength between the free world and the tyrannical world. The success of our cause will depend upon the strength of our free people, the strength of our democratic institutions, and the strength of our economic system. Let us thank God for the opportunities we have had to build that strength and for the enterprise that has impelled us to use our opportunities.

Today, as we give consideration to the appropriation bill before us, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate what the farmers of America are doing through their REA program to build a stronger and more productive agriculture in this country. As a result of the work they have already completed, rural America is infinitely better prepared than ever before to meet whatever emergency may be forced upon us.

If the leaders of our industry should announce that they had just brought into 85 percent of their factories a new kind of low-cost power capable of increasing factory output and efficiency, it would be news that would startle the world. Yet that is exactly what the farmers through the REA are doing right under our very eyes, without fanfare and without headlines.

When REA was established in 1935, only 1 farm in 10 had central station electric service. At the time of Pearl Harbor, 3 farms in 10 had electricity. Despite that relatively small percentage, electricity helped

the farmer achieve record after record in production through the years of World War II.

Today, 85 percent of the farms in this country have electric power on them. The REA program that barely had time to get started before the Japs blasted us into the war, has, in the last 5 years, virtually revolutionized American agriculture.

What farmer today would dream of undertaking a dairy farm without electricity? His labor-saving milking machines, his milk-saving refrigeration, his electrically-powered water system—all these and more are essential parts of a well-run, efficient and productive dairy farm.

What has happened on the dairy farm is just one instance. The same thing has been happening on 85 percent of all the farms in America. So multiply these advances by the 5,000,000 farms that have modern electric power today. Then you will begin to appreciate the impact of REA on our agriculture and on our whole economy.

In the electric motor, industrial America has had an efficient source of power for many decades. It has been a significant factor in the development of America as the world's greatest industrial nation. Today the electric motor is also out on the farm, ready to help the farmer grind feed, clean the barn, pump water, dry grain and hay, and in general provide highly essential and low cost power for the farmer.

Consider these things in the light of the crisis that is confronting us today. We have out on the farms of America the equivalent of millions of extra hands that just a few years ago were not available. We have put into our agriculture new power, new efficiency, new productivity. All of it is adding to the strength of this Nation as we go forward in the leadership of the free world.

The progress farmers are making with the help of the REA program is all the more significant when the character of the program is taken into account. The REA program is one of the finest expressions of our democracy. It works on the principle of local control, local ownership, and local accomplishment.

Here is a program that helps the people help themselves. REA is only a lending agency. It is the local people, with the help of Government financing, who are building the power systems that are electrifying the farms. It is the local people who operate these power systems and who are paying back the money to the Government—paying it back with interest.

Last October when Congress passed legislation authorizing loans for the improvement and expansion of rural telephone service, it followed this REA pattern of providing the people with the help they need to do the job themselves. Today this new telephone program is beginning the job of modernizing rural communications as the electric program has been modernizing power and light on the farm during the recent past.

I have always been glad to support the rural electrification program—one of the most beneficial and forward-looking measures instituted by the Roosevelt administration.

It has been of benefit to every part of the country. I am happy to point out the achievements of the REA borrowers in my own State. From 23 percent of our farms electrified when the program started, we have since then forged ahead until now the percentage is well over 90 percent.

We have 15 REA-financed systems in Pennsylvania and these privately owned, locally managed, taxpaying business organizations have already invested \$25,000,000 of loan funds in their power systems. They are paying back these loans, in a sound business-like way, while doing a job of building a stronger agriculture in Pennsylvania.

From the time Morris L. Cooke, of my home State of Pennsylvania, as the first Administrator of REA, set the program on its course of progress, this program has built, and built well, the strength of rural America. It is a program in which the people of this country and the free world have a big stake and which must be pressed forward in the achievement of its objective.

It is for that reason that I urge upon you to support the appropriation of the Rural Electrification Administration in the bill before us. This program is making a great contribution to the people of this country at a very minimum of cost, since the loans are being paid back to the Government. This is tremendously important to all of us, whether we are permitted to live in peace or whether we must mobilize our strength for war. REA is an investment that is already paying back dividends many times over in extra power for farmers and for America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Farmers Home Administration—Loan authorization," on page 214, line 6, after "(except grants under 504 (a))", to strike out "\$56,350,000" and insert "\$71,350,000"; in the same line, after the amendment above stated, to insert "of which not to exceed \$3,500,000 of the amount available for the purposes of title I and section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, may be distributed to States and Territories without regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy, in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto, for loans in reclamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented public land."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia in regard to the amendment in line 6 on page 214. Will that provision encourage the settlement of the more sparsely populated States where there is a large amount of undeveloped land?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the amount of \$3,500,000 is supposed to be available for some irrigated projects in some States which have very small populations, but where the veterans have moved in to take up the lands which are subject to irrigation.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment would apply particularly to a State such as Wyoming, would it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly, and possibly to three or four other States where such irrigation projects are coming into operation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. To what amendment does the Senator from Vermont refer?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To the committee amendment on page 214, beginning in line 6 and ending in line 13.

The question is on agreeing to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was on page 215, line 5, after the word "acts," to insert a colon and the following additional provisos: "Provided further, That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing authority, the Secretary of the

Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans to the Secretary: *Provided further*, That repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-debt transaction."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation from the Senator from Georgia in regard to the amendment. It seems to me that it is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill, and that the amendment, if adopted, would open wide the door.

The amendment is clearly legislation, Mr. President, and it goes into a field which certainly was not dealt with in the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives. Certainly the language of the amendment is wide in its implications and scope.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I trust that the Senator will withhold any point of order he may intend to propose against this amendment.

I think I would be less than frank if I did not say that the amendment is subject to a point of order. However, identical language has been carried in the appropriation bill for a long time, as a means for the procurement of funds with which to make this type of loans under the Farmers Home Administration. The language of this amendment or similar language was set forth in the budget, just as was the case in last year's bill. It was included in the bill as reported by the House Appropriations Committee, but on the floor of the House the provision was stricken on a point of order.

There is nothing new so far as this method of borrowing is concerned. It has been used for a number of years. Up until now a very creditable repayment record has been made.

There can be no question that the amendment is legislation; but its enactment into law is necessary in order to implement all of the activities of the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. BRIDGES. What is the repayment record? From my own impression and the impression of the persons with whom I have talked, this amendment would leave the matter wide open.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator realizes that when rehabilitation loans are made under the Farmers Home Administration, we are not dealing with the very best credit risks, because the basic law provides that no such loan can be made until the prospective borrower is able to submit evidence that the loan is not available from any other source. In that connection, the general practice has been to require such statements from the banks in the community, from the production credit agency, and from other sources of credit.

So far as the tenant loan program is concerned, there has been a perfectly amazing repayment record. Repayments are current; in fact, the collections really are ahead of the repayment schedule in the case of the purchase of farms by means of the funds obtained under this provision of the act. In the

case of rehabilitation loans, there have been some losses; there can be no question as to that. Those who were administering this portion of the law inherited a great many loans from the old Rural Resettlement Administration and from the old seed loans, which were made only in cases of dire emergency. So the transactions in the case of such loans are included under this heading. Of course, the loans to which I have just referred occurred away back in 1918 and 1920—almost in the days of antiquity, so far as any modern agricultural program is concerned.

However, generally speaking, a very fine record of collections has been made. For the past 5 years the collections have greatly exceeded the loans. A study of the collections would do a great deal to restore one's faith in the honest purposes of mankind, because some of the loans were made years ago and some of the borrowers meantime have left the farms. Yet when they reached a time when they were able to secure employment, they repaid the loans.

This program has been vital in connection with extending aid to veterans of World War II. As I recall, approximately 50 percent of the loans which have been made were made to veterans, and all the new loans being made are being made to veterans.

Mr. BRIDGES. But is there a limitation? Will not the sky be the limit?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; a limit is set forth on page 214.

On page 215, this amendment would begin with the words:

Provided further, That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing authority—

And the loans are limited by the amount set forth on page 214.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Georgia to say that the same language was included in the last appropriation bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and funds have been available. I do not know that the provision in last year's appropriation bill was in identically the same language as the language of this amendment; but the funds have been available from the Treasury, under the last several appropriation bills.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In view of the fact that it is recognized that such language is essential to the program, why has not enabling legislation been introduced through the normal channels, and enacted?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot answer that question, because I am not a member of the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I really cannot say why such enabling legislation has not been enacted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will not the Senator from Georgia agree that that is the manner in which the matter should have been handled?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; there should have been legislation in that connection. However, I am sure the Senator from Delaware will agree with me that in the

case of the appropriation bills generally, certain language has been carried for years in those bills, although normally it would properly be the subject of proposed legislation introduced by some of the standing committees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I can understand why the matter might be handled once in this way; but I do not understand why year after year the appropriation bills should carry provisions which are purely legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, there is a question as to whether the amendment is legislation. It was regarded as legislation in the House of Representatives. However, there is some question as to whether it is legislation.

This language makes available to the Secretary of the Treasury funds for the purpose of being loaned by him to the Secretary of Agriculture, to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture for this purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I correctly understand that this authority is limited by the amount set forth on page 214, in line 6?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; there is no question about that. It is absolutely limited by that amount.

Mr. BRIDGES. So in this case, if no point of order is made against the amendment, and if the amendment is adopted and is contained in the bill as finally enacted, the provision thus made will be similar to the provision which has been made in previous years in the appropriation bill. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. And the amount is limited to the appropriation set forth on page 214, in line 6; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from New Hampshire is entirely correct.

Mr. President, I would be the last person to be willing to have this language make available an unlimited amount of money, because, of course, the provision is in the nature of an appropriation.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand that the Senator from Georgia watches these matters carefully, but, of course, I wish to be sure just what we are doing in this respect.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Georgia has no information about this matter, except as to what has occurred in the past?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I think I can state that, so far as loans for the purchase of land are concerned, the repayments are current, and no losses have occurred. Some losses have occurred on rehabilitation loans, but the funds lost since the Farmers Home Administration was established would be less than 3 percent of the total amount of money made available.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that the repayments have been approximately 85 or 90 percent—in short, that the repayments have been good?

Mr. RUSSELL. They have been more than that, under the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the repayments have been somewhere between 90 and 95

percent in my own State. The repayments to the Farmers' Home Administration on loans which were made to the poorest class of agricultural borrowers—

Mr. RUSSELL. The poorest credit risks in the Nation.

Mr. AIKEN. The repayments on those loans have compared very favorably with the repayments to the RFC, I am sure, although the loans made by the RFC were made to what was supposed to be a higher and better class of borrowers—in the case of the RFC, to industrial and financial borrowers.

I am sure a very good record has been made, considering the fact that loans have been made only to persons who could not borrow money anywhere else.

However, I do question the language of the amendment and the continuance of the language year after year in the appropriation bill. It seems to me that there cannot be a clear statement of the Government's financial affairs, in reporting on what our expenditures and our receipts are, until this matter is treated as one related to the expenditures and receipts of the Government, rather than as public debt transaction. I think that point should be cleared up, and that a correction should be made.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I should like to raise a question in connection with this matter. Certainly it is never the intention to write off any of these loans unless it becomes a positive fact that the loan cannot be collected. The loan may be carried for a number of years; and it is necessary to review it again and again before a decision finally is reached to write off the loan as being uncollectible.

I think that has been one reason why it has been difficult to write any specific language on this point, because it is the desire not to write off such a loan if it can possibly be collected. For that reason, the language is broad, almost to the point of vagueness, in this case.

However, I would say, as the Senator from Georgia has said, that probably there is no other legislative provision which has done more, actually, to take a young man or a young family off the relief rolls or to get them out of a discouraged state of mind, and put them on a self-supporting and self-respecting basis, by providing them with funds, and by doing so at a time when they have neither credit nor proof that they would be good managers, except for the fact that the man may have been a good hired man somewhere in the neighborhood. He may have married a good, sound, reliable young girl, and that was the only asset he had. No banker could loan to a man under those circumstances. Here was an agency from which he could obtain the funds, start farming, and, in due time, pay off the loan.

I could relate three specific cases of young men or young couples who obtained such loans. It was only for a matter of 3 or 4 years. The loans enabled them to carry on. They have made

a most remarkable achievement in starting out in life for themselves. I would say it is one of the appropriations which has functioned in a commendable manner. The vagueness of the language results from the lack of knowledge of how to write an act in any manner that would be applicable to such a situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his contribution. I shall be through, as soon as I give the Senator from New Hampshire the specific figures for the year 1949. In that year, \$91,507,510 was loaned; principal and interest was collected of \$117,114,511.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator that that is a rather unusual Federal accomplishment; but I still say the regular committees of the Congress should provide for this project by law rather than to place the item in a general appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was not present when the testimony was adduced on this item. In the table for loan authorizations the loan authorization for 1950 was given as \$40,000,000 for farm tenancy and housing loans. The estimates for 1951 were \$70,000,000. The House bill provided for \$56,350,000, which was an increase over last year, but which was short about \$13,000,000 of the budget estimate. I have been quoting from the table of loan authorizations found on page 112 of the committee report. The Senate committee has restored the full amount of the budget estimate; in fact, it has gone further than that and added \$1,350,000. A footnote reads:

Includes \$1,350,000 transferred from direct appropriation for enlargement and development loans.

So the appropriation exceeds the estimate by \$1,350,000. What was the evidence adduced which required the Senate to exceed the budget estimate by \$1,350,000? That is my first question. The second question is, is the \$1,350,000 cash, or is it a loan authorization.

Mr. RUSSELL. The House transferred the \$1,350,000. I will read to the Senator a brief statement from the House report.

Mr. WHERRY. I have read the side slip.

Mr. RUSSELL. I quote from the House report, page 141:

An increase of \$15,000,000 has been authorized for farm tenancy and housing loans, \$1,350,000 has been approved as a transfer from direct appropriation to borrowing authorization for enlargement and development loans under section 504b of the Housing Act of 1949, and an additional \$1,000,000 in borrowing authority has been provided for water facilities loans.

The reason for that, and what has happened, is that instead of appropriating the money directly from the Treasury, it was all put into this loan arrangement, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury. Last year we made a modest appropriation for the Housing Act, and

it was made as a direct appropriation from the Treasury.

Inasmuch as the House had included the \$1,350,000 in the funds authorized to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury, instead of making it as a direct appropriation, we left it in that shape.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I make is, was there a decrease by \$1,350,000 at some other place in the appropriation bill? This exceeds the budget estimate by \$1,350,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. The Budget estimate for 1951 is \$70,000,000, and the Senate committee has recommended \$71,350,000. That is provided through the transfer of funds. What I should like to ask is, if the transfer is made and covers this particular item, where is it deducted in the appropriation bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is mistaken about the Budget Bureau's estimate. The total Budget estimate was \$160,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. We are talking about farm tenancy and housing loans. I refer merely to loans.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will refer to page 112 of the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate he will find the table of loan authorizations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand, but the Budget Bureau's estimate for these items was \$160,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true, but it is broken down into farm tenancy and housing loans, \$70,000,000; production and subsistence loans, \$85,000,000; water facilities loans, \$5,000,000; a total of \$160,000,000. The House bill provided \$145,350,000. The Senate committee has recommended \$160,350,000. The answer is obtained by the breakdown of farm tenancy and housing loans, which we are talking about. I am asking where the \$1,350,000 comes from, and where it is deducted in the appropriation bill. It states in a footnote that the \$1,350,000 was transferred from direct appropriation for enlargement and development loans.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. But why did the Senate committee add \$1,350,000 to the farm tenancy and housing loans, unless the amount were taken from something else? The Budget estimate is \$70,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think he will find that \$1,000,000 of that was taken from water facilities loans.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. I have that explanation. But it still runs \$1,350,000 above the budget estimate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The entire amount recommended by the Senate committee is \$160,350,000, which includes an increase in the farm tenancy and housing loans of \$1,350,000.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I am making. Why was that done?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am advised by the clerk of the committee, though he has not absolutely shown it to me yet, that it comes off the appropriation and was transferred to loans.

Mr. WHERRY. Does that mean that it comes off the general appropriation for agricultural purposes?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct; and it is put into the loan provision.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it deducted in cash? This is a loan authorization.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is deducted from the item for grants. I have the Budget Bureau's estimate now. The item for grants comes under the Farmers Home Administration, for housing.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, the amount comes off housing, is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. On the item found on page 215, in line 16. Whereas the budget estimate is \$2,000,000, the item of appropriation is \$650,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. That is the transfer that is made, is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. One more thing: Is this still a loan authorization of \$1,350,000, or is it cash coming from the direct appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a loan authorization.

Mr. WHERRY. And are the loans reimbursables?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. They are reimbursables, the same as the farm tenancy and housing loans?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 215, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses," on page 216, line 1, after the numerals "1949", to strike out "\$27,700,000" and insert "\$29,000,000."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia a question in connection with page 95 of the report on the general appropriation bill. It has to do with rural electrification and the Southwestern Power Administration. I attended all the hearings on this subject, which, as I recall, were joint hearings of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I notice, at the end of the first paragraph under the heading "Rural Electrification Administration," the following:

The committee believes that no loan should be made for construction of such facilities unless in areas where private power companies cannot or will not furnish adequate power at reasonable rates and within a reasonable time.

I thoroughly agree with the report, and I concurred in it as a member of the subcommittee, but it was my understanding that the Administrator had the determination, because there were such great variations in various sections of the country. As I understand, up to the present time the Administrator has studied carefully the needs, and it was rather left to the Administrator as to the loaning of the money.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of anyone who can pass upon that question other than the Administrator of the REA. The funds are made available to

him. He is responsible for making loans, and certainly it would be within his jurisdiction to determine the facts and reasons.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his statement.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I also desire to thank the Senator from Georgia for his statement, because I agree with him 100 percent that it is the Administrator who has the jurisdiction and the full authority for determining what rates are reasonable. As the Senator knows, in States which have public utility commissions all existing rates, presumably, are reasonable from the standpoint of the utility companies, because they have been found so by the State commissions.

Utility rates may be reasonable in the light of a company's accumulation of investments, including uneconomical and obsolete ones, and still be completely unreasonable from the standpoint of the cooperative's need for lower cost power to extend electric service to farmers and its ability to obtain such low-cost power by constructing its own generating facilities.

So, as the Senator knows, under the basic law and under the intent of the committee, these are facts within the jurisdiction and the authority of the Administrator of the REA to determine.

Mr. RUSSELL. I never had any other thought with reference to it.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that as a member of the subcommittee, I did not, either.

Furthermore, even though the rates themselves may be reasonable, other terms and conditions demanded by the power companies may impose intolerable burdens on the cooperatives. Such burdens, appearing in many existing contracts, include restrictions on resale of power, refusal to deliver power to the co-ops' load centers, necessitating costly construction by the co-ops; insistence on ratchet clauses requiring the co-ops to pay for more power than they get; and requirements that the co-ops pay higher rates for power used by consumers in larger amounts.

Of course, the Administrator, in considering whether loans should be made on generating plants or transmission lines, has it fully within his jurisdiction to consider, and he should consider these questions; is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. They all go to the reasonableness of the rates.

Mr. HILL. For instance, a power company in the State of Alabama, in submitting a proposed contract had in the contract a provision permitting the company to stop serving the cooperatives by reason of war. We know, of course, that in time of war it is very important that farmers have power. We know that during the last war farmers, with less manpower, with less fertilizer, fewer insecticides, and other things which they had in the past, stepped up their crops. One important reason why they were able to do it was because so many of our farms had electricity and the farmers

were able to use the electricity to step up war production. So, of course, in determining whether rates are reasonable, the Administrator has it in its jurisdiction and should consider all these questions to which I have adverted.

As the Senator knows, the REA has made loans for generation and transmission facilities only where no adequate source of power was available or where a saving in the cost of wholesale power to the cooperatives could be achieved. The matter is in the discretion and in the judgment and determination of the Administrator, just as the distinguished Senator from Georgia has so well said. The policy of the Administrator as to loans for generating plants and transmission lines is clear. It stands today just as it has in the past.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The able Senator from Alabama has well stated the present policy of the REA as related in its administrative bulletin which was placed in the hearings. The question I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia is this: Was it the intention of the committee to rewrite the REA law through this paragraph in the report?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not in the slightest degree. We did not undertake to rewrite the REA law, and we did not propose to do anything which would interfere with getting electric current into farm homes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And there is nothing in either the bill or the report which would overthrow the present policy of the REA?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that I am completely familiar with all the details of the present policy, but there is nothing in the committee report which, in my judgment, disturbs the power or the discretion which the Administrator has under the present law. There has been a feeling in some quarters—but, speaking for myself, I did not concur—with reference to putting anything at all in the report dealing with the subject. There has been a feeling that the proportion of loans being made for generating and transmitting facilities by the REA was increasing at too great a rate, perhaps to the detriment of the cause of getting power into farm homes. Hearings were had for four or five days in conjunction with the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations.

I was not sufficiently well qualified in the science of electricity and its distribution to be able to pass upon each and every one of the cases presented to the committee. They were presented, on the one hand, by those who were very much in favor of transmission and generating lines, and they were opposed, on the other hand, by those who were very much opposed to them. I could not pass upon the question. It was necessary for someone in the administrative end of the Government to pass on it. The Rural Electrification Administration has its Administrator, and it is his duty to pass upon these applications. That is his obligation under the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In the Senator's judgment there is nothing in this

provision, is there, which would take away from the Administrator his authority or discretion?

Mr. RUSSELL. For my own part, I take this to be an admonition to the Administrator to exercise great care in the making of these loans. As I see it, there is nothing in the bill which changes the law. There is nothing in the report of the committee which could be construed as changing the law.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I believe the committee was justified in stating that no loans should be made for the erection of generating plants unless private power companies cannot or will not furnish adequate electric current at reasonable rates and within a reasonable time. The Subcommittee on Interior was presented with evidence to show that REA loans were being considered on the guaranty of SPA agreeing to purchase all the current produced so as to make possible the discharge of the proposed loan. In other words, one Government agency guaranteeing the loans of another Government agency. Such should not be permitted for obvious reasons.

Mr. President, I should like to read the following language from page 95 of the committee's report as indicative of the fact that the committee realizes that it was not within the province of the Appropriations Committee to change the law on the subject of REA:

In view of the importance of this matter, the committee respectfully suggests that the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry review this entire subject to determine whether legislation is necessary.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I agree with that. That is where legislation ought to come from. It cannot come from the subcommittee.

Mr. HILL. If there is to be a change in policy, it ought to come from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the standing legislative committee of this body.

Mr. RUSSELL. I took that position in the subcommittee. I also took it in the full committee, but was not sustained. However, that is my position.

Mr. YOUNG. Would the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee interpret the paragraph to mean that REA has been making loans in the past which were not justified, and that this was a word of admonition to the REA to curtail some of its present loans?

Mr. RUSSELL. I made no such statement, Mr. President. I said that for my own part I was not sufficiently expert nor would I undertake to go into the merits or demerits of these loans. I think it is a matter for the Administrator of the REA and for the standing committees of Congress.

Mr. YOUNG. I had the same idea. I felt that there was nothing in the language of the bill which would change the present program or do injury to it. My understanding is that if they are not able to get current from existing companies at reasonable rates they may build generating plants as they have done in the past. Does the Senator have the same understanding?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. There is no question that in compliance with the

spirit and letter of the original REA Act the Administrator would have that authority when it is necessary to get current to the farmers.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say that what the Senator from Georgia has stated is also my understanding of the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] received a telegram which deals with the subject under discussion. He had to leave before he was able to present the telegram for insertion in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUTLAND, N. DAK., July 15, 1950.

United States Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Have been informed restrictive language in pending Senate report on Interior and Agriculture appropriations could have had effects on future administration of generation and transmission loans. Urge your cooperation in bringing about deletion of any language or items that could be construed or interpreted as restricting administration of Rural Electric Administration in any way. The great value of unrestricted policy is in its competitive strength. The good common sense of our cooperatives and Administrator will avoid unreasonable or excessive investment in generation or transmission. But if REA ever loses its power to build facilities whenever or wherever found necessary expedient or desirable—then our co-ops and the people they serve will be at the mercy of the commercial private-owned utilities. On the other hand the threat of real competition will make them willing to coordinate and cooperate for the common and public good. We have achieved a considerable degree of coordination and cooperation with the private-owned public utilities here in North Dakota. We could never have done this with a restricted Rural Electric Administration. Strongly urge your complete vigilance in maintaining a strong unfettered REA and a public power policy that puts the good of the people above any special privilege group.

OBED A. WYUM,
President, North Dakota Association
of Rural Electric Cooperatives.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I inquire which committee amendment is now under consideration?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment on page 216, line 1.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to discuss this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I inquire what was the Chair's statement? I could not hear it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announced that the amendment under consideration is on page 216, line 1.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to point out that last year this organization spent for administration \$26,149,000. The House increased the figure to \$27,700,000, or an increase of more than a million and a half dollars. The Senate committee has raised this figure still further by \$1,300,000. I am very glad to see that everyone seems to approve of the substantive work of the Farmers Home Administration. I think it is doing a very excellent type of work. However, these appropriations would not help the tenant farmers. These appropri-

tions are intended for the officials in the Farmers Home Administration. I hope very much that the Senate will reconsider the action by which it approved the amendment, and I move such reconsideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has not been approved. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 216, lines 1 and 2.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope very much that the committee amendment will be rejected and that we may save \$1,300,000. Its rejection would reduce the amount of money to be spent by the officials in the Department of Agriculture. Otherwise they would get a million and a half dollars more than they received for the fiscal year just ended.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that last year we passed a housing bill. The provision for farm housing, when compared with what was provided for urban areas, is somewhat pathetic. We have insured billions of dollars worth of urban housing. However, when we get \$40,000,000 for farm housing all over the Nation, objection is raised to that small amount. Of the billions which we have provided for housing the farmers would get the so-called magnificent sum of \$40,000,000 under the provisions of this bill. These are not self-executing loans. Someone must execute them and administer them. The item is \$1,000,000 less than the Budget Bureau allowed. We tried to go just as slowly as we could. I think the amendment should be approved.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is my understanding that the House of Representatives included \$739,385 to take care of the projects which the Senator from Georgia has described.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Therefore even if we reject the Senate amendment of \$29,000,000 and accept the House figure of \$27,700,000, that amount would be available to take care of the project which the Senator has described.

Mr. RUSSELL. But that is not for housing alone. Water facilities are involved also. They are considered to be very important.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It does include housing.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was included at the time the House determined the figure of \$27,700,000. It will be found that the House figure was \$26,960,615. They decided to make it the round figure of \$27,700,000, and included in that item are all the expenses which the Senator from Georgia has described. The Senate appropriation committee has increased that item by an additional \$1,300,000. As one who voted for the reorganization plans, with the thought that if we would support the President in the reorganization of the Government we would get a lower cost of administration, I now find that under this appropriation bill practically every administrative branch of the Government is calling for an average increase of 8 to 10 percent over and above what was allowed to them last year. I do not understand it. I am beginning to wonder if, as one who supported the Hoover Com-

mission reorganization plans on the basis it would provide greater efficiency that I was not being fooled. Instead of saving 3 or 4 billion dollars a year as was promised if we would accept these reorganization plans, we now find the reorganized departments costing more than the old agencies. I wish the Senator from Georgia would point out why this department should cost the taxpayers approximately 10 percent more than it cost last year, and unless good reasons are given I shall vote against the committee amendment which increases the amount by \$1,300,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall undertake to explain the matter. The amount which was available last year, as I recall, was \$26,960,615, if the appropriation for the full year reflected the increase in salaries that was allowed by the Congress.

In the 1950 estimate, the Budget Bureau approved the sum of \$618,000 for the expense of making additional farm ownership and water facilities loans to homestead entrymen and others on reclamation projects. I am not altogether familiar with the details of those loans, but members of the committee who are familiar with them, who live in the areas where these projects are now being developed and opened up, stated that that was most important.

Then for costs of making the additional farm housing loans and grants in 1951, and servicing farm housing loans made in 1950, the budget allowed an increase of \$2,059,300.

For servicing in 1951 insured mortgages made in prior years and the additional production and subsistence loans to be made in 1950, the budget allowed \$362,060.

Then there were the pay adjustment costs, which grew out of the increases in pay given under the accelerated pay increase act, the Ramspeck Act, and any other acts of Congress, which amounted to \$811,615, which made a total of \$30,000,000 for the 1951 Budget estimates.

Of that amount, the Senate committee has allowed a total of \$29,000,000, which is \$1,000,000 below the Budget estimate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I point out to the Senator that it may be \$1,000,000 below the Budget estimate, but it is still \$2,000,000 more than the amount under which the same agency operated during the past 12 months.

Mr. RUSSELL. I just undertook to explain that there is \$2,059,300, for the housing loans in the rural areas.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That law was in effect at the time the House gave consideration to the bill, and the House decided that \$26,700,000 was enough.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, the House decided that, but I do not agree with the House. I do not think these loans will be self-executing. There is no way the provisions of this act can be carried out other than that we have provided.

Time and again I have seen members of the Committee on Appropriations sitting on the floor when there came before the Senate bills to increase the pay of Federal employees and Senators receiving telegrams from one source and another and would come in and vote "aye" to raise the salaries of employees. Then

they would go out and telegraph someone, "I voted for your pay increase," and would telegraph another one, "I voted for your pay increase." They received the plaudits of those whose salaries were increased, but later when the Committee on Appropriations received a budget estimate which raised the appropriation a million dollars more than the agency had had the previous year the Senators would come forward and say, "What do they mean by increasing this estimate a million dollars?" The Budget Bureau did not do it; Congress did it by voting for the increases in pay.

The same thought applies when we pass an act such as the Housing Act. We said we were going to let the farmers get just a little housing. Of course, it was hardly enough for them to smell, \$40,000,000 over the entire United States, as compared with a billion dollars poured out for housing in the cities. But when we passed that bill and some official came in and asked for a little money to administer the Farm Housing Act, he was told, "You are going away up in your appropriation." We cannot add to the duties of a bureau of Government on such an extensive scale, to deal with farm housing in 3,000 counties in the United States, without allowing for some increase in the appropriation to administer the program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am very glad to hear the Senator from Georgia point that fact out, because it is one of the facts that needs to be brought out. I remind him that I emphasized the same thought in 1949 at the time the Congress passed the pay-increase bills. I was one of the few Senators who voted against these increases, and, if I remember correctly, the Senator from Georgia voted for them. If I am in error, the Senator can correct me. I agree with him fully that it is inconsistent for those who vote for every salary increase and every authorization bill to then attack the appropriations bills and try to convince the public that they are great economizers.

The best way to cut Government expenditures is to stop voting for the authorizations.

Perhaps I am in error in thinking the Senator from Georgia voted for the pay bills.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator's memory is completely in error on that point. It so happened that the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Arizona, and the Senator from Colorado, who sit in the same row of seats, got together and framed an amendment to reduce every salary increase that was brought out by the Senator's committee, and we got the amendments approved on the floor of the Senate. Then I voted against the bill, after it was amended. As I recall, it was a viva voce vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I stand corrected in my statement then. I do know that there were very few Senators who voted against the salary increases. At that time I took the position Congress should not increase the salaries until we had a

balanced budget, and I agree with the Senator from Georgia that it is poor taste for those who have consistently voted for the authorizations to attack the appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator did not understand me to be making a personal statement with respect to him when I was discussing the pay-increase bills, because I will say that the Senator from Delaware has saved the Government millions of dollars by his constant objection to such bills on the calendar and otherwise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the committee has approved \$27,700,000 for administrative expenses of the Farmers' Home Administration, which is an increase of \$1,551,000 over 1950 appropriations. The House committee stated, on page 141 of its report, as follows:

This increase will permit the Department to put the farm-housing program authorized on a part-year basis in 1950 on a full-year basis in 1951, and will cover increased pay costs. In addition, it will provide approximately \$300,000 for servicing insured mortgages made in prior years and for handling the additional farm-tenant and water-facilities loans authorized for 1951.

We are not proposing that we should go back to the appropriation for the year 1949 and 1950. We are perfectly willing to have the appropriation go forward by a million and a half beyond that. The House says that is sufficient to provide for the extra work. We simply do not want to go up \$2,800,000.

I point out that if we approve a \$29,000,000 appropriation for administration, that will represent administrative costs of 18 percent of the moneys disbursed and loaned by the Farmers Home Administration. They are disbursing and lending something over \$166,000,000, and here there is recommended \$29,000,000 for administration, which represents an administrative cost of 18 percent. I submit that is a rather high administrative ratio, particularly when, as the Senator from Georgia has correctly pointed out, at least half of the outlays are for loans, not direct appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 216, line 2.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Extension Service—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico," on page 217, line 25, after the word "and," to strike out "section 3 of the act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343c), extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, \$10,000" and insert "the act approved October 27, 1949 (Public Law 417), extending to the Territory of Alaska the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act and sections 21 and 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act, \$42,150; Puerto Rico, section 3 of the act of March 4, 1931 (7 U. S. C. 386f), authorizing extension of the Capper-Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico, \$31,348"; in line 12, after the figures "\$408,000," to insert "and the act ap-

proved October 26, 1949 (Public Law 406), extending the benefits of section 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, \$40,000"; and in line 17, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "\$27,000,000" and insert "\$27,103,498."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses," on page 218, line 24, after the word "possessions," to strike out "\$900,000" and insert "\$915,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Secretary," on page 219, line 11, after the word "Agriculture", to strike out "\$2,143,300" and insert "\$2,179,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the subhead "Office of the Solicitor," on page 220, line 6, after the word "service", to strike out "\$2,450,000" and insert "\$2,675,000"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses which several amounts not exceeding a total of \$207,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation."

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is not an appropriation for persons giving direct service to agriculture. It is an appropriation for lawyers in the Department of Agriculture. In 1950 the appropriations for legal services in the Office of the Solicitor were \$2,364,000. The House upped that to \$2,450,000, an increase of \$86,000. The Senate committee is now proposing an appropriation of \$2,675,000, which is an increase of over \$300,000 compared with the appropriation for the current year. There is the further provision that there shall be added to this sum for legal services other appropriations or authorizations provided for in various other items in the bill.

The legal profession is a very valuable profession, but it seems to me that economy can be made on the legal staffs in virtually every governmental bureau in Washington. Washington is well known for being top heavy with lawyers, and the departments are top heavy with lawyers. This is one place where we can effect a reduction without impairing service in the slightest.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Has the Senator from Illinois made investigation to determine how much of this additional \$250,000 or \$300,000 increase is for the use of law libraries? It is inconceivable to me that a request of that kind should be made, because in every section of the United States, in every city of any consequence or in every county of any consequence there are public law libraries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know. I cannot believe, however, that that is an item which is of any significance in the total. I believe the principal amount must be for the payment of lawyers.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Illinois understands, does he not, that it takes a great many lawyers to find the proper interpretation for acts of the Congress which will be entirely satisfactory to the head of the Department that employs the lawyers. Being sure of that on my own part, I will gladly support the proposal of the Senator from Illinois to kill this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Vermont has again and again, I think very properly, called the attention of the Senate and the country to the fact that increasingly the heads of departments, instead of asking for legal opinions from the Attorney General, ask for legal opinions from their own legal departments, and then these legal departments solemnly give opinions satisfactory to their chiefs.

The Senator from Vermont has pointed out that out again and again, and I quite agree with him in that respect. I am delighted that he reinforces my proposal.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think I pointed out that for the year 1948, the Attorney General's office, which is supposed to interpret laws which are not clear to the agencies which are concerned, gave only 33 formal opinions on laws to all the agencies of the Government. The other interpretations, or "misinterpretations" perhaps would be a better word, for some of them anyway, were made by solicitors in the offices of the various agencies, and, of course, the solicitors and their staffs, being responsible to the heads of the agencies for their jobs, do the best they can to bring forth interpretations which will be satisfactory to the heads of the agencies which employ them.

One of the greatest weaknesses of our Government today is the great amount of employment and money expended on these solicitors' offices, which spend so much time in finding ways of getting around the intent of the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I realize it is always very popular to jump on the lawyers in the Government.

Mr. AIKEN. No, no, Mr. President; I was not jumping on the lawyers. I was jumping on the heads of the departments who insist that the lawyers bring in the interpretations they want.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am impressed by the fact that in every revolution the first persons who are in danger are the lawyers. When Jack Cade delivered his famous address to his men at Cheapside, he told them how he was going to bring it about so that they could buy a 3-penny glass of ale for half a penny, and a 4-penny loaf of bread for 1 penny, and one of his men said, in referring to the revolution, that "the first thing we will do is to kill off all the lawyers." Much of that same spirit seems to have come down from the days of Jack Cade's rebellion.

It is not a question of securing lawyers for the Department of Agriculture. The increase was not put in the bill arbitrarily and capriciously to give Mr. Brannan some high-powered gentleman who could twist the laws around to his liking. It was put in the bill in the hope that we would be able to have a sane lending program in connection with the telephone

legislation which was passed last year and the housing legislation which was passed last year, which greatly adds to the legal duties of the Department of Agriculture.

The Department is going to lend a great deal of money under those two bills. It is going to lend \$40,000,000 for housing, and \$30,000,000 is contained in the act dealing with the rural telephone program.

In addition innumerable cases are arising by virtue of the imposition of acreage allotments and marketing quotas in the case of some commodities, and the plans we have been compelled to make for adjustments on other crops next year. Of course, if this war continues I imagine all acreage allotments and marketing quotas will go out the window, because the farmers will be requested to produce a great deal more.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Georgia realizes, does he not, that if acreage allotments and quotas go out the window probably twice as many lawyers will be required to enforce the price ceilings on farm commodities.

Mr. RUSSELL. That will not be a matter which will be dealt with in the Department of Agriculture. If that must be dealt with we will have a Mr. Henderson or someone else to handle it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The subcommittee took proof as to all these matters, did it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. The subcommittee did, yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The bill was reported after the most careful investigation and after extensive proof, and after careful consultation both in the subcommittee and in the full committee. Is it not reasonable to suppose that what was done in the subcommittee and in the full committee is a better way of legislating than simply to take the offhand opinion of one of our own Members on the floor?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the committee reported this item \$395,000 below the budget. Some Senators have been talking about a 10-percent cut. Here is a case where more than a 10-percent reduction was applied to the budget estimate. I believe it would be a short-sighted policy to defeat this amendment, involving as it does about \$207,000, when the money is absolutely necessary to any sane and sensible administration of the telephone loan program and of the farm-housing program. Senators can strike it out of the bill if they will, but I unhesitatingly predict that in the long run such action will mean much greater losses to the National Treasury in connection with these two important lending programs which were authorized last year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The side slip does not state the number of lawyers that

should be hired. Does the Senator know, from the evidence, the number of lawyers proposed to be employed?

Mr. RUSSELL. I can find how many the Department wanted to employ. I do not know how many the Department will hire with this money, because we applied a rule of thumb and hoped this modest increase would be sufficient to enable the Department to avoid great loss in connection with the telephone loan program and the housing program. We have the figures requested by the Department, but it is impossible for me to carry them all in my mind. They requested 125 lawyers. That is the number they would employ if they were allowed the entire six-hundred-thousand-odd dollars requested. I imagine the amount the committee allowed would, on the original basis, probably mean the employment of 35 or 40 lawyers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator feel that such a number of lawyers is altogether too many simply to interpret the provisions of three or four statutes? Could not such interpretation be made in the local office?

Mr. RUSSELL. This appropriation is for the local office.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I understood. Does not the Senator feel that 40 lawyers are too many to be employed simply to interpret three or four laws?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think if they can get by with respect to the Telephone Loan Act with 40 lawyers it will be an achievement to be hailed throughout the country. If a private enterprise were to embark on a program of that kind, which is supposed to expand from year to year and will involve the lending of probably \$2,000,000,000 of Government funds, they would undoubtedly employ more than 40 lawyers, and each lawyer would be paid three times the salary scale provided for the Government lawyers. If some gigantic organization were getting ready to embark on a program of the same kind it would certainly need more lawyers than are proposed to be hired by the Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that they would be paid more money, but I do not think any firm would hire 40 lawyers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Many a firm would have more than 40 lawyers.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I, too, was of the impression a few years ago that the lawyers in the Department of Agriculture did not work very much. However, last year and the year before I had many occasions to deal with the Department in connection with the REA program. I then found that the lawyers in the Department of Agriculture are among the hardest-working employees of the Government. I have known them to work Saturdays and Sundays, in order to develop programs for my own State.

Mr. FERGUSON. Were they working on programs or on propaganda?

Mr. YOUNG. They were working on the strictly legal aspects of the REA in my own State. I had a lawyer friend

from North Dakota working with them, so I know whereof I speak.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to hear that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 220, in line 6. [Putting the question.]

The "aycs" appear to have it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Information," on page 221, line 19, after the figures "\$611,128", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office of Information, as the central agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not exceeding \$300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this amendment? I understand that it provides for an additional \$300,000 for sound pictures which will set forth and propagandize the programs of the various agencies of the Department of Agriculture. I, for one, would like to have an explanation of this amendment, and I should like to know its source.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the language to which the Senator adverts, which I believe is to be found on page 221, beginning in line 19—

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. That language has previously appeared in the appropriation bill. It was submitted by the Bureau of the Budget this year. It was then approved by the House Committee on Appropriations, but was stricken from the bill when the bill was being dealt with on the floor of the House of Representatives. That action was taken on a point of order.

The amendment was voted by the Senate Appropriations Committee to be restored to the bill, in view of the statement to the committee by the Department of Agriculture, which I shall read:

The purpose of this language is to facilitate financing the production and distribution of motion pictures for bureaus in the Department by the existing and authorized facilities in the Office of Information. The authority of the Department to produce motion pictures, in furtherance of the purposes of the Organic Act of 1862 (5 U. S. C. 511) has long been recognized and the Department has provided them since 1912. They are used mainly by the Extension Service as education and demonstrational aids.

The authority to transfer contained in this language was inserted in the Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1943. While essentially the same result can be accomplished under the reimbursement authority of section 601 of the Economy Act, the above provision per-

mits a merger of transferred funds, in the interests of simpler accounting.

Mr. AIKEN. But has the amount been used in other years?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on this point?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me say that one of the best of all sound motion pictures developed by the Department of Agriculture is one which deals with the preservation of agricultural products in canning work and in the preservation of fruits. I am sure the Senator from Vermont is familiar with some of those motion pictures. Their great advantage is that instead of requiring a home demonstration agent to go from house to house and to set up the demonstration in each house, films are now available to show how these facilities can be used in the deep-freeze units—an extremely fine demonstration of what to do in the home canning of fruits and vegetables.

I think the sound film developed on the canning of fruits and vegetables alone is worth all the money which has been used for this purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. But if there already is a provision of \$1,265,800 for this purpose, is the Secretary of Agriculture to be given authority to exercise his own judgment in the spending of an additional \$300,000 for the production of motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department? Why do we have the appropriation in two places? Why do we provide that the \$300,000 can be taken from some other fund if the Secretary of Agriculture desires to use it in the production of motion and sound pictures which will set forth the work of any agency of the Department which he may choose to have set forth?

The amendment almost gives the Secretary of Agriculture unlimited authority to produce the kind of motion picture or sound picture he wishes to have produced, so long as it has some relationship to the work of one of the agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly; but first let me say that I am particularly concerned with this amendment, and perhaps the Senator from New Mexico knows why.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can only say to my good friend, the Senator from Vermont, that I do not know why the matter is handled in this fashion. I was only attempting to reply to the question as to whether or not sound films and motion pictures demonstrating the work of the Department have heretofore been used.

I say that in my opinion the expenditure of money for films heretofore prepared has been a very good expenditure.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from New Mexico is entirely correct. If properly used, a reasonable amount of money well spent would return good dividends on the investment.

However, I see no restriction on the Secretary of Agriculture in regard to the use of this \$300,000 to produce the kind of film he may wish to have produced, so long as it relates to some phase of

the work of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator say whether any division of the Department of Agriculture which under the agricultural appropriation has any money to spend in relation to authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department, could transfer all that money to this particular agency and have it do all the work and handle all the program?

Mr. AIKEN. I would rather have the Senator from Georgia answer that question. As I read the law, it seems to me that \$300,000 would be taken out of the \$1,265,800. Or could it come from any unused funds of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the \$300,000 is very similar to the appropriation for the Office of the Secretary. As the Senator is aware, there go into the Office of the Secretary various allotments from various bureaus and agencies within the Department of Agriculture, for the purpose of supervision of the work within that agency. I think the \$300,000 is in addition to the appropriation referred to by the Senator, and I think it can be transferred from funds which are appropriated for the various branches of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FERGUSON. But not necessarily under the Office of Information? That is the idea, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. It has to be spent under the Office of Information.

Mr. FERGUSON. But it can come from any other agency of the Department of Agriculture; can it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; there is no question about that.

So, as I understand this \$300,000, it comes by transfer from any agency of the Department. For example, I think the Commodity Credit Corporation, if it has any funds available for this purpose, can transfer them so as to have a film made to show farmers how to store corn in home storage; and the money could also be used for the distribution of that film.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Could the money also be used to show the advantages or disadvantages of the Brannan plan? It could be used for that purpose, could it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will permit me to reply, let me say that I do not think the money could be used for that purpose at all. If I thought it could be used for that purpose, I certainly would not approve of this amendment. However, I do not think the money could be used for such a purpose, because the amendment states that the funds may be used for "authorized programs."

Up to this good moment, the Congress of the United States has not authorized the Brannan plan.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Michigan that I

think I agree with the Senator from Georgia that the money could not legally be used to promote a new program. But the money could be used for the production of a sound or motion picture to show how the American farmer in recent years has attained salvation under the programs of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Marketing is a part of the Brannan plan, is it not? Distribution is a part of the Brannan plan, and both are recognized in other sections relating to the marketing of farm products. Does not the Senator think that the funds could be used for that purpose, and, therefore, to demonstrate the values of the Brannan plan?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Michigan believes, as I do, that certain funds appropriated to the Department of Agriculture have already been used—or misused—for the promotion of the Brannan plan.

There is no guaranty that, if Commodity Credit or PMA funds have been used for that purpose, this \$300,000 movie or sound film could not also be used at least promote enthusiasm, to show that while we are doing pretty well under the present programs, we might do even better.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is familiar with the recent program in Minnesota, under which some \$34,000 or perhaps as much as \$50,000 was used in behalf of the Brannan plan, even though not authorized. The Senator has no doubt as to that fact, has he?

Mr. AIKEN. I also pointed out recently, when the Senator from Michigan was absent from the Senate Chamber, that the Comptroller General never ruled on the point raised by the Senator from Michigan, namely, that the Secretary of Agriculture, at the meeting in Minnesota, violated the law by making a speech in favor of the Brannan plan. The Comptroller General held that it was a matter which would properly come before the Department of Justice, not before the Comptroller General.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the Senator from Vermont familiar with the statement I made previously on the floor of the Senate, in which I showed that the Secretary of Agriculture had pointed out to his top PMA men that in his opinion it was more important that they work toward the enactment of his legislative program than that they work to make the existing law function?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator from Delaware made some such statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I quoted a portion of a letter which the Secretary had written to his top officials, in which he had made that statement.

Mr. AIKEN. There is some indication that at least a few of them have

borne that admonition in mind. It appears to me that this is definitely legislation on an appropriation bill, and I ask the Chair to rule on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Vermont is making the point of order?

Mr. AIKEN. I am making the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that I am highly suspicious of this item of \$300,000, which is to be used for the production of a sound or motion picture, as proposed. I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is a legislative matter, but it is an amendment to a legislative matter, because the language which precedes it, writing out all the numbers of the yearbooks which can be printed, is itself legislative. So it is an amendment to a legislative provision which comes to us in the House bill. We certainly have a right to amend a House legislative provision which comes to the Senate. When the House undertakes to write out and prescribe how many of the Yearbooks of Agriculture shall be printed for the use of the House and Senate, and to write in a great deal of legislation in connection with the Office of Information, the Senate has a right to amend it to the extent proposed, because when the House legislates, then the Senate has a right to legislate. The House provision, prescribing the number of yearbooks which can be printed, is purely legislative. That is one form of information. We come forward with another.

While I am about it, the distinguished Senator has talked about a sound film. This provision is not only for a sound film, but for preparing an agricultural exhibit to be taken around to State fairs and gatherings of that kind. It was not placed in the bill with any idea of promoting the Brannan plan—perish the thought, so far as our committee is concerned.

I do not know how the Members feel about it. I did not poll them. But this is a provision which has been in the bills since 1943. It is not a new idea to assist by means of the dissemination of information by way of agricultural exhibits, moving pictures, and otherwise. It has been in progress since 1943, and it is certainly not put in this bill with any idea of propagandizing for the Brannan plan. The Brannan plan was in existence before 1943. It was not called the Brannan plan. It bore the name then of a gentleman from Iowa or Illinois, some doctor from one of the agricultural college experiment stations in that area, who headed the movement as an emergency or a depression measure.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, later pinned his name to the program evolved by this professor. But there is nothing about the Brannan plan in this amendment. I hope the Senator will not assail it on those grounds, be-

cause it does not relate to the Brannan plan.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that the Senator from Vermont did not bring up the idea that this might be used for promoting the Brannan Plan. However, the Senator from Vermont is not satisfied with this provision. I should prefer, Mr. President, to make the point of order that the provision is not germane to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that this identical language was stricken from the bill in the House, that a point of order was made against it, and that it was removed from the bill for that reason?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly correct. But the House has an entirely different system from that of the Senate when it comes to dealing with points of order.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. But, unless there is something else about this amendment which is absolutely germane—

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, it is germane.

Mr. WHERRY. Unless it amends the provision which came to the Senate from the House, it seems to me that it is not germane.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a proposal to amend what the House sent to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. What the House sent to the Senate was a provision for information, and this amendment relates to information. It provides for exhibits explaining new agricultural developments of major interest to farmers and is supplied to some 35 large State and interstate fairs which request this material each year. Technical assistance and production facilities are also extended to department agencies for the preparation of small exhibits, for limited use. In addition, the Office of Information provides motion picture, radio, and projection service for the Department and supervises the distribution of films from 72 cooperative State film libraries for the use of extension agencies.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. This amendment goes far beyond the provisions sent to the Senate by the House. In fact, it authorizes the Secretary to use his own judgment as to whether or not \$300,000 worth of sound or motion-picture film would promote the work of the Department.

Mr. RUSSELL. Upon whose judgment are we going to have to depend for information?

Mr. AIKEN. I ask for the judgment of the Senate upon the point of order.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The language sought to be employed is that which has to do with information.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It happens that what the House did was to provide for information in the form of yearbooks. The yearbook contains possibly a thousand items of information beneficial to the farmer. Am I correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Besides the items outlined in the yearbook, giving sound information to the farmer, the Senate amendment provides only for additional information, but, nevertheless, information. Is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. There can be no question about the germaneness of the amendment. The item is as follows:

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work in the Department.

It goes on to provide for the publication of 230,850 copies of the yearbook for the use of the House and the Senate, which is certainly legislation. Then comes the amendment which provides for additional information dealing with agriculture, to be furnished by the transfer of \$300,000 from other appropriations. Then follows this legislation:

That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of \$10,000 to be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944—

And so forth. That is legislation. The whole section is legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Georgia has just read into the *Record* what I had intended to read, under the general caption of "Office of Information." Everything which he has read, it seems to me, is right in line with what the proviso does. It deals with the same subject matter, and it seems to me it is all absolutely germane.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The point on which the House sustained the point of order, however, was that the \$300,000 was to be transferred from other bureaus within the Department of Agriculture, in addition to the amount of money allocated for the purposes which the Senator just mentioned. It seems to me it is new legislation, and that the House was correct in striking it out.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not intend to pass on the rules of the House, because from what little experience I have had I know that they are widely different from the rules of the Senate. Limitations are not out of order in the House.

In the Senate it has been held that all limitations are out of order. There is no similarity of rules as between the House and the Senate in dealing with appropriation bills. I claim, and shall continue to insist so long as I am a Member of the Senate, that when the House legislates one line, as it does when it spells out the number of yearbooks to be printed, it has opened the door, and the Senate can legislate on the subject even in an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the distinguished Senator in that respect, but I make the point that that was not the issue in the House. It was not on the question of whether it was germane to the Office of Information; it was that the \$300,000 was to be transferred within the Department for the purposes outlined. It was on that question that the point of order was made. I submit that if the Senate attempts to write it into the bill under the theory that it is amending what the House did, a point of order can properly be made.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not agree at all with the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the amendment provides that—

Not exceeding \$300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein.

The amendment could not be more germane.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is a point of order debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not debatable.

Mr. McFARLAND. I insist on the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has raised the question of germaneness of the Senate amendment, which has just been discussed, to the bill as passed by the House.

Under rule XVI, paragraph 4, the Chair will submit the question of germaneness to the Senate, which, under the rule, is not debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senate is anxious to have a vote on this question tonight, the junior Senator from Nebraska will suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Eastland	Ives
Anderson	Eaton	Jenner
Brewster	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Bridges	Ferguson	Kem
Butler	Fulbright	Kerr
Chapman	George	Kilgore
Chavez	Graham	Langer
Connally	Hayden	Lehman
Cordon	Hickenlooper	Lodge
Donnell	Hill	Lucas
Douglas	Holland	McFarland
Dworshak	Humphrey	McKellar

Magnuson
Malone
Martin
Maybank
Millikin
Morse
Murray
Myers

O'Mahoney
Pepper
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Schoeppel
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.

Stennis
Taft
Thomas, Okla.
Thye
Watkins
Wherry
Williams
Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is, Is the committee amendment before the Senate germane to the House provision? The question is submitted to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The rule provides that no further point of order can be made and that the question of germaneness must be settled by a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Two questions are involved. One is the question of new legislation. Where new legislation is proposed by a committee, the Senate may decide that it is germane to the provision in a House bill. In that case the point of order on the ground that it is new legislation no longer lies.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, if the Senate decides that the language is germane, the point of order is actually settled by the vote on the question of germaneness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senate decides it is germane, of course it can vote on the question of agreeing to the amendment separately. However, the point of order that it is new legislation is then disposed of.

Mr. TAFT. A point of inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Germane to what? Germane to the bill? Germane to the provision of the House bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Germane to the House language, to which it is an amendment.

The Senator from Georgia, in charge of the bill in reply to the point of order that it was new legislation, contended that it was germane to the provision of the bill to which it is an amendment, which is the House language.

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the point of order raised to the question of germaneness or on the ground of new legislation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order was made against the amendment on the ground that it was new legislation, and the Senator from Georgia, to counter that point of order, said that it was germane to the legislative provision in the House text.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear the Senator from Georgia raise the question of germaneness, and the point of order was not debatable, so how was it raised?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The present occupant of the chair was temporarily called out at the time the point was raised, but the Chair understands that when the point of order was raised

against the language on the ground that it was new legislation, the Senator from Georgia contended that it was germane to the House provision, and that raised the question, and the occupant of the chair at that time submitted the question to the Senate, and the point of no quorum was made. That is the present situation.

The question is, Is the amendment germane to the House language?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those who take the position that the language of the committee amendment is germane to the House language will vote "yea." Those who take the contrary position will vote "nay."

The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are detained on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY],

the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] are detained on official business.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 35, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—35

Anderson	Hill	Maybank
Chapman	Holland	Morse
Chavez	Humphrey	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Donnell	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kilgore	Pepper
Eastland	Langer	Robertson
Ellender	Lehman	Russell
Fulbright	Lucas	Stennis
George	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Graham	McKellar	Young
Hayden	Magnuson	

NAYS—25

Aiken	Ives	Smith, Maine
Brewster	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Kem	Taft
Butler	Lodge	Thye
Cordon	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin	Wherry
Ecton	Millikin	Williams
Ferguson	Saltonstall	
Hickenlooper	Schoeppel	

NOT VOTING—36

Benton	Hendrickson	McMahon
Bricker	Hoyer	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Darby	Kefauver	Taylor
Downey	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Leahy	Tobey
Frear	Long	Tydings
Gillette	McCarran	Vandenberg
Green	McCarthy	Wiley
Gurney	McClellan	Withers

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote the yeas are 35, the nays are 25, the Senate holds the amendment germane, and that settles the point of order on the ground that it is new legislation.

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

REPORT OF MAJORITY MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the report of the majority members of the Tydings subcommittee which is just out, not having gone through the Foreign Relations Committee, asserts that I was absent for 9 of the 31 sessions of the meetings of the subcommittee, that for this reason the subcommittee was "burdened in its work" and that there was significance in most of these absences coming during consideration of the Amerasia case.

The truth is that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who is one of the majority signers of the report, missed five meetings—five of the nine—as I did, because we were members of the subcommittee of two which was taking testimony in New York and abroad on the day-to-day policing of the loyalty program pursuant to a unanimous vote of the full subcommittee. This was between the date of May 26 and June 5 when most of the consideration of the Amerasia case occurred. I missed the other four meetings because a young man who was a close friend of my son's, of myself, and of my whole family, was drowned near my home in Massachusetts and I was preoccupied for several days with many things pertaining to the tragedy. This occurred in March just as the subcommittee was beginning its hear-

ings and could have had no possible effect, burdensome or otherwise, on the work of the subcommittee.

It is a pity—and it is foreign to all the usual courtesies between Senators—that I should be criticized by name for being absent on official committee work and, secondly, for being absent because of the death of a close and beloved friend.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. HICKENLOOPER addressed the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment when I have completed my statement.

It is this type of petty sniping—this attempt to hit below the belt—which has made the work of the subcommittee so difficult. If the other statements in the majority's report are no more accurate than these statements about myself, the report will be chiefly valuable as fiction and as special pleading, rather than as fact. Indeed this makes the whole document suspect.

The majority report also attacks me by name for reading 12 of the 81 loyalty files. Twelve files taken at random and requiring five whole days to read, are a representative cross-section and convinced me that the files were in such an unfinished, undeveloped state as not to provide a sound basis for reaching conclusions. It is noteworthy that, while the majority criticizes me for refusing to accept these files blindly at their face value, nowhere in the majority report are these files discussed as individual cases, one by one the way I do. There is merely a blanket endorsement, and there is no way of knowing whether the majority read 81 files or none at all. My report goes into specific details.

Mr. President, in my minority views, I purposely made no personal attacks on any members of the subcommittee and, at this serious moment in history, I shall not do so, but it is necessary that I clarify the flagrant misstatements which the majority have seen fit to make about my part personally in this investigation. They must be indeed desperate men to use these personal methods to divert attention from the main issue which, of course, is the total inadequacy of their investigation.

I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. As I recall the history of this investigation, the resolution adopted by the Senate authorized the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to investigate the matter and to report to the Senate. Am I to understand that the subcommittee, which was designated to investigate and report to the full Foreign Relations Committee, has released a report to the press purporting to be the report of the full committee?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. It is an unusual proceeding, though, since the subcommittee should have reported to the full Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I must utter a vigorous protest against that procedure. I have never heard of it before. The subcommittee

was appointed to report to the full committee, and the full committee was to consider it before any public report was made.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is correct. I think it is a most unusual procedure. I know of no reason for taking this unusual procedure and ignoring in rather cavalier fashion all the other members of the committee.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Massachusetts would tell me when he managed to obtain a copy of this report of the subcommittee, that is of the majority members of the subcommittee of which I happen to be a minority member. I am curious about that.

Mr. LODGE. I got it this afternoon at about 4 o'clock. I went down into the sort of battle station they have down in the cellar. I went in and asked a young lady there to give me a copy of the report, which she did. Maybe she was not supposed to do so. Maybe I am not supposed to see it until it comes out in the newspapers tomorrow.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For a considerable period of time, I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts, I have been obtaining my information about the subcommittee from the newspapers. I have been totally unable to secure a copy, galley proof, or otherwise, of this so-called report of the majority party membership on this subcommittee. I understand it was freely handed out to the newspapers this morning, and perhaps yesterday, and on last Friday at least one or two newspapermen, I am told, had access to the galley proof; and yet, as a member of the subcommittee, I was not provided with any such report. I understand that after some considerable inquiry on the part of my office this afternoon two copies were sent over late, after they had been pretty generally scattered around to the public.

I think it is a rather fantastic procedure, and I expect to have something to say about it when I can find out what the majority has said. One or two little things that have been quoted to me by the press certainly will lend themselves to a considerable amount of interesting comment.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say to the Senator from Iowa that we have a well-established procedure in the Senate, which has developed over the years as the result of experience; and whenever a little handful of Senators undertake to violate that procedure and bypass it, naturally and obviously it makes anything they do suspect.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Was it the understanding of the Senator from Massachusetts that this subcommittee, to which he and I both, at least on paper, belong, was to report to the Foreign Relations Committee as a creature of the Foreign Relations Committee, or was the

Mr. LUCAS. Please do not do that now.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator should certainly let me comment on what he said my views were. I know he is fair.

Mr. LUCAS. The report speaks for itself. I have merely been told that by someone. Perhaps I should not even have mentioned it. If it misinterprets in any way the Senator's attitude, I will simply withdraw it, to keep him from entering upon a long discussion, because the three majority members of the subcommittee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYRINGS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], are not present. Frankly, perhaps, I should not have said that.

Mr. LODGE. I wonder where they are. [Laughter.]

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment on page 221, beginning in line 19.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this amendment had not been called to my attention until now. It is a quarter of seven. I should like further opportunity to examine it and study it. I wonder whether the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia, would be willing to postpone the vote until tomorrow. The amendment reads:

*Provided, That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department can be more advantageously prepared * * * by the Office of Information, * * * additional funds not exceeding \$300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein:*

The distinguished Senator from Georgia says that that is not an increase in the funds available for information, and that the amount can be used by the different departments. He has other arguments, including the argument that this amendment has been in the bill before. Nevertheless, Mr. President, the way it is framed, it seems to me that it can be used very well for a program like the Brannan plan. I have seen Department of Agriculture bulletins which are distinctly propaganda for the Brannan plan, and whether "authorized programs of the various agencies" includes programs simply authorized by Mr. Brannan and not authorized by Congress, I have no particular means of checking, without further investigation.

If the Senator is willing to defer action on the amendment, if after I examine all the Senator's arguments I find them sound I shall make no further request for delay tomorrow morning, and shall say nothing on the subject. But I should like the opportunity, if the Senator is willing, to go over the evidence until the first thing tomorrow morning.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am always agreeable to any reasonable request, and it may be there is nothing unreasonable about the request of the Senator from Ohio. I am a little amazed that my distinguished friend from Ohio should have been 7 years discovering this horrible bugaboo under the bed. This language has been in agricultural appropriation bills for 7 years. It has been renewed. It has been before the Senate time and time again. It is not merely getting read now to jump forth, seize the Senate, and force the Brannan plan through. It has been in the bill for all these many years. I do not believe there is any reason for delaying action on the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Possibly it is the language under which the Brannan plan has been printed and issued in booklet form by the Secretary of Agriculture. If so, then I want it to come out of the bill. That may not be true. I can only say to the Senator that it is now 10 minutes of 7. I should like, if he will grant me the privilege, to have the opportunity of looking into it somewhat further. It may be that I shall find that I am wrong. If so, I will yield fully to the Senator's views, the first thing in the morning.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be willing to agree to any language which would protect us from an avalanche of propaganda for the Brannan plan. I should be perfectly willing to include a provision that the programs must be authorized by Congress. I think that that is the only logical construction that could be placed on the language. But if the Senator from Ohio wishes to study the matter through, tonight, and peruse it, I shall not object to letting it go over until tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope his good, sound judgment will bring him to the conclusion that he should vote for the amendment, and that he was in error in thinking the amendment was not germane.

Mr. TAFT. That was based on the fact that I had not thoroughly examined it. But it seemed to me that in the way the authorization was framed, it permitted the use of money for particular agricultural programs not primarily informational, but to be used as informational programs. The Senator assures me that that is not so; so possibly my thought as to its germaneness was wrong. But it seems to me that if the amendment does what has been indicated, then I shall not think it germane to a general appropriation of money for programs of information.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of the fact that this amendment is going over until tomorrow, I think I should read this further paragraph from the testimony before the committee:

The authority to transfer, contained in this language, was inserted in the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1943, and while essentially the same result can be accomplished under the reimbursement authority of section 601 of the Economy Act, the economy measure permits the transfer of funds in the interest of simplified accounting.

Really, there is authority under other laws for the transfer of these funds. This provision makes it simply a matter

of bookkeeping. But I am perfectly willing to let the vote go over until tomorrow morning. I should like to have action on the other amendments completed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will go over until tomorrow.

The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Library," on page 222, after line 19, to strike out:

Not to exceed \$12,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this title shall be available for travel expenses. Amounts available from appropriations contained in this title are hereby reduced by the total sum of \$645,496, such amount to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this chapter.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Corporations," on page 223, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$16,000,000" and insert "\$16,350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 224, line 3, after the word "discharge", to strike out "\$170,515,131" and insert "\$66,698,457."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that amendment? It seems to me to revert to the old method of keeping the Commodity Credit Corporation funds intact by canceling notes which the Corporation has given the Treasury. I recall that the General Accounting Office protested very vigorously against that kind of bookkeeping, because the losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation never appeared as a Government expenditure under such a method. While I realize that the Senate committee has cut the amount which the House had canceled from approximately \$170,000,000, to approximately \$66,000,000, and for that I am very grateful, I wonder if the Senator—

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator will rejoice and be exceedingly glad when he hears the explanation. The reason the sum was cut from \$170,515,131 to \$66,698,457 was because upon a reaudit it was found that the losses were that much less than the figure of \$170,515,131. Therefore, the Government is really \$103,816,674 better off than we thought it was as a result of the transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the plan to wipe out losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation simply by canceling notes given to the Treasury?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the only way in which we have ever handled it.

Mr. AIKEN. I know. As I pointed out, the General Accounting Office vigorously protested such methods. I shall not oppose the amendment tonight. I think I shall concentrate on the other amendment which has been under discussion and which is much more vulnerable.

Mr. RUSSELL. It has been found that approximately \$103,000,000 worth of notes will be paid to the Treasury which

we did not think would be paid, and the Government is \$103,000,000 better off than appeared by the figures submitted.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont is very happy to learn that. He is almost ready to think the Commodity Credit Corporation did not need the \$2,000,000,000 which we appropriated a while ago.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not a fact that at the price at which cotton was selling it looked as if there might be losses on the 1948 crop, but with the increase in the price of cotton all the losses were wiped out by the realization that the Commodity Credit Corporation could sell its stocks at more than they cost, and if they closed the pool and took in some cotton they would actually sustain a profit instead of a loss? That applies to corn, wheat, and many other commodities. These stocks are not nearly so extensive as some people calculated. I think some of the money recently appropriated will not be used. I made a calculation and figured that probably the Corporation will not need all of the \$2,000,000,000. But the wise thing was to appropriate it, but the desire would be that it would never require that amount of money.

Mr. AIKEN. If we find the Commodity Credit Corporation does not require the \$2,000,000,000, the impression made on the public with regard to the farm program would be much better if we rescinded that authorization.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that from the standpoint of the taxpayers it makes no difference whether we pay for this program through cancellation of notes or through appropriations, but I think the Senator will agree with me that this cancellation of notes in appropriation bills does have the effect of hiding from the American people the true cost of the program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot see that it does. An appropriation would be more widely publicized than would the cancellation, but I do not think it hides the facts from anyone who wishes to get the facts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree that it does not exactly hide them, but it does not give the publicity to the cost of the program that would be given through a direct appropriation by Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think the use of the word "hide" was fortunate. If the appropriation were made for that purpose it probably would be a little more evident to the reader of a newspaper, but any person who went into the subject would find that on the cancellation theory it would be more widely recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The reason I raised the point is because in one of the recent reports of the Secretary of Agriculture he pointed out the amount of money which Congress had appropriated for the Corporation since its inception in

1933. While he emphasized the amount of money which the Corporation had paid back into the Treasury, he failed to mention the \$1,500,000,000 of note cancellations, nor did he mention the \$2,000,000,000 which had automatically accrued to this Corporation under section 32 during the past 15 years, both of which were taxpayers' money. The inclusion of these items would make quite a difference in the ultimate answer as to the results of the program.

Mr. RUSSELL. That would make a difference, of course.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The so-called surpluses about which the Secretary of Agriculture has been boasting have been false and misleading. The Commodity Credit Corporation was never established with the thought of making money. No one thought it would make money. But the taxpayers have a right to know what losses are involved and that information has not been given them. I think the Senate should abandon this note-cancellation procedure and make direct appropriations. In that way the cost of the program would be evident to everyone.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say "several billions of dollars"?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it is a false profit. When the ECA has to buy cotton and buys it from the Commodity Credit Corporation at the market price, it does not cost the Treasury of the United States a penny more than it would if it went on the open market and bought the cotton. That transaction resulted in a profit of more than \$200,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not questioning the merits or demerits of the individual transaction. I directed a letter to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and asked him if he would review the operations of the Corporation for the past 15 years and give me the net result, from the standpoint of the taxpayer, of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation since its inception. In his reply, which I have here, he said:

In answer to your letter of February 1, 1949, the net loss sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation from its organization on October 17, 1933, through December 31, 1948, was \$2,145,930,367 plus the around \$2,000,000,000 which it had received under section 32.

He went on to point out—

Mr. ANDERSON. A portion of that is for the subsidization of food, and has nothing to do with the farm program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not breaking it down, but I am saying that the Corporation has not shown a profit. On the contrary, its loss is nearly \$4,000,000,000 total.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think it is as wrong as it can be to say that the Corporation has lost several billions of dollars, when we realize that the Congress of the United States voted that, instead of paying the full price of something, it could be taken, for convenience, from the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not questioning here the merits or the demerits of

the program authorized by Congress, nor am I questioning the program. But I do question the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture in a bulletin, from which I quote, when he said:

Incidentally, Commodity Credit Corporation shows a lifetime profit rather than a loss.

That statement is not true. There is no use of our trying to conceal the fact that these support programs do cost money, and I think the true facts should be made known to the American taxpayers.

I shall not oppose the amendment, because it is immaterial whether we cancel the notes or whether we authorize an appropriation, but I do think the true picture should be presented in the report by the Secretary of Agriculture, and I think legislation should be enacted to correct this unsound procedure.

Mr. ANDERSON. I subscribe to that statement fully. I think one of the tragedies of the whole system of reporting is that the Comptroller General can issue a report and say the loss has been \$2,000,000,000 on this program. If that is saddled on the farmer, it is a serious thing. I agree with the Senator from Delaware that if we could segregate those things which were subsidy programs in furtherance of the decision of the Congress itself to handle it that way we would be better off.

A great deal of money was used in the campaign against the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. The Government could have done that by direct appropriation by Congress, or it could have done it by the use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds. The amounts which were used from Commodity Credit Corporation funds should not be charged to the farm program.

I agree with the Senator that it would be desirable to have a complete and well-rounded picture of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think it would show that the cost of the farm program has been extremely low. I think that a great many things which have been charged against the Commodity Credit Corporation make it look as though the farm program has been extremely costly. Whatever the figure is, we ought to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely say that the Commodity Credit Corporation as a corporation under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture has cost the taxpayers around \$4,000,000,000, according to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Perhaps that should not all be charged against the agricultural program. However, we do not have a breakdown of these items in view of the fact that we have never been able to get the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Without the books we do not know how we should assess these charges. The point I am raising is that the true cost of these programs would be clearer if Congress would get around to making a direct appropriation. The Secretary of Agriculture should come in and justify appropriations on the basis of the merits or demerits of the question involved. Then there would be no ques-

tion in the mind of the committee, Congress, or the country as to what it is costing. Furthermore, I say that when the Secretary of Agriculture puts out a bulletin in which he says this Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, has shown a lifetime profit, rather than a loss, that statement is not true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 224, line 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—General provisions," on page 229, after line 5, to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 411. Of the funds appropriated in this chapter for travel expenses, \$791,888 shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury on or before August 1, 1950; but such amount shall be credited toward any other reduction in amounts available for such travel expenses resulting from decreases in appropriations made by this act below the budget estimates.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have heretofore sent an amendment to the desk relating to the Meat Inspection Service. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has not been offered. The Senator does not need to request unanimous consent to withdraw it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that motion so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not have an opportunity to read the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I submitted an amendment which would have provided \$2,500 for a part-time veterinarian to inspect meat at the Seattle stockyards. I have the assurance of those who are familiar with this program that out of the three-thousand-two-hundred-some-odd inspectors we ought to be entitled to at least one inspector at the union stockyards in Seattle.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not sure that the Senator should withdraw his amendment. I am of the opinion that if his amendment is a good amendment it should be carried to conference. The Seattle Union Stockyards deal primarily, so far as the inspection of cattle is concerned, with cattle on the hoof. It is not a question of meat grading. The city of Seattle takes care of that by ordinance. It has to do with this cattle which come into the country from Canada. Shipments from Canada into the United States are not covered by the interstate commerce provisions. It is upon that basis that the Department of Agriculture has refused to place an inspector in the union stockyards at Seattle. I do not think it would be wholly out of order for the Senator from Washington to press his amendment and, of successful, to have the Senate conferees carry it to conference. If that is desirable to the Senator from Washington, I think the provision for \$2,500 should be voted on by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is not in order at this time. The amendment was ordered to be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not want to embarrass the subcommittee, because the chairman assured me that there would be sufficient meat inspectors to provide one for Seattle. I make the point that this involves an international program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that there will be a sufficient number of meat inspectors to take care of all demands from all over the country. Certainly if there is a slaughtering proposition involved, or if it involves a packing house, the Senator from Washington is entitled to an inspector. It would not make any difference whether the cow came from Canada or from the moon. The Government would be responsible, of course. If it is a question of inspecting cattle on the hoof, it is an entirely different proposition. Certainly we are inspecting cattle which comes into the country from Mexico, and certainly the rule which applies to the border of Mexico should apply to the border at Canada.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would the Senator be willing to take the amendment to conference?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would have no objection to taking it to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington cannot offer his amendment now. It is not in order until all committee amendments have been disposed of.

UNJUSTIFIED INCREASES IN THE PRICE LEVEL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take 3 or 4 minutes on an extraneous subject matter. I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks I shall now make printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the debate today on the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a cartoon which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. The cartoon is by Herblock; and in a very real sense I think it constitutes the finest, most penetrating "speech" I have observed thus far on the entire economic problem which confronts the country. Even though the "speech" is in cartoon form, it says a great deal; it says something to which the American people and, particularly, the administration, should give heed.

I understand from newspaper reports that the President of the United States perhaps will make a statement later this week in regard to our economic problems. If the President does, I am sure the speech he makes will demonstrate very careful study and thought in regard to what in my opinion is a current economic crisis.

The cartoon to which I have referred shows Uncle Sam in the process of being fitted to a new pair of shoes. The salesman, however, has gotten his boxes mixed, obviously, because he is presenting to Uncle Sam one shoe which is

marked "War footing"—and that is shown as a high shoe—and another shoe marked "Partial mobilization"—and that shoe is shown in the cartoon as an oxford, whereas the shoe that Uncle Sam is shown to have taken off is marked "Business as usual."

Mr. President, I wish to present very briefly to the Senate a price problem which is becoming a great emergency in the United States as the hours go by. Over the week end and during most of today I have been gathering information in regard to what is happening to the price structure in the United States. Certainly there is no scarcity of foodstuffs. For that matter, there is no scarcity of a large quantity of the items which the fear of a spreading war have caused to rise to a price level which can honestly be characterized as a profiteering price level.

I happen to be one who thinks it too bad that in a period of hysteria which is sweeping our country, caused by fears which apparently many consumers entertain as to the possible scarcity of goods, once again great economic forces are collecting blood money from the American people; yet that is what they are doing because of the great inflationary changes in the price level which are occurring in the United States.

For instance, Mr. President, let us consider meat. There is no scarcity of meat. There is ample meat in the storage houses of the United States today. Let the great meat packers justify if they can—but they cannot—the increases in meat prices which the meat packers are guilty of imposing upon the American people in the last few days. Mr. President, it is profiteering. It is the collection of blood money. It is a tariff imposed upon the American consumers because the fear of a spreading war is creeping into the minds of many American consumers.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was going to ask the Senator whether in his judgment there is any scarcity of eggs, either. Yet only recently the price of eggs has been raised 3 cents a dozen.

Mr. MORSE. There is no scarcity, so far as I can determine from such research as I have been able to conduct; and I intend to continue it on a personal basis until the Congress does what I think it should do.

So far as I can determine, there is no scarcity in the case of any of the foodstuffs which have been subjected to the unconscionable price increases which have occurred in the past few days.

Again, Mr. President, the explanation is simply that certain economic forces are taking advantage of the American consumers. In my judgment it is time we took action to stop the profiteering which already is characterizing the price structure.

I think the meat packers have something to answer for in connection with the increases in meat prices which are occurring in the United States. I hope the President will have something to say about that, if it is true—as I judge from the ticker—that he is going to make a

statement on the over-all policy of the administration in regard to economic controls during this period of time.

Mr. President, in my judgment we have no right to sit here as a Congress and see the American consumers suffer the losses that this inflationary spiral, represented by the unconscionable increases in food prices during the last few days, is causing them at the present time. I think it is already a little late for the administration to be talking about imposing some reasonable checks which will have some power of restraint over the sources of supply of food. I think it is a little late for the administration to be taking such steps, but perhaps it is better to have it done late rather than not at all.

Mr. President, I do not like controls; but let us face the fact that we had better do some checking with respect to some of the basic commodities which determine the standard of living of our people. Let us realize that we must put in the stop now on the basic commodities—such as meat, for example. I think it is simply outrageous that the average housewife has been subjected to such price increases. For instance, this morning I received from my own State a report in regard to meat prices in Oregon. If we go into the matter, I think we shall find that there is a uniform national pattern, a jiggling up of the price structure on some of the basic food commodities. I think we must face the fact that we should establish some checks on a few of the basic commodities in the field of food.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, in a moment. After I yield to the Senator from South Carolina, I wish to say something about some other commodities, commodities outside the field of food.

I simply wish to say that it is no answer to talk about voluntary controls in the case of the basic commodities, Mr. President. Voluntary controls constitute a nice theory; but where are the voluntary controls? The meat packers certainly have it within their power to put some voluntary controls into operation. However, they have not done so. Perhaps after they get the prices up to an even more unconscionable level than the present price level, the meat packers may wish to try to stop us from doing what we should do in the interest of the people; at that time the meat packers may try to prevent such action by suggesting some voluntary controls. However, by that time we shall have to deal with a roll-back on prices, rather than a stabilization of the prices then existing—prices which, for example, the meat packers already will have gotten up.

Now I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has said he does not like controls. Let me say that I do not like controls, either. Certainly I hope it will not be necessary to have a system of rationing.

I wish to say that I expect the Banking and Currency Committee to begin

an investigation of price increases. As the Senator from Oregon knows, that committee is charged with the duty of making studies of all matters relating to prices. I have asked the committee to meet on Thursday, following the President's address on Wednesday to the Congress, and following his address on Wednesday night to the people. So our committee will be studying the price increases which have occurred in the last few days.

I hope it will not be necessary to have rationing. I have always been opposed to rationing.

However, I hope the American people will keep their heads clear and their feet on the ground, and will not be stampeded into hoarding sugar or other commodities—as has been reported recently in the newspapers—and I hope the producers of the various commodities will not attempt because of the tragedy occurring in Korea, to take advantage in the way the Senator from Oregon has discussed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have great confidence in the Senator from South Carolina and in the Banking and Currency Committee, and I am sure they will do what is desirable to be done on the basis of the facts presented to the committee. It is good news to hear that the Senator from South Carolina intends in his committee to proceed to investigate this matter, beginning next Thursday. However, I think it is time that a few of us on the floor of the Senate issued some warnings to the business forces in the United States which are taking advantage of the war situation by jacking up to unconscionable levels the prices of commodities which are not even scarce.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. MORSE. Certain business forces are attempting to take that step because they have control over the distribution of such commodities. For instance, this morning I talked to three butchers in Washington, D. C. They informed me that they cannot tell what their meat will cost them next week. One of them told me of the increases in the wholesale price of hams cited to him by his wholesaler since last week. Yet, as the Senator from South Carolina knows, there has been nothing to produce any scarcity in hams, nothing which would justify an increase in the price of hams in less than a week. There is only one word by which to describe that action, and it is a nasty word: It is the word "profiteering."

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. MORSE. It is profiteering at the expense of the fears of American mothers and fathers, and it is profiteering at the expense of the blood which is being shed by American boys in Korea.

Believe me, Mr. President, I am going to make my voice heard for a few minutes today on the floor of the Senate in opposition to that kind of unconscionable economic conduct on the part of any group within our citizenry—whether it be the meat packers or any others.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me point out that even the price of bread has been raised 1 cent.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. It is good news to me that the increase in prices is not charged to the price-support program. In fact, if we had had a price-support program in regard to meat, I think we would not be faced with the situation confronting us today as far as meat is concerned.

There is not a surplus of meat today. In fact, the reason we have a scarcity of meat now is that there has been no assurance to the producers that they would be protected against extreme losses. As a result, many livestock producers, and particularly feeders, have either cut down their operations or gone out of business, fearing there would be an extreme price collapse. So we now have many who are out of business who ought to be in business. I think this is a case where lack of a support-price program is more responsible for this price increase than if we have had one.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to say, to my good friend from North Dakota that there is no scarcity in meat, as between last week and this week, which would justify the tremendous increase in the price of meat. That is, the over-all supply of meat to which the Senator from North Dakota has directed attention in no way justifies the increase in the price of meat on the part of wholesalers as compared with the prices last week and the prices being quoted this week. That cannot be justified, and it can be explained only by the fact that those who have control over the channels of distribution of meat are taking a profiteering advantage of the Korean war. I do not like it. I am glad to hear the Senator from South Carolina point out that as chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, he does not like it, and that he proposes to find out the causes for it.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the question of unreasonable price rises is quite as objectionable to the producer, to the farmer, and to the feeder as it is to consumers. I think it is uncalled for and very objectionable from a long-range farmer viewpoint. Producers are always hurt by extreme price fluctuations.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from North Dakota is absolutely right. If a poll were taken of the cattlemen, sheepmen, hog raisers, and other producers of livestock, they would express the same sort of resentment which the Senators from North Dakota, South Carolina, and Oregon are expressing this afternoon on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

RECORD for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the communications from Justice Bottomly were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MONTANA,
SUPREME COURT,
Helena, June 1, 1950.

Re Waterton-Belly Rivers.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: As you know, I have been working for over 2 years on the matter of getting a reference before the International Commission, American-Canadian Border, for a division and settlement of the waters of the Waterton-Belly Rivers.

These two rivers originate in Glacier National Park, in Montana, flow north between two ranges across the international border into Canada. The approximate flow is 400,000 acre-feet. If all this flow could be put on land for irrigation it would mean that it would cover 400,000 acres 1 foot deep. About 1 to 2 inches is all that is needed for irrigation for row crops, but three to five applications are needed during the growing season.

Now the Canadians started some 3 years ago to get going on putting this water on their land. They are now engaged in building a dam on the Belly. They have a canal surveyed to bring the water of the Waterton into the Belly above said dam. Then they will divert the water as far east through Alberta into Saskatchewan. Their Canadian Government has entered into the picture and has authorized expenditures for the whole project.

Our Reclamation Bureau has made some surveys—the idea is to make a treaty with Canada. Then the Bureau, if authorized, would build a high dam on the Belly with Canada and store all this water, then divert our equitable share through a natural sag or draw, a gravity flow canal into Montana about where Sweet Grass is, then take the water both east and west from there onto the land. Mr. Sloan has said this is the most feasible program.

I do not need to elaborate to you what an asset 200,000 acres of irrigated land would mean to Montana and the Nation in raising food and livestock. I am enclosing a copy of an editorial and news articles on that feature.

Either Canada gets this forever and our acres parch forever or we get an equitable share and we have a producing asset forever.

This matter has been before the International Commission for over a year. It has been charged by some that the Canadians are arbitrary in this matter; that they are dragging their feet and won't agree to anything, hoping to delay the matter without action until they get this water on their land—then it would be practically impossible for the United States to ever get a drop.

I don't think, at least I hope, that this is not the attitude of the Canadians. We have always had the most friendly relations with the Canadians, and I am confident that when we make this matter clear to them they will be fair to us, and the good-neighbor relations between our State and the Canadians across the border will continue as they have in the past.

The Commission is holding two meetings in Montana in June, at Shelby June 12, then at Havre June 17, and two meetings at Canadian points. It is to be hoped that we may be able to work out this problem with our Canadian friends in a spirit of justice and fair play.

The other alternative for us to get this water is to drill an all-American tunnel

through the mountains and also build a dam across Waterton Lake along the boundary line and bring the water to our parched land, but this is a very expensive proposition. Nevertheless, it is well known that we do not stop at expense when we recognize that a program is indispensable to the protection of our rights. A bill has been introduced in Congress to drill this tunnel, but I think we should delay action on that measure while we undertake to convince the Canadians of the justice of our position. If the Canadians act fairly in this matter, it will avoid a heavy expense on us which we would have to bear in order to protect our interests.

As you can see, JIM, time is of the essence, and a determination should be made soon if we expect any water. You know Mr. Valance, an attorney in the State Department who handles these matters, is here now gathering information and arranging for the meetings. He is keen and alert to the situation. I hope you can contact him upon his return to Washington after these hearings. I told him that the time had come to act firmly in this matter and let our neighbors across the border understand that we intend to insist on a fair division of this water, and that unless they acquiesce we will be compelled to take such action as is necessary to protect our interests.

I think some speeches should be made in both the House and Senate, explaining this situation in detail so that the public may understand the problem. I have written Senator Langer as his State is interested in controlling the Red River, another border stream. All these questions clear across the country along the border should be handled together as one problem, not piecemeal. Am enclosing copy of my letter to him.

Thank you to give attention to this, JIM, as it appears to me to be not only an international question but one of the biggest matters for the good of Montana in particular and for the country as a whole.

Sincerely yours,

R. V. BOTTOMLY.

MAY 27, 1950.

Re Tidelands and Waterton and Belly Rivers.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am writing to you as I know you always recognize the equities in a case. You may not know but I was one of three attorneys general of the States who fought in every way I could the so-called tidelands steal, which you had a lot to do with in helping to defeat and in sustaining the President's veto. I notice you will again have the matter before you.

Two years ago while I was attorney general I prepared a brief on the subject and, thinking it might be of some use to you, I am enclosing a copy. I have just recently had a letter from Harold Ickes, to whom I had submitted a copy and asked him, if, as an administrator, he thought that my analysis was valid and correct as to the bill now in Congress. He answered, stating that it was as valid today as when written, in his opinion. I would like your reaction to my brief at your convenience.

Now as to the Belly-Waterton Rivers: These rivers arise in Glacier National Park, Mont., flow north into Canada between two ranges, and fed by the perpetual snows, glaciers, and rains, they flow into Canada at the crossing of the international boundary. There is a flow of approximately 400,000 acre-feet.

Montana has hundreds of thousands of acres of arid land, superior soils, just east of the Rocky Mountain range, which with this water would be converted into a perpetual, highly productive garden, producing

row crops, fibers, alfalfa, and feed crops for livestock for all time to come.

The Bureau of Reclamation has reported that by building a high dam on the Waterton near Lethbridge, Alberta, diverting the Belly into the Waterton by short canal, the equitable share flowing from the United States could be diverted back into the United States by gravity through a natural depression at a very economical figure.

The other alternative is to drive a tunnel through the mountains and bring the water onto the lands, but at a very high cost. This matter is now before the International Commission for adjustment but the Canadians are arbitrary and are working feverishly to perfect an irrigation works, construct dams, and divert and put all this water on their lands before a decision can be reached through the Commission. The Commissioners are holding two hearings on this matter in Montana, one at Shelby, June 12, and one at Havre, June 17, and two in Canada.

Mr. Valance, attorney for the United States Department in Charge of United States-Canada Border Problems, is now here. I have known him for years. He is keen and knows the works.

I have been working for over 2 years on this matter. The magnitude of this problem is set forth in an enclosed editorial and article.

The reason I am writing is that time is of the essence herein. We don't want to lose this water which is a great national asset as well as a great benefit to Montana, as the editorial sets forth.

Now the Red River in Canada and your State needs controlling. From this side of the international line there isn't much that this country can do, but our Government could participate with Canada in building dams or other works to arrest the flood menace and as a part of the consideration Canada should consent to an equitable division of our Waterton-Belly waters. In other words, it is my theory that all waters of the international border should be considered as one problem clear across the board by the International Commission, instead of piecemeal and dealing with each matter separately.

The Canadians have been very arbitrary in this matter, bluntly telling the United States that if we think we can get this water go ahead and take it. They know the only way we can take it is by tunneling through the mountains. The cost would be terrific unless figured on a hundred-year basis. But with their consent we could, if the Senate approved by treaty, assist in building the high dam near Lethbridge and divert the water to our lands with very moderate expense.

Mr. Valance will return to Washington after these hearings, and I hope you can get together and go over this matter, as both projects are of utmost importance to the States concerned and to the United States also. This has been written hurriedly; hope you get my idea. I am also writing our Senator, JAMES E. MURRAY.

Sincerely yours,

R. V. BOTTOMLY.

JOHN J. MUCCIO, UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR TO KOREA

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD a release which the Secretary of State has authorized of a telegram sent by him, by direction of the President, to the Honorable John J. Muccio, United States Ambassador to the Republic of Korea. It gives me a special pleasure to ask for this insertion in the RECORD because of the fact that Ambassador Muccio is a personal friend of mine and a fellow Rhode Islander.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
July 13, 1950.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson has sent the following message to the Honorable John J. Muccio, United States Ambassador to the Republic of Korea:

"The President has asked me to extend to you and to your staff his appreciation and commendation for your courageous and effective performance of duty since the onset of the present emergency in Korea.

"Your prompt and accurate reporting of the situation, the dispatch and efficiency with which you carried out the evacuation of the many American citizens for whom you were responsible, and the confidence which you have inspired in the face of the unprovoked aggression against Korea are in the finest tradition of the Foreign Service."

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate finishes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SUGGESTED 10-PERCENT ADDITION TO TAXES FOR MILITARY PURPOSES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes to make a suggestion concerning the war effort.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the threat of becoming involved in a world war is now greater than the threat that confronted us in 1940. In that year the Congress authorized an expansion of our Military Establishment, provided for a draft of manpower, and passed a special tax bill to help finance that preparedness program.

That tax bill, which I helped frame, provided that commencing the first of the following calendar year and continuing for a period of 5 years all taxpayers should add 10 percent to their tax bills and that the funds so created should be placed in a special trust fund to be used exclusively for military purposes.

In this emergency I suggest reenactment of that law to become effective January 1, 1951, but exempting this time all excise taxes since they are still at the full war rate. Such a tax, applied only to personal and corporate income would raise in special defense money approximately \$2,000,000,000 a year at the current rate of national income. It would not be retroactive on anyone because provision could be made for those reporting on a fiscal year basis to apply the increase only to that portion earned in calendar 1951.

At the present time the top effective personal income rate is 82 percent, but the 10-percent increase would not fall as heavily on those in the top brackets as might appear at first glance because of the law passed several years ago to permit husband and wife to divide the family income. That provision gave substantial tax relief to married persons with joint incomes up to \$400,000. For those in that category the present top

effective rate of 82 percent applies only to that portion of income above \$200,000 and the additional 10 percent would not be a 10-percent addition to the rate, but merely 10 percent of the computed tax liability.

I have received letters and have read editorials in the Virginia newspapers indicating that Congress should act promptly to put the Nation on a full war footing. In my opinion, such a step is not now required, and would be calculated to do more harm than good. It was difficult enough to make OPA work during World War II. It was impossible to make it work a year after the war ended. There is an abundance of food, of clothing, and of many other consumer items, and no occasion to ration their distribution. It might be wise to give the President stand-by powers to allocate steel, which is so essential to the war effort, although I am confident that it can be accomplished by a voluntary agreement. It might be advisable to give the Federal Reserve Board stand-by powers to control consumer credit, which now is at an all-time high; but that likewise, to a large extent, could be accomplished by voluntary cooperation between banks and the merchants whose commercial paper they handle.

Undoubtedly, the best and safest way to control the issuance of too much new money through deficit financing and the inflationary pressure of that new money is to absorb at least a part of it through taxation. Aside from that desirable result, it will be inviting ultimate financial disaster if we run the national debt to such large proportions that confidence will be lost in Government bonds. In the budget now pending, there is a potential deficit of four or five billion dollars; and that budget carries no appropriation for more than \$5,000,000,000 of E bonds or savings bonds which will mature next year, the assumption being that those now holding those bonds will buy new ones. Should that assumption not materialize, a terrific strain would be placed upon the commercial bond market in refinancing that obligation.

Although the time may come when we shall be forced to put our entire economy on a war footing, the first step in that direction undoubtedly is taxes; and many patriotic citizens will gladly pay additional taxes if the law imposing them provides that they shall be sequestered for military purposes only, and not made available for unnecessary domestic spending.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment, which was passed over yesterday, in the Department of Agriculture section of the appropriation bill, on page 221, beginning in line 19.

ENDING THE COLD WAR—IV

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, for many weeks past I have addressed the Senate on the subject of winning and

ending the cold war. The cold war has now become a hot one, which is the way in which we had every reason to believe the cold war would end, in view of the fact that we never fought it with intelligence and energy. Had we done so, the Politburo would have been weaker at home than it is now, and the free world would have been stronger in this emergency than it now shows itself to be.

We have ahead of us the long, grinding months of making up, by the expenditure of billions of dollars and how many lives we cannot estimate, for the lack of engaging the enemy on the field where he was deployed—the field of the minds and loyalties of men.

In concluding this series of observations I wish to refer briefly to two recent opportunities for successful engagement with the enemy from which some advantage may yet be salvaged, although the full advantage of the opportunity has been lost.

Let me first call attention to the semi-humorous but deadly serious charge of strewing potato bugs over the farms of eastern Germany, which charge, being practically uncontested, was later enlarged to include Czechoslovakia as well. I referred to this in a hearing on Senate Resolution 243 before the Foreign Relations Committee. I said:

Why should not this accusation bring from us an offer to donate free of charge X tons of DDT to the potato growers of East Prussia? This chemical not only killed the bugs in Aroostook County, Maine, but it likewise destroyed other parasites and hindered the spread of most diseases the potato plant is afflicted with.

We have nothing but good wishes and good will for the people of east Germany. Why not express it in this light-hearted and practical way. Undertakings of this sort should be part and parcel of the measures to be undertaken under Senate Resolution 243.

The serious and dangerous undertone to this silly accusation should be clear to all. Potato bugs and disease germs are too closely parallel to be ignored. To have let the accusation go with a simple denial, and without taking advantage of the possibilities for human appeal in the thing, leads us one step further toward new savageries in modern warfare. But there is still another lost battle of even greater significance.

Mr. President, I refer to a serious and effective offensive on the battlefield of ideas which was launched at the so-called World Peace Congress in Stockholm on March 15-19, 1950, held under the chairmanship of Frederic Joliot-Curie, the French Nobel prize winner. For the record, the American attendance at this so-called Peace Congress should be noted. The delegates were Mr. J. Rogge, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States and a vice chairman of the conference; the artist Rockwell Kent; the writer Albert Kahn; and Mr. Johannes Steel, vice president of the Progressive Party.

The ingeniousness of the work done by this Peace Congress is to be found in the wording of the manifesto which they produced. I quote:

We demand the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon as a weapon of intimidation and mass extermination of people.

We demand the establishment of strict international control over the implementation of this decision.

We consider that the government which first uses the atomic weapon against any other country will commit a crime against humanity and shall be regarded as a war criminal.

We call upon all people of good will all over the world to sign this appeal.

Why should not such a manifesto appeal to people all over the world, and why should not millions and millions of people attach their signatures to it?

Mr. President, it was calculated some little time ago that something over 130,000,000 signatures have been attached to this manifesto. Since that time other millions have signed. A news item shortly before the invasion of South Korea indicated that one and one-half million had signed north of the thirty-eighth parallel. The Russians know how to devise a good idea, spread it, broadcast, and make it effective. We do not. As a result, millions of people behind the iron curtain and in the missionary areas where Communist propaganda is at work are led to class Russia as being a peace-loving country, and the United States becomes more firmly settled than ever in the popular mind as being the world's warmonger.

But now let us see where we can get hold of this Russian declaration whose possibilities we could turn to the advantage of the free world. The second paragraph of the manifesto reads:

We demand the establishment of strict international control over the implementation of this decision.

Is not this an acceptance of the United Nations plan?

Mr. President, let us take them up. Let us take them up. Let us take them up. Is not that exactly what we have been asking for? Talk about folly—how can we have the folly to allow these millions of signatures to be attached to a petition for doing what we have been trying to persuade the Russians to do from the very start of our negotiations over the use of the atomic bomb? What is the matter with us? Are we thinking about something else than war or peace? Have we gone into senile decay?

It is not too late now for the State Department, by world-wide broadcast and direct diplomatic action, to take Russia up on her new and our old proposal for the control of the A-bomb.

Mr. President, we wait to see whether that Department remains a dangerous liability or charts for us a new course of effective service to our national interest and to the safety of the free nations of the globe.

So much for opportunities whose full possibilities have been missed but from which some advantage to the free world may still be drawn. In concluding, Mr. President, I wish to refer to earlier proposals of mine which become more timely, more necessary, now that the cold war has reached the boiling point.

Let me first refer to a highly significant piece of information. A friend of mine has in his employ on his farm, a family of Latvian DP's. Their history

is incredible. The family itself escaped to western Germany some little time ago. The father, months before, had been seized and taken to a work camp in far Siberia. From that work camp he escaped and made his way mostly on foot over the thousands of miles of Russia, Poland, and eastern Germany until he crossed the border into western Germany and rejoined his family. In all those thousands of miles he sought and obtained nightly food and shelter wherever he might chance to find himself. In province after province of Russia itself as well as in Poland and eastern Germany he found everywhere families and farm houses who were willing to give shelter and aid to a fugitive.

What a story this is. It means that all along these weary miles there was no one so convinced of the virtues of the Politburo that it was felt to be a duty to give up a fugitive to the authorities. Only a strong sense of hostility to the existing Russian Government could have persuaded these hundreds of citizens to have risked reprisals and punishment in giving that shelter. Is not this one story, this single incident, and eye-opener as to the mental and spiritual background of the people against which the Russian Government has to operate within its own territories?

Another evidence is to be found in the great numbers of political prisoners which that government has found it necessary to put away from normal living. Reliable estimates have put these numbers at 9,000,000, excluding women and criminals. When we consider that the total adult male population—between the ages of 18 and 55—is somewhere around 90,000,000, we come up with the astonishing figure that about 15 percent of those adult males are in prison camps. Does that indicate that the Russian people are solidly behind the Russian Government?

If it was advisable to get in touch with the Russian people by the Voice of America and by other means while the cold war was still on, it is a thousand times more advisable now, when our only hope of getting out of this thing without great loss of treasure, lives, and liberties lies in giving the Politburo so much trouble at home as to seriously limit their ability to foment trouble abroad.

From now on the Voice of America must direct itself narrowly and sharply to the present emergency. It must go on the spiritual offensive. It must tell the Russian people that whereas the Western World has been giving freedom to its colonies and conquered peoples, we see their Government rolling over nation after nation, never daring to trust its cause to the choice of the people, but always capturing territory by subversive minorities and force of arms. Against this, in its latest and most flagrant form, the invasion of South Korea, the free world has had to rise in defense of free men everywhere.

The second point which must be hammered home is that there does not exist in the free world, any group anywhere which has anything but friendly feeling for the Russian people. Nowhere is

there to be found a nation or a political party or any important individuals who want anything which the Russian people have. What we want for them is the blessings of freedom which we have been enjoying and of which their Government has deprived them and of which it now seeks to deprive the whole world.

We are friends of the Russian people. The insane lust for conquest which possesses their Government is going to impose on the Russian people new hardships, new dangers, new deprivation of the good things of life and of spiritual freedom. Their only enemy is their own Government.

Hitler knew and the Politburo knows how to affect the minds and hearts of men. They did it by the simple telling of simple lies over and over and over again. We can do as much. Rather, we can do more by adopting their technique but with a different message. We can tell the truth in simple, understandable, and straightforward terms over and over and over and over again. The time has come for that.

On this floor in the months past I have from time to time suggested the use of such unconventional means of reaching the Russian people as the employment of free balloons dropping messages of good will over the thousands of square miles of Russian territory. These messages will not lie rotting in the fields and streets. They will be passed from hand to hand. They likewise should be simple, primarily pictorial, and reiterate in varying form but with unvarying persistence the fact that we of the Western World have a common cause with the people of Russia. We are not against them. We are for them. Their hope for the future lies in our success. Our failure condemns them to permanent slavery.

Mr. President, when I have made this suggestion in times past it has been intimated to me strongly that this is not a proper diplomatic procedure—that a Nation which undertakes this is violating the sovereignty of the holy preserves of the Politburo. We have passed the period of striped-pantie etiquette. When the North Korean armies and armament swept south over the thirty-eighth parallel, these rules of formal procedure went into the ash can. Does the State Department know that yet? If not, someone should tell them.

There is one final and tremendously powerful means of reaching the people of Russia, and of the satellite countries behind the curtain, which remains to be described. There are many thousands of liberty-loving patriots gathered on our side of the curtain. They are biting their nails and eating their hearts out. They will not serve for pay as employees of our Government. They will, with sufficient support and with missions to perform, risk their lives and the lives of their wives and children on missions into the heart of the Politburo country. These men must be put to work.

Mr. President, by means such as I have just described and by other means yet to be devised in the light of developments as they appear, we can shorten the hot war.

We can save billions in treasure, and an unknown number of lives of men in our own country and abroad who know what freedom is and who have found its taste so sweet that they are willing to die for it.

Mr. STENNIS and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

THE KOREAN CRISIS AND MEASURES TO AVOID WORLD WAR III

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we are being rapidly pushed toward a general war that will threaten our national existence. Neither diplomacy, negotiation, nor wishful thinking will avoid it. Our only hope is to show our utmost in strength, and a grim and unfaltering determination to see things through.

In my opinion there are two definite steps that can be taken that will greatly lessen the chances for a general world-wide war, and win it, should that war come anyway. Without these steps being taken, a general war of almost unbearable length and suffering is certain. The first step is all-out support in men and materials in the Korean war by every member of the United Nations who opposes Soviet aggression. The second step is to go on a wartime production basis in the United States. These two moves are dependent one on the other and will present a force in the world never before known.

The United States failed properly to support the League of Nations and we were thus charged with its failure, and the resulting debacle of World War II. Realizing our mistake, and also appreciating new world conditions, we launched forth in an entirely new and strong position in world affairs, and helped formulate the United Nations, and from its beginnings we have supported this great world movement without stint and without trying to play a dominating role. For this we do not deserve, nor do we claim any special credit.

Further, in recognition of the war-depleted conditions of many of our fellow members in the United Nations, we have sponsored for several years, and still sponsor an economic recovery program that covers most of western Europe. This has been at a cost of billions of dollars to us. Also, a like program has been extended to other areas of the world. For this we do not deserve, nor do we claim any special credit.

Further still, in recognition of their present need for assistance, and in reliance on their honor and integrity, we have sponsored and financed a huge military assistance program to all the Atlantic Pact nations and to other extended areas, including Korea. For all of this we do not deserve, nor do we claim any special credit.

At the call of the United Nations we immediately rushed men, planes, goods, and guns to far-distant Korea, to stop the brutal attacks of the communistic hordes. Our money is being spent, our material is being consumed, and more, our men are dying by the day, by the week.

This is the test. Where is the actual support from our United Nations allies?

Where is the ground support? Where are even the firm promises of something tangible and definite that can be counted on? Week has followed week, but little definitely has been done, and little has been furnished. The call has gone forth to the United Nations members by Secretary General Lie. What is the response?

I know that over-all plans have to be made and then men and materials available have to be fitted into this plan in the most effective manner and places. This requires time. But firm pledges can be forthcoming immediately. I am not unmindful of the absolute necessity of having strong forces available at other strategic and in highly important areas of the world. As to other members of the United Nations, the impossible is not expected; the unreasonable is not demanded.

However, in this world crisis, no member nation of the United Nations should be the final judge of the extent of their obligations, nor of their ability to perform these obligations.

Each member nation can at least submit all the pertinent facts as to their ability and as to their surrounding situation to the over-all governing authorities of the United Nations, and let this over-all group decide what is reasonable support for each nation to furnish. Regardless of danger spots elsewhere, there would be a tremendous world-wide psychological power behind an all-out, all-flag, united effort in Korea. Let the other member-nation flags be unfurled and take their places alongside the Stars and Stripes, with the blue and white flag of the United Nations.

This is the test. We have met the call. Shall the United Nations continue as a reality, as an active force to be felt, or shall it continue only as a plan on paper? We, the people of the United States, are entitled to know. If we do not have an effective United Nations, then we are entitled to know that also. Then we shall make other plans. In the realm of practical affairs, we shall have little or no choice, except to abandon the United Nations, withdraw our own commitments, and travel along the road, the hard road of mere self-preservation.

But even granting the most hopeful results from the developments from other members of the United Nations, it is still a painful fact that we must go largely on a war economy. Time saved now in doing so will mean blood and misery and lives saved in months and years to come.

We hate controls, we hate regimentation. They hazard our freedom. I appreciate the fact that if we go into controls, it is possible we shall never come out from under controls. But if we do not go in, we may never come through as a nation. I appreciate the fact that in a long war, we could lose our form of government, even if we did not lose the war; and we could well lose the capitalistic system even if we did not lose the war. However, it seems clear to me that in order to preserve this very personal freedom, this capitalistic system, and this, our cherished form of government, it is absolutely necessary to have these hated controls, and the sooner, the

better. By controls, I mean the effective control of wages, of prices, of materials, of manpower, and of production, and with an excess profits tax that actually chokes off excessive war profits.

The industrial production of the United States is the most powerful war factor in the world today. It turned the tide in World War II, to put it in motion will perhaps prevent an all-out world war III. Our failure to meet the obligation of effectively using this production as our most powerful war weapon will be nothing less than criminal negligence.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 221, line 22, it is proposed to strike out the word "authorize" and to insert in line 23 the words "authorized by Congress."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, last night I raised the question with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as to whether the committee amendment would permit the preparation of motion-picture films and other propaganda in behalf of the Brannan plan. I was somewhat concerned about the words "relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department." They might refer to a propaganda program authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture. It seemed to me that we should make it perfectly clear that what we propose to do is with reference to programs authorized by Congress.

I may say that I have checked the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. It is true that this proviso has been in every appropriation bill for the past 4 or 5 years. In my opinion, if the committee amendment were not adopted, the power to make such motion pictures would exist in the Commodity Credit Corporation, anyway, in all probability, so that even if we strike out the amendment I doubt that we would change substantially the powers. But if the Senator from Georgia will be willing, by accepting my amendment, to make it clear, which I understand is his own position, that it is not intended in any way to authorize Brannan-plan propaganda, I myself should have no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I stated on yesterday that it was my construction of the language that it permitted only the dissemination of information authorized by Congress. That is still my construction of the language. I have no objection to the amendment to the committee amendment. I find that films which have been made are those which deal principally with the farm program, such as the dissemination of information through the Extension Service. I think

the distinguished Senator from Ohio is unduly suspicious, but I am perfectly willing to accept his amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The point which the Senator from Georgia made last is that to which I was going to refer. As I understand, all these moving-picture films have been with respect to programs which have been authorized directly by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to read a list of the motion pictures which have been produced up to this time:

Brucellosis, which portrays methods for eradicating the disease on the farms.

Outbreak, a historical documentary film recording how previous outbreaks of this dread plague have been eradicated and suggesting vigilance against the disease at all times.

Today's Chicks, a film to show the farmer how healthy baby chicks are produced by cooperating hatcherymen under the national poultry improvement plan.

Forest Fire Behavior, a film to convey knowledge of fire behavior and action which may be taken toward control.

Black Stem Rust, a film to explain the nature of stem rust, how it damages small grain, and how it may be controlled through elimination of barberry bushes.

It's No Picnic, dealing with the nature and damage by forest fires, the various causes thereof, and specific ways in which forest fires can be prevented.

Dead Out, a two-reel film on forest burning in the Southeast, showing how to burn brush and grass safely.

Blister Rust Control, a series of six pictures on this disease attacking the pine forests of the country, one picture dealing with the life history of the disease and its control in a general way, and one picture for each of five regions in the country on the value of the pine and the specific problems in each region.

I may say further, Mr. President, that I have an extract from the House report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1943 which was passed in the calendar year 1942. It states that the consolidation was a part of the economies to be effected in order to help the war effort, and that it was provided in the bill as an economy measure and not to propagandize the Brannan plan or any other controversial question. However, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if these moving pictures are made solely in the Office of Information. I should like to know whether or not any other moving pictures have been made by any other division besides the Office of Information. Does the Senator have the record on that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, up to now all the pictures have been made by the Office of Information.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator positively state that as a fact?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. That was my understanding. I do not know it to be a fact.

Mr. WHERRY. I am very much interested in this amendment. The House must have stricken out this provision for some reason. I agree it has been in the appropriation bill since 1943. However, this year the House deleted it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The House did not strike it out. It went out on a point of order. One Member of the House made a point of order against a number of provisions of the bill, and under the peculiar rules of the House of Representatives they were all subject to the point of order, and they all went out. We restored most of them. This is the only one as to which there has been any controversy up to now.

Mr. WHERRY. At page 267 of the House hearings justification is given for these programs. The Department of Agriculture makes this statement:

The primary functions of the Office of Information are (1) over-all coordination of all information work in the Department and (2) final editing and clearance of all publications and releases of information to the public. The Office provides a service to the Department and its constituent agencies designed to assist farmers, organizations, and institutions interested in agriculture, and the public at large, by providing factual information on results of agricultural research work, trends in agricultural production, prices, and consumption, the scope of agricultural programs and policies, and similar information which will assist farmers and the public to obtain useful knowledge pertaining to the Nation's agriculture.

It goes on to recount the work involved and emphasizes in detail some of it. It seems to me that the language is sufficiently broad to encompass not only the presentation of the Brannan plan, but any other plan which might be hatched by the Department of Agriculture, and it could be publicized not only by the Office of Information but material could be gathered and publicized by other divisions or bureaus, even though the Office of Information did not do so. What does the Senator think about that?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not see anything dangerous in the language to which the Senator has referred. When the Department of Agriculture was established it was designed to be an agency for the purpose of disseminating information pertaining to agriculture. That was its primary purpose. All that has been added to it since then, by way of farm-action programs, has been merely supplemental, because the primary purpose of the Department of Agriculture is to disseminate information pertaining to agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will permit me to say so, I agree with him thoroughly in that statement. So far as research is concerned, I want to go as far as we possibly can. In fact, I should like to go even farther than we have gone. I think research results should be publicized throughout the country for the benefit of farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL. They certainly are not worth anything if they are not publicized.

Mr. WHERRY. This provision, however, raises an entirely different ques-

tion. From the language read, which is the justification by the Department, not only the Brannan plan but any other policy which might be advocated by the Department of Agriculture, though not authorized by Congress, could be publicized to the public generally.

I should like to ask the Senator one more question. On page 358 of the House hearings appears a statement to which I should like to call attention. Has the Senator a copy of the House hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry to say that I have not. My assistant is endeavoring to get a copy of them.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall quote from page 358: "RMA project No. 205. General Economics of Marketing." In 1949 the appropriation was \$13,000. In 1950 the appropriation was \$134,850. I do not have the budget estimate or the amount allocated to 1951. This may be a perfectly legitimate appropriation. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator the reason for the expansion. What is the justification for an increase from \$13,000 in 1949 to \$134,850 in 1950. Does it have anything to do with the information we have been talking about?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe it has the slightest thing to do with it. All research which is carried on by the Research and Marketing Administration must be approved by an outside committee, which is appointed for the purpose of studying the whole research question. It has nothing to do with the Brannan plan, if that is what the Senator has in mind. All research projects which are being carried on in the Department of Agriculture are submitted to the committee. I did not read them to the last detail, but I did scan through the general objectives of the research projects. None of them related to the Brannan plan.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I think this is very important. Are these moving pictures brought up to date? Have any of them been made since those mentioned in the list the Senator read?

Mr. RUSSELL. The motion pictures set forth in the list constitute the entire number which have been produced since the information appropriations for the various bureaus of the Department were consolidated, as they were in 1942. I may say to the Senator that if we adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Taft], which I have agreed to accept so far as I could as chairman of the subcommittee handling the appropriation, there would be a restriction on all these items which would definitely prevent the publication of any propaganda for the Brannan plan. I have been suspicious that that was the purpose of my friend from Ohio.

Secretary Brannan has defended his plan with great vigor and industry all over the Nation. He has made any number of speeches for it, and there has been some question as to the manner in which some of the audiences were assembled. But I have never yet heard any specific

charge that any of the films which have been made were in anywise connected with the Brannan plan. If they had been, when we consider how controversial the Brannan plan is, undoubtedly someone would have written to the Senator from Nebraska or to the Senator from Georgia or some other Senator and said, "I saw a moving picture that is put out to publicize and to support the Brannan plan."

I am not a supporter of the Brannan plan. I am opposed to the philosophy of that plan sponsored by the Secretary of Agriculture, but I concede to him the right to go anywhere he pleases in the United States and make a speech any time he chooses in support of his plan. It may build up some support for the plan in my own State, and it may heap coals on my back in an endeavor to drive me to support the plan. But that is one of the things we will have to face when we come to it. I am not apprehensive that these films will support the Brannan plan, because I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture would adopt that policy, in view of the amendment, and I believe that if he did it would backfire on him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not contending that Secretary Brannan does not have a right to support any plan he desires to, on his own, and to go to the four corners of the United States and speak on it to the public. I am in total agreement with the Senator in that respect. But I do not want the Secretary to use the taxpayers' money in any informational service to publicize a plan he sponsors, unless it is authorized by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Neither do I.

Mr. WHERRY. That is my only apprehension in this matter. I certainly have a right, I believe, to try to make it as clear as I can that we do not want him to do that.

Mr. RUSSELL. No one challenges the Senator's right. I have merely pointed out that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio limits this expenditure to programs approved by the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. That leads to the next question. Does it limit it? It limits it, I think, only to the transfers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is all it limits it to.

Mr. WHERRY. How about limiting it to the full amount. It seems to me that if we put a limit of \$300,000 on the amount which might be transferred from the small agencies to the office of Information, it is just as important to limit the \$1,265,800 which the Office of Information can use for the same purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. My amendment deals only with the particular \$300,000 of the committee amendment. I was dealing with the committee amendment only. If the Senator wants a general limitation, I think it should be offered in an amendment to the bill itself.

Mr. WHERRY. I was going to ask the Senator from Georgia another question. I understand the Senator is not

worried about these funds, and I have a wholesome respect for his judgment, as he knows, so that I am inclined to go along with the Senator's statement. But we are writing in an amendment to limit the authorization for these purposes to \$300,000. If that is wise is it not equally wise that possibly an amendment to the general provision should be inserted, affecting programs authorized by the Congress? Would there be any objection to that?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think that would be splitting hairs to the nth degree. If it would afford any great solace to the Senator from Nebraska, I would not oppose it, but I think it is utterly unnecessary. No instances have been brought forward where the Secretary has used these particular funds for the purpose of propagandizing for the Brannan plan.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator answer my question? If it is necessary for the \$300,000, is it splitting any more hairs to apply it to the general provision?

Mr. RUSSELL. I accepted the amendment in order to allay the fears of the distinguished Senator from Ohio and others.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator allay my fears by inserting—

Mr. RUSSELL. No; am not willing to say before we reach the point where an amendment would be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator reflect on it?

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly will.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel there is any difference, so far as the funds are concerned?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; and to be perfectly frank, my reason for accepting the amendment of the Senator from Ohio was to expedite the business of the Senate. I do not think the amendment makes a particle of difference one way or the other, but I thought it would be better to accept a harmless amendment than to spend 3 or 4 hours on the floor of the Senate discussing this proposition, and having ghosts raised, and the statement made that all this money was going to be used to propagandize the Brannan plan. I am not for the Brannan plan. I have been opposed to it from the day it was announced, but I am not going around with my lance all set to joust with windmills or to attempt to slay dragons which do not exist.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is building up a pretty big bogeyman for me to slay. I ask, is there any difference between limiting the \$300,000 and the \$1,265,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. Technically, I do not see that there is.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the dragon has already been slain, and I ask the distinguished Senator if he will accept an amendment, when the proper time comes, to offer such an amendment to the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be disposed to, if it would be any gratification to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not want to be committed to it now, until I have an op-

portunity to read all the language, to see where it is to be in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator, and I hope he will look with favor upon it, because my opinion is that if we are to try to limit the \$300,000 which may be transferred, it is just as important to apply it to the \$1,265,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it is necessary in either case.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the Senator, but if it is necessary in one case and the Senator permits the amendment there, I ask the distinguished Senator to accept it in the other case.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be happy to look into it, but the amendment will not be in order until we complete action on the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he remembers whether there is a limitation on the amount the Commodity Credit Corporation may spend for publicity purposes, and, if so, what the amount is.

Mr. RUSSELL. Answering off the cuff, without guaranteeing the correctness of the statement, I think the Commodity Credit Corporation is included within the \$300,000 limit, and I think that funds could be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation up to that amount.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator say that if this amendment were voted down and the sound pictures were not permitted to be made in the Secretary's office, he could direct them to be made through the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. RUSSELL. They say as much. They say they have ample authority under the law. These funds are concentrated into the \$300,000 for the purpose of simplifying the bookkeeping. This is a limitation. If we vote this provision out of the bill, they could spend any funds that were available for informational purposes. This amendment tends to achieve the result the Senator from Vermont seeks, in that it puts a limitation on the \$300,000, on the funds which can be spent.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the Senator from Georgia will be proved to be correct in that view, and that the officials will not exceed the authority.

I should like to call the attention of the Senator to just one other matter which I think he can clear up. It is in connection with the provision on page 204, line 21, where the language reads:

Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order No. 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers.

As I understand, the prohibition which was inserted in the law in 1944 prohibits this information for such services at the levels down through the county and the community levels. In last year's appropriation bill, the references to the community and county were omitted. Does the Senator from Georgia understand that the proviso I have just read means that the community and county levels of the PMA are restricted to the answering of inquiries and the supplying of information which properly comes within the scope of their own work?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is correct. The Senator from Vermont knows well that that language has been in the appropriation bills for some 5 or 6 years. I do not recall exactly when it was first inserted.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it was slightly changed last year.

Mr. RUSSELL. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it was changed last year, as I recall.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the Senate undertook to change it, but the House refused to yield, and I think it finally went out of the bill. I do not recall the year, but 5 or 6 years ago the PMA was setting up a great many so-called information centers in its regional and State offices, and a violent controversy arose as between two of the major farm organizations as to the propriety of those offices and the information they were furnishing, one of the farm organizations taking the position that some of the information was designed to aid the other farm organizations. The general complaint was made that it was entirely too expensive. So that limitation was put in originally, as I recall, in the Senate, and it has been in the bill ever since then.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Georgia is chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee. It is not intended, is it, that this proviso should authorize the employment of county information specialists or propagandists, as they are commonly called?

Mr. RUSSELL. It certainly is not intended to employ any propagandists of any kind. It is intended to limit it to actual information as to farming information for the counties. Where they have the clear crop system in counties thousands of questions arise that are necessary to be answered, answers are compelled to be made, and we do not want to shut the farmer off if he will incur a penalty by overplanting by as little as 1 acre.

Mr. AIKEN. I was sure that is what the Senator from Georgia intended. I am happy he has made that point plain. I also want to assure the Senator from Georgia that no one is more concerned in making the PMA and other good agricultural programs work than is the Senator from Vermont. But we all know of instances of efforts being made to use local committees for political purposes, and I for one want to stop that practice so far as possible, regardless of in whose interests they may be used.

Mr. RUSSELL. If any program should be kept on a nonpartisan and

nonpolitical basis it is the farm program. In my judgment the use of any county committee or the use of any farm program for partisan political purposes would be highly reprehensible, whether it was done to help a Republican, or Democrat, or Progressive, or States Righter, I might add.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I understand that concludes the committee amendments to this chapter of the bill. There are some three amendments which have been printed. I have discussed them with their authors and I should like to receive unanimous consent that the printed amendments to this chapter be considered at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the Senator consider my amendment in that group?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to obtain some information on the Senator's amendment before accepting it.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to object to the Senator's request because I should like to help expedite action upon the bill. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. All committee amendments must be acted upon first, unless unanimous consent is obtained to take up other amendments out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the rule under which the Senate is now operating.

Mr. WHERRY. Inasmuch as we have proceeded in that manner with respect to the preceding chapters of the bill, it seems to me we should continue to follow that course unless the amendments in question are very slight. What is proposed to be done by the amendments in question?

Mr. RUSSELL. One of the amendments is to be proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has one, which has been the subject of discussion, and I have obtained information with respect to it. The other one is to be offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. That is a printed amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that the amendment dealing with meat inspection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I have had an opportunity to investigate those three amendments. I have not had an opportunity to investigate the amendment which the Senator from Nebraska intends to propose.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know why my amendment would require very much investigation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it will require much investigation, but I should like to read amendments before I accept them. I should like to read the Senator's amendment before accepting it.

Mr. WHERRY. I should be glad to have my amendment offered last, and the Senator can withhold his consent to

my amendment until he has had an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska has a perfect right to object if he desires. What I just proposed was merely to accommodate Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the request of the Senator from Georgia that, by unanimous consent, the Senate proceed to take up the printed amendments which will be offered from the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, still reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I desire to be constructive about this matter. I am not acting in an arbitrary manner in order to have my amendment accepted. I should like to know, if I can be informed, what the first amendment would do. I know what the last amendment would do. I do not think it would be necessary to have a quorum call to let other Senators know what is to be taken up for consideration. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] what his amendment is.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will permit me, I will explain all three printed amendments. The first amendment, proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma, does not in any wise affect the amount of the appropriated funds. It does permit the Soil Conservation Service, in areas where work is now being carried on, to operate in connection with some lands which are not now eligible because they lie between private lands on which they are doing work and public lands in the area of a stream. The amendment would permit them to complete some phases of the projects which are essential to the operation of the whole. It involves no increase in expenditures. It merely clarifies the authority of the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. WHERRY. Where are the projects located?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think they are located in Texas and Oklahoma. That is my recollection.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, there are 11 States involved: the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Georgia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Iowa, Minnesota, Texas, and California.

Mr. WHERRY. Would this be the beginning merely, and would completion of the work entail some appropriations next year?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if I may, I shall make a brief statement. In the 1946 flood control act, section 13 authorized certain work on, I believe, 11 different projects. That included the projects recommended by the Department of Agriculture. In some of those projects they did not go far enough to permit of treatment of ditches and gulleys. My amendment gives the Department the right to treat ditches and gulleys.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to that amendment, Mr. President. What is the next amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has an amendment which will increase the appropriation for research by \$35,000, so as to deal with an outbreak of a disease at-

tacking the spruce and the beech trees in the White Mountains, as I understand. The Senator from New Hampshire does not have a budget estimate, but we have in the form of dead chestnut trees so many monuments to the delay in proceeding to attack these diseases at their source that I told the Senator from New Hampshire I was willing to accept his amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection, Mr. President, to the consideration of the three amendments which have been referred to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request for consideration of the three amendments? The Chair hears none, and unanimous consent is given.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I submit my amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he will not confer with the junior Senator from Nebraska? I should be glad to show him where in the bill I wish the language of my amendment to be inserted. I should like to do that so he may decide whether he will accept my amendment after the three others have been considered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, my differentiation between these three amendments and the Senator's amendment is not due to any desire to resist the Senator's amendment. It is due to the fact that these three amendments have been printed. If the Senator offers his amendment, other amendments will be offered from the floor, and if we are to accept any such floor amendments we should accept all of them at one time so as not to make fish of one and fowl of the other.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator did for the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] exactly what he is speaking of now.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio was not printed.

Mr. RUSSELL. The parliamentary situation in respect to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio was entirely different. His amendment was an amendment to a committee amendment which had to be passed upon. The Senator from Nebraska proposes to offer an amendment to the text of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Which is not in order; whereas the amendment of the Senator from Ohio was in order, and there was nothing the Senator from Georgia could have done to prevent the Senator from Ohio from offering his amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. But the Senator from Georgia has made a unanimous consent request for consideration of amendments which he will take to conference. I simply ask that my amendment also be taken to conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. I told the Senator from Nebraska I was disposed to accept his amendment, but I should like to look into such matters and at least reasonably understand what I am doing at the time I accept amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Georgia needs no advice with respect to

what he is doing. He is one of our most able Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suppose I should accept the Senator's amendment after that statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I can see no difference between the one and the others. I would deeply appreciate it if the Senator would accept my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first printed amendment coming under the unanimous-consent agreement will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas is as follows:

On page 200, line 14, before the period insert the following: "Provided further, That of the funds available herein, not in excess of \$7,880,000 may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, for necessary gulley control, floodwater detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief statement explanatory of the amendment which has just been adopted.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. The amendment is recommended.
2. The Flood Control Act of 1936 provides that improvement of rivers and other waterways for flood control shall be under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Army Engineers and that measures for run-off and water-flow retention and soil erosion prevention on watersheds should be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. Obviously it was the intention of Congress at the time the Flood Control Act of 1936 was passed that work on main streams would be done by the Army Engineers and soil conservation and erosion work on the watersheds would be done by the Department of Agriculture. If this is true, the work authorized in the above amendment is already covered by general authorization.
3. In the Flood Control Act of 1944 11 watershed programs were specifically authorized for the Department of Agriculture and survey reports were adopted on each of them. Some of these reports such as the Little Sioux Watershed in Iowa, the Los Angeles watershed in California, and so forth, specifically called for authority for gulley control, flood water detention, and floodway structures. Some of the other reports such as the Coosa River watershed in Georgia and the Trinity River watershed in Texas did not provide for gulley control, flood water detention, and floodway structures specifically, and these measures are now found to be necessary. The Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture has held that these survey reports have the force of law and since the authority for floodway structures, and so forth is omitted from them, the Department of Agriculture, even though it has general authority in the Flood Control Act of 1936 over the alluvial lands, does not have authority beyond that specifically written into the survey reports on the 11 programs set forth in the Flood Control Act of 1944.
4. Of the \$9,880,000 included in the omnibus appropriation bill for flood-control work

of the Department of Agriculture, the department intends to expend approximately \$4,300,000 for gulley control, flood water detention, and floodway structures in the alluvial lands. Some of the expenditures are already authorized in the survey reports covering the projects, but unless this amendment is adopted money for this purpose will not be available for such work in the Potomac River watershed, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania; Coosa River watershed, Georgia and Tennessee; the Middle Colorado River watershed, Texas; the Trinity River watershed, Texas; and the Washita River watershed, Oklahoma and Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment coming under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment submitted by Mr. BRIDGES is as follows:

On page 196, line 6, strike out "\$2,995,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,030,000, of which \$55,000 shall be available for such investigations and experiments at Bartlett Experimental Forest only."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, unless some member of the committee objects, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment coming under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

On page 179, line 15, strike out "\$7,950,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,952,500."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], formerly the Secretary of Agriculture, has stated that he thinks adoption of this amendment is necessary. I was of the opinion that it was not. In the absence of full information, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, let me inquire what the amendment will do.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment will add \$2,500 to the \$12,800,000 provided for meat inspection, to allow a part-time inspector at Seattle, Wash., where there is no meat inspector at the present time, according to the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment also relates to transfers of livestock.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it relates to the transfer of cattle brought in from Canada; in other words, it relates to the international trade in cattle from Canada.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, it seems to me that the additional amount provided by the amendment is not sufficient. Furthermore, it seems to me the subject matter of the amendment should have been handled by the committee in the course of its consideration of the bill in the first place. If the necessary amounts are not studied and recom-

mended by the committee in the course of its consideration of the bill in the first place, then we are mistaken in everything we do in connection with the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if I may make an observation at this point, let me say that it seems that under the amendment the inspection service relates to cattle in international shipment, for which it is claimed that sufficient authority is not available. Of course the amendment will not cure the difficulty if there is a lack of statutory authority.

Mr. CORDON. Of course not.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senate would have to recede under the circumstances, when the amendment came before the conferees.

However, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] formerly the Secretary of Agriculture, has said that he thinks adoption of the amendment is necessary.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have no objection to the addition of \$2,500 to the appropriation for meat inspection in order to make possible the employment of a meat inspector at Seattle, Wash., or at any other place, so far as that is concerned, where it is necessary. However, it is perfectly apparent to all Senators on the floor of the Senate, I think, that the addition of \$2,500 for that purpose does not carry any statutory authority that is not available in the bill at the present time. The amendment would simply add \$2,500 to the \$12,800,000, as I recall, which already is available.

It seems to me that, if there is going to be any presumption in favor of any committee and its work in attempting to reach logical conclusions with respect to appropriations, the time to commence to do so is now. If the amendment was necessary, it should have been presented to the committee, and the committee should have been given an opportunity to consider it and to act upon it.

So I object to adoption of the amendment by unanimous consent.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection until I can make an explanation?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to withhold the objection.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the shortage of inspectors for animals and also for plants imported into this country is not confined to the State of Washington alone. Trouble has been encountered in many sections of the country as well. It is due primarily, I would say, to the limitation on the number of hours during which an inspector can work. So, along the borders, instead of perhaps going out after supper and inspecting a truckload or a carload of cattle coming into the country, the inspectors are prohibited from doing so at the present time.

There has been a great deal of trouble along the Vermont border and along the coast of Florida in this respect. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and I introduced a bill which would permit the Federal Government to allow the inspectors to work overtime, and, I suppose, to

give them overtime pay, and then to recover the cost from the importers, who originally made this complaint, and who seemed willing to pay the additional cost incurred in that way. It was not a matter of cost, but a matter of accommodation, because sometimes the shipments would reach the border a few minutes after the inspector was required to stop work, according to the law; and the result would be that the cattle would have to be kept there all night until the inspector came on duty the next day.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry unanimously reported the bill favorably the other day, and it is now on the calendar. The bill was previously approved by the Department of Agriculture.

So far as I know, there is no opposition to this proposal. Its enactment would alleviate much of the trouble which has been referred to by the Senator from Washington, so far as the shipment of cattle across the border is concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; if I now have the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I wish to correct a statement I made a few moments ago. The Senator from Washington in discussing his amendment referred to it as a meat-inspection amendment. I thought he was referring to meat inspection at a stockyard; and yesterday I stated that I could not possibly understand how it made any difference whether a cow came from the moon or from Canada or from elsewhere, once the cow was slaughtered.

However, apparently the Senator was speaking of part-time inspectors on the border, rather than meat inspectors at slaughtering houses, because I find that the amendment does not relate to the \$12,800,000 which is available for meat inspection, but relates to the \$7,950,000 for the control and eradication of animal diseases, which means the inspection of animals on the hoof as they come across the border, to see whether they are free from disease.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. No amount of appropriation would permit inspection after hours, so long as the inspectors cannot work after 4 o'clock in the afternoon. Even if 20 inspectors were available at a certain point, if they had to stop work at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, the difficulty would continue.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I indicated my objection to adoption of the amendment by unanimous consent. I was under a wrong impression, also, with reference to the identity of the portion of the bill proposed to be amended. Inasmuch as this amendment relates to the eradication and control of animal diseases, it is acceptable to me; I have no objection to it.

However, I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Georgia as to how the legal authority to act in the way suggested, if that authority does not now exist, can be conferred by means of this amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it can. In my own judgment, I doubt very seriously that it can. My doubt is increased

by the fact that the committee clerk has handed me a statement from the Department of Agriculture, which I shall now read:

[U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Administration, Bureau of Animal Industry]

The amendment offered by Senator MAGNUSON increasing by \$2,500 the item "Animal disease control and eradication" under the head "Salaries and expenses, Animal Industry," would provide for part-time service of an inspector at Seattle, Wash., for public stockyards inspection work. Under present import regulations, cattle imported from Canada for slaughter may be consigned to a public stockyard for sale, otherwise they must be consigned directly to a slaughtering establishment. Public stockyards are those yards covered by Federal inspection of livestock received at such yards. Seattle is not now a public stockyard.

If Seattle is not a public stockyard, I have very grave doubt that the Department could assign an inspector to it to enforce Federal regulations.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Can the Senator from Georgia advise the Senator from Oregon as to how a stockyard can become a public stockyard?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think a stockyard becomes a public stockyard when it is posted and brought under the operation of the inspection item.

Mr. CORDON. Is there a Federal law on the subject?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield, I might clear up the statement of the Department of Agriculture in regard to a public stockyard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to clear up that matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield, if I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is not a public stockyard in the sense that it is operated by a public body. It is operated by the slaughterhouse which is adjacent to the stockyard, though all other slaughtering houses in the area use the stockyard. It is operated technically and jointly by all of them, but it is under the management of the slaughterhouse which is adjacent to the yard, and it is called the Union Stockyards. Anyone may ship to it. It is a sort of cooperative undertaking, managed, however, by the one slaughterhouse which is adjacent to the yard, because it happens to be located on the railroad sidings.

Mr. AIKEN. Did I not understand the Senator from Washington to say there was a shortage of border inspection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, this has nothing to do with border inspection.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not located on the border?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I desire to read a letter I have received from the persons

affected. I placed it in the RECORD yesterday. The letter is very short, and if the Senator from Georgia will permit, I should like to read it. It poses a problem, similar to the question here. The letter was addressed to me under date of June 30, by the Seattle Packing Co., which operates the yard in question, and it reads as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR: Although the Department of Agriculture recognizes the need for restoring Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards, it is unable to do so because of a shortage of funds. The Department estimates, however, that only \$2,500 is needed to restore the Federal inspection at Seattle as only the part-time services of one veterinarian is required. It is, therefore, suggested that you obtain an appropriation of \$2,500 for this purpose. This is important to the Northwest for the following reasons:

Increased control of livestock diseases is a protection to the general public. With Federal inspection the Seattle Union Stockyards would be assured that a veterinarian would be in charge and that adequate inspection with regard to communicable diseases would be in effect.

Livestock producers will be better served under Federal inspection. At the present time the Northwest is served by only two Federal-inspected yards. These are located at Spokane and Portland. Under State law, health requirements are enforced by the Brand Division which require that all female stock be tested and tagged when sold, except when sold to a packer for slaughter or for resale at a federally inspected yard.

Since a federally inspected yard has a veterinarian on duty, the additional expense and delay required by testing female cattle is avoided. Inasmuch as the Seattle Union Stockyards are not now inspected, livestock producers tend to make their shipments either to Spokane or to Portland.

Slaughter in the Northwest area would increase. Since reductions in the tariff on meat from Canada to the United States from 6 to 3 cents per pound, effective January 1, 1948, and the termination of shipments from Canada to the United Kingdom, meat importations to the United States have been greatly increased. Due to higher wage rates, expenses, etc., in the United States, most of this importation is now in the form of meat that is dressed. It would be desirable to have it come in the form of livestock so that the slaughter and processing could be performed here. Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards would therefore greatly facilitate the movement of livestock from Canada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will suspend a moment, the Chair observes that there is no opposition, apparently, to the pending amendment. The chairman of the subcommittee has accepted it. As the Chair understands, the Senator from Oregon has withdrawn his objection. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a judge once said to me, "When the court is with you, sit down." I shall now follow that very wise counsel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] on page 179, line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes, for the time being, the amendments to chapter VI, and brings us to chapter VII, the Department of the Interior.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to chapter VI, the agricultural bill. I stepped off the floor of the Senate a moment, and while I was gone the chapter was evidently finished. My understanding from the distinguished Senator from Georgia had been that, if I requested unanimous consent, he would not object to the consideration of an amendment which I desired to offer, on page 220, in line 22, after the word "work" to insert "and programs authorized by Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think the proposed amendment would add to or take from the provision. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senate will temporarily return to the consideration of chapter VI, and will consider an amendment to be offered from the floor by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I propose the following amendment: On page 220, line 22, after the word "work", to insert "and programs authorized by Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to the consideration of chapter VII, and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will want to impose upon the patience of the distinguished Senator from Arizona. We are now taking up the chapter on the Department of the Interior, are we not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Several Senators wanted me to notify them when this chapter was reached. If the distinguished Senator will permit me, and if he will yield for a quorum call, I think we at least ought to have a quorum call. Senators will then be on notice.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	Kerr
Anderson	Frear	Kilgore
Benton	Fulbright	Langer
Brewster	George	Leahy
Bricker	Gillette	Lehman
Bridges	Graham	Lodge
Butler	Green	Lucas
Byrd	Gurney	McCarran
Capehart	Hayden	McCarthy
Chapman	Hendrickson	McClellan
Chavez	Hickenlooper	McFarland
Connally	Hill	McKellar
Cordon	Hoey	Magnuson
Darby	Holland	Malone
Donnell	Humphrey	Martin
Douglas	Hunt	Maybank
Dworshak	Ives	Millikin
Eastland	Jenner	Morse
Ecton	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Ferguson	Kem	Myers

Neely	Schoeppel	Thye
O'Connor	Smith, Maine	Tydings
O'Mahoney	Smith, N. J.	Watkins
Pepper	Stennis	Wherry
Robertson	Taft	Wiley
Russell	Thomas, Okla.	Williams
Saltonstall	Thomas, Utah	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have before me a scholarly study dealing with the Recognition of Governments, with special consideration of the current problem with regard to governments in China. The paper was written by Stanley K. Hornbeck and was presented at the forty-fourth annual meeting of the American Society of International Law in Washington, on April 29, 1950. The paper will be printed in the proceedings of the society, but its application to recent action in the United Nations Security Council on the Korean situation makes the study particularly timely now. To make it available to Congress now, I shall ask unanimous consent to have it printed at the close of my remarks.

Mr. Hornbeck is well known for his long service in the Department of State as Chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs and as United States Ambassador to the Netherlands.

After presenting the main principles of recognition of governments as developed by authoritative scholars, Mr. Hornbeck makes a reasoned and valuable application of them to the specific question of how the United States ought to deal with the attempt of Communist China to have its government recognized in the place of the Nationalist Republic of China. In the course of his paper Mr. Hornbeck gives strong reasons and argument why the United States need not and should not recognize the Communist Government of China at this time.

Mr. Hornbeck developed this material before the recent outbreak in Korea. Proceedings in the Security Council on the Korean situation offer powerful support to the wisdom of Mr. Hornbeck's conclusions. If the United States had recognized Communist China when we were pressed to do so, and if Communist China was then seated in the Security Council as Russia has tried to bring about by a form of parliamentary blackmail, the Security Council would have been prevented from taking the prompt and decisive action it did take in the Korean situation.

As far back as January 17 of this year I developed this question of recognition in great detail. On this floor I stated:

Recognition of Red China by any country which has been engaged in the fight to contain world communism is surrender on another front of the cold war. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 17, 1950, p. 492.)

Had we recognized Red China at that time, the tragedy would have proved to be a double one. First, it would have been a spiritual blow to the hopes of all people of the world, particularly those in southeastern Asia, who look to us for

television. He did so in a simple, down-to-earth style, devoid of undue technical references—a program that was a public service at its best.

I feel his radio series, Let's Talk It Over, is a concrete example of a program in which a metropolitan station makes a positive effort to bring the listeners more closely and more fully into the operation of the station. It indicates a solid desire to have programs which are sincerely in the public interest. The history of Station KLZ, as evidenced by the numerous awards it has received in the past decade, is a record of splendid public service. The new series, Let's Talk It Over, represents a continuation of that high public-service consciousness. As evidence of that, let me call to the attention of the members of this body an article by Ken White, a member of the Denver Post staff, which appeared on June 6, 1950. Because Mr. White so forcibly explains the high purpose of this series, I ask that his article of that date be inserted as a part of this RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post of June 6, 1950]

KEN WHITE ON THE AIR—HOWS AND WHEREFORES

Hugh Terry, the boss wrangler over at KLZ, has started himself a radio program which can do a lot to help people understand how a radio station—any radio station—operates, week in and week out; why it can and does put certain things on the air; why it makes schedule changes which frequently are confusing to the listener.

Terry calls his program Let's Talk It Over. The first broadcast was heard last Saturday at 12:15 p. m. The KLZ veep and general manager says he wants to make it a talk-it-over feature in the true sense of the word. He wants listeners to ask anything they please about radio, and particularly about KLZ. He'll answer, with the help of his department heads.

Terry is a pretty straight talker, and I believe he'll answer criticism, if any, of KLZ's operations about as objectively as any station manager could be expected to. Nothing he might say would merit respect, otherwise.

He also, by the way, is an accomplished mike performer. Knowing his subject, he didn't bother with a script on the first program—dealing with television prospects—and the colloquy with Matt McEniry, the announcer, profited from the resulting naturalness.

No matter the point of control, radio is a pretty remote business.

Stations traditionally take their punishment and praise in silence. They profit from some of both; actually try, most of them, to be guided by what they hear from listeners.

Individual performers reach listeners, but at management level there's traditionally an aloofness that makes it difficult for listeners to feel anything for a station's call letters.

Often stations get criticism anonymous and otherwise; that is unfair—not unfair intentionally but because listeners lack information on which to base criticism. To them many a change that can be defended as necessary—if a station tells them about it—seems merely high-handed affront. Programs go in, programs go out, favorites disappear. Not always is the originating or relaying station to blame, as Terry will try to make clear.

He will, of course, take a realistic approach—a radio station makes its money by programming programs that bring in money.

If it has a conscience, it tries to program some programs of limited appeal which it believes are in the public interest.

If its manager is crazy, he believes he can please everybody at the same time. Hugh Terry is not crazy.

He feels he's programming the way he should; will explain on Let's Talk It Over why things are done the way they are, up there in the Shirley-Savoy.

Not that he'll be talking defensively all the time. Doubtless many letters merely will ask for clarification of various procedures.

By contributing to a better understanding of radio, via this program, Terry will win friends for the station—friends who will feel closer to it—and to other stations, as well, perhaps.

UNITED STATES SUFFERING DEFEAT ON PSYCHOLOGICAL FRONT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Suffering Defeat Throughout World on Psychological Front; Bold Action Held Needed by Truman To Organize Peace Information Office." The article is by David Lawrence, and is of such importance that I think it should be printed in the RECORD, so that all Members of Congress may read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SUFFERING DEFEAT THROUGHOUT WORLD ON PSYCHOLOGICAL FRONT—BOLD ACTION HELD NEEDED BY TRUMAN TO ORGANIZE PEACE INFORMATION OFFICE

(By David Lawrence)

Much worse than the set-backs on the Korean front are the defeats being suffered throughout the world on the psychological front both by the United States and the United Nations.

Never, it might be said, in so grave an international situation has there been such a conspicuous lack of imagination and such timidity as is being exhibited by the United States Government in fighting the psychological war.

The Soviet Union has grasped the initiative and has made flank attacks around the United States in the propaganda battles in Asia as well as in Europe.

The lazy answer to this is that the United States hasn't provided the funds—the Marshall plan of ideas, as Senator BENTON, of Connecticut, calls it. But the truth is that even if \$100,000,000 is appropriated, it would be ineffective if our Government fails to express itself forthrightly in the propaganda field.

THREE WEEKS OF INACTIVITY

More than 3 weeks have passed since the Kremlin put the North Korean government up to an aggression that has startled the world. The United States and the United Nations responded with military effort, as yet unsuccessful, but at the same time the Soviet triumphantly grasped the initiative on the propaganda side. The Russians accuse the United Nations along with the United States of sanctioning aggression. Peace petitions are being circulated with tens of thousands of signatures by the Communists in a publicity stunt which is not being combated effectively by the western democracies.

In the face of the plain aggression in Korea, nobody in our Government or in the UN has officially, formally, and loudly called Moscow the aggressor. The United Nations, moreover, has invited American boys to be killed but politely hesitates to warn the nations helping to kill American boys that those nations are aggressors, too. While it is

obvious that no nation can be asked to supply military help against its will, it is traitorous for any member of the United Nations at the same time to be supplying arms and military power to the country which is fighting the United Nations forces.

Senator HOMER FERGUSON of Michigan has pointed this up in a speech in the Senate in which he demands that the Washington Government request the UN to adopt a resolution warning any nation helping the North Koreans that it will be regarded as a partner in the aggression.

The UN got considerable prestige by adopting a resolution calling for military forces to resist aggression in Korea, but it will rapidly lose that prestige if it stands idly by and lets the Kremlin supply munitions to the North Koreans in an obvious attempt to defeat the United Nations forces, including the United States.

POLICY MAKERS FLOUNDER

The propaganda war is being poorly handled not because there are not enough technicians to do the job or because there are inadequate transmission facilities. It is falling down because nobody in the Truman administration with authority to act has vision enough to realize what a propaganda war means. It doesn't mean just a battery of mimeograph machines and a \$7,000,000 building in New York. It means that the men who make policy—men with the courage of their convictions—must call a spade a spade in public. The policy makers are floundering. Three weeks of valuable time have been lost while the American Government cravenly refrains from denouncing the Kremlin leaders as the true aggressors. The answer usually heard is that this might offend the Kremlin—as if "appeasement" is the way out of Korea.

What is needed is a new executive board or commission of three eminent men to give full time to the work and be responsible directly to the President and not to any Cabinet officer. The head of the Office of War Information was responsible in World War II directly to the President. He must be free again to tell the President what any member of the Cabinet is doing or failing to do that is hurting on the psychological side of warfare. He must be free to speak out in the meetings of the National Security Council, of which he should be a member. The task cannot be performed by a subordinate unit in the State Department. The top level officers of that institution are too busy writing legal notes in the field of diplomacy and too much steeped in traditions and forms to use the vocabulary of propaganda war.

America is losing on the military side in Korea but not for long. America is losing, however, on the psychological front and there is no sign of any turn in the tide. It will take bold action by the President to organize an Office of Peace Information and to give it the proper instructions to engage in a world-wide crusade of truth.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 940. An act to authorize construction of the Eklutna project, hydroelectric generating plant and transmission facilities in connection therewith, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5866. An act to adjust and define the boundary between Great Smoky Mountains National Park and the Cherokee-Pisgah-Nantahala National Forests and for other purposes.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the committee amendments to chapter VII, making appropriations for the Interior Department, I wish to make a brief statement respecting this chapter as reported to the Senate.

The House considered budget estimates totaling \$669,251,505, approving appropriations in the amount of \$622,134,130. After the bill passed the House, supplemental estimates in the amount of \$5,720,000 were received by the Senate, increasing the total 1951 budget estimates to \$674,971,505.

Although the Senate committee approved \$5,698,000 of the \$5,720,000 in supplemental estimates, the total of chapter VII as reported to the Senate is \$617,006,030, or \$5,128,100 less than chapter VII as passed by the House and \$57,935,475 less than the 1951 estimates. Percentagewise, the total approved by the Senate committee is eight-tenths of 1 percent under the House total and eight and fifty-nine hundredths percent below the 1951 estimates.

Of the \$617,006,030 in cash appropriations approved by the committee, approximately \$65,000,000 is for the liquidation of prior contract authority.

The total new contract authority for the Interior Department as reported by the Appropriations Committee is in the amount of \$37,830,000, which amount is \$420,000 less than the amount allowed by the House, \$6,920,000 less than the 1951 budget estimates, and which is \$27,421,700 less than contract authority granted for the fiscal year 1950.

Mr. President, I may say that some of the reductions were larger than I personally felt should have been made. On the other hand, some of the reductions were not so large as some members of the subcommittee felt should have been made. In this respect, the bill is a compromise and represents a very honest and earnest effort on the part of the subcommittee to make the reductions in the amounts and in the specific appropriations where it was felt reductions could best be made. As I have stated, the final result is a bill which in cash is \$5,128,100 under the House bill, despite the inclusion of \$5,698,000 in supplementals not considered by the House, and \$57,965,475 under the 1951 budget estimates, and in contract authority chapter VII is \$420,000 under the House bill and \$6,920,000 under the 1951 budget estimates.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Of the \$617,006,030 recommended by the committee, \$324,104,000 is for the Bureau of Reclamation, and this amount includes \$5,445,000 in supplemental estimates not considered by the House.

There are no new projects included in the 1951 budget estimates or in the committee's recommendations. The amount of \$324,104,000 recommended by the committee, although it includes \$5,445,-

000 in supplemental estimates, is \$1,004,000 under the House bill, \$35,214,500 under the 1951 estimates, and is \$32,650,510 less than was appropriated to the Reclamation Bureau in the fiscal year 1950.

Mr. President, I may mention, in this connection, because the larger reductions of the bill come out of the Bureau of Reclamation appropriations, that it is a result of an effort on the part of the subcommittee, and the committee having the bill in charge, to take into consideration the effect in dollars of the Taber-Thomas amendment as adopted by the House of Representatives.

The bill as it passed the House was sent to the Department of the Interior with the request that they examine it to determine how much money they would lose if the Taber-Thomas amendment were put into effect, and having determined that amount, to see if a similar sum approximately as great could be taken from the bill where it would hurt, but would not hurt so much; and that is what we have accomplished.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. It is, however, a fact, is it not, that the Interior Department, in carrying out the request of the chairman of the subcommittee, did so by reducing construction items, and not by reducing other activities included in the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is not entirely correct, but largely so.

Mr. CORDON. To what extent is it in error?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is in error in that there are some reductions made that are not in construction items, but the primary effect is upon the construction items, and it was possible for the reason that upon examination of the carry-over of unexpended balances on some of the projects it was felt it would be safe to make the reductions in those places.

Mr. CORDON. Will the chairman of the subcommittee at the appropriate time advise the Senate as to the reductions voluntarily made by the Interior Department in items other than construction?

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall be very glad to do so, because I have a tabulation which covers the entire amount.

Mr. CORDON. Is the tabulation in shape so that it might be placed in the RECORD today for the benefit of the Senate tomorrow? It would be helpful in studying the effects of the bill, particularly with respect to activities other than the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, which, as I recall, has taken all the cuts. The Senator advises there are other matters. I was not aware of them.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will ask the clerk to make a search through the table and advise the Senator later in that regard.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

For the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the committee recommends appropriations in the amount of \$80,746,055, which amount is \$3,953,055 in excess of the House allowance but which is \$5,250,320 less than the 1951 budget estimates.

The larger increases recommended by the committee are for restoring funds for California Indians, all of which had been deleted by the House, additional funds to meet deficiencies in State educational contracts for the education of Indian children, additional funds for Indian school construction, and improvement of roads on Indian reservations.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Would it not be well to advise the Senate with respect to the necessity of restoring the amounts in connection with the activities having to do with the Indians in California, where a cut was made by the House which eliminated all funds for those Indians, and the cut was made under a misapprehension both as to the fact and the law?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it appears from the record that three gentlemen appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations asserting that they represented the Indians in California, and that the Indians in California wanted no assistance whatever from the United States. Taking them at their word, the House committee struck out, anywhere in the bill under the Bureau of Indian Affairs, any item affecting the Indians in California. It was stated in the report that the House eliminated \$2,554,975 from the budget estimates. When the matter came before our committee the Representatives in Congress from California appeared, the Senators from California appeared, the officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs appeared, and it was determined definitely that the gentlemen who assumed to speak for the Indians of California had no authority whatsoever to speak for them. For that reason we have restored proportionately the money recommended in the budget estimate for the Indians of California. Where a reduction was made a proportionate reduction was made in the California Indian appropriation.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Another large item in the bill is for the Bonneville Power Administration, for which the committee recommends appropriations totaling \$44,000,000 and contract authority in the amount of \$20,000,000.

The amount recommended by the committee for construction, \$39,500,000, is \$2,000,000 less than the amount approved by the House and \$2,500,000 less than the 1951 estimate.

For operation and maintenance the committee approved \$4,500,000, which amount is \$500,000 less than the House allowance and \$750,000 less than the budget estimate.

GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES

Of the \$617,006,030 total appropriation proposed by the committee, a total of \$53,588,285 is for government in the Territories, including the administration of Alaska, Hawaii, Virgin Islands, and Guam, construction of roads in Alaska, and the continued rehabilitation of the Alaska Railroad.

The total of \$53,588,285 recommended by the committee is \$3,741,215 less than the total of \$57,329,500 approved by the

House, and is \$5,189,315 less than the 1951 budget estimates of \$58,777,600.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In making his statement the Senator referred to the expenditures by the Government for the Territories, and he mentioned Hawaii, Alaska, and Guam, but did not mention Puerto Rico. Was there any particular significance to that?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. In the case of Puerto Rico all of the internal-revenue collections go to the Territory, and that amount is sufficient to support the government of the Territory, and an appropriation is not required from the Treasury of the United States. It is different in the case of the Virgin Islands. Since I have mentioned the Virgin Islands, I should say they have been paid for two or three times over by the internal-revenue collections on the rum produced there, all of which revenue goes into the Treasury of the United States. On the other hand, it appears each year as though we are making a donation or gift to the island. If the same rule applied to the Virgin Islands as is applied to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands would have a magnificent surplus in the Treasury.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it should be pointed out, so that the public may know, because of the importance of Alaska as a strategic outpost of this country, that what the Senator is discussing is the internal appropriations, and that it has nothing to do with the millions which have been appropriated for military expenditures, which also includes the improvement of roads.

Mr. HAYDEN. What we include in the pending bill is for continuing the improvement and operation of the Alaskan Railroad and many highway items, but it does not apply to military construction in any sense.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But in some cases the military construction and the money appropriated in the pending bill almost overlap.

Mr. HAYDEN. The military authorities strongly recommended placing the railroad in good operating condition. But we do it in this bill rather than in some other bill.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

With respect to the Southwestern Power Administration, I am glad to report to the Senate that the Secretary of the Interior, the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration, and the private power companies in Oklahoma have agreed upon a means of integrating the hydroelectric power produced at Government dams with steam power produced by the private utilities in a manner which will provide for servicing public bodies with Government power as contemplated by section 5 of the 1944 Flood Control Act and which will serve as a pattern for similar contracts

with public utilities in the southwest power area.

Senators will remember that last year there was considerable controversy in this body as to what should be done with respect to appropriations for the Southwestern Power Administration. The Senate decided in that respect, as it did with respect to the Reclamation Service, that in order to negotiate upon an equal footing with the private utilities, the Southwestern Power Administration should be supplied with sufficient funds so if satisfactory wheeling or integrating contracts could not be made, that the necessary transmission lines would be constructed by the Southwestern Power Administration. I expressed the opinion at that time that if the money were granted and placed in the hands of the Southwestern Power Administration, it would be possible to work out such an agreement with the private power companies there that the money would not actually have to be expended.

I felt that the tendency was growing, particularly in the southern area of the United States, for all private power companies and the public power development to live and to let live. I illustrated that by the fact that the Alabama Power Co., the Mississippi Power Co., and the Georgia Power Co. refused to join in the fight on the Tennessee Valley Authority steam plant, showing that they were getting along very well in that area in the matter of power, and that they would not participate in a fight of that kind. I believed that if we gave the Southwestern Power Administration ample money to carry on a program if necessary, it would prove not to be necessary, and that is exactly what has happened in that area. They have come to an agreement.

I think perhaps the best way to describe that agreement is to quote from the words of Mr. Douglas G. Wright, the Southwestern Power Administrator, in an address delivered at Muskogee, Okla., dedicating the SPA building there on July 15, 1950. Mr. Wright said:

There isn't any point in rehashing all of the things which have gone before us. But this is probably one of the greatest weeks in the history of Oklahoma. Oklahoma has found the way, through a perfectly freely arrived at bargain. The American way of bargaining, where we fought like the very devil. Where we pushed and shoved—where we used every kind of a force known.

Pushing one way, and then another, we finally arrived at an agreement. An agreement with the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. and the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma which placed Oklahoma in the No. 1 spot in the Nation, in my judgment, in power potential. Oklahoma today has available the resources of the \$130,000,000 Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., the \$100,000,000 Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, and at least a \$250,000,000 Government development program, to utilize for any power need she can think of.

Her consumers have achieved what I have been pleased to call the No. 1 freedom of power. This is, namely, your right to decide where you will get your electric power, what you will do with it as you use it, and whether or not you will own any part of the facilities which serve you.

He further said:

Under that contract, the utility companies have agreed with the Government that the

consumer does have the No. 1 liberty—the right to decide where he buys his electric power, and what he does with it after he buys it. We have agreed to that.

Secondly, the companies and the Government have agreed that the Government has the right to sell its power to whomever it desires, on whatever terms it desires.

And, third, we have agreed that the companies have the right to sell their power to whomever they desire, on whatever terms they desire.

Then he adds:

We had a perfect marriage. It was love at first sight. The only trouble was nobody could figure out who should provide the dowry. Both sides wanted the dowry in this case. Well, we finally settled it in the American way. Each side gets part of the dowry. And you people who use power are going to get the benefit from all of this integration.

I think Mr. Wright is to be congratulated upon the conclusion of this very fine contract.

In that connection I desire to say that I have observed this matter very closely from time to time, and I found that the power companies in Oklahoma at all times were actually engaged in a serious effort to come together and to arrive at an agreement. There was no backing or filling and no dodging. I was convinced all along, although there were some who were not so convinced, that where there was the spirit to come to an accord an accord would be reached.

I particularly want to state that R. K. Lane, of the Oklahoma Public Service Co., impressed me as being a man who, standing stoutly for the interests of the people who invested their money in his company, yet realized that cooperating with the Government in an effort of this kind gained profit to them, and that it could be done in a way that was entirely in keeping with the present public-power policies announced by the Congress.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KERR. To clarify a point in my own mind I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question about the committee report which discusses briefly the SPA continuing fund. I refer to the language of the committee report found at page 130 of the report to accompany House bill 7786, as follows:

The subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations conducted joint hearings with the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations, which handles the appropriation for the Rural Electrification Administration, on the use of the continuing fund of the Southwestern Power Administration for the purpose of aiding in the construction and operation of facilities for producing and transmitting power for the use of public bodies and cooperatives. This program involves the expenditure of loans of considerable amounts by the REA to a combination of local cooperatives and the lease of the facilities by the Southwestern Power Administration. The continuing fund is being used for this purpose to an extent not contemplated at the time SPA was created. The committee feels that the utmost care should be exercised by those administering this fund to avoid its use in any instance where it is not absolutely necessary to enable public bodies and cooperatives to secure sufficient power to supply customers. It is not the intent of the committee that

the continuing fund be used directly or indirectly in the construction or operation of power-producing facilities and transmission lines to compete with private enterprise in areas where adequate power is available or will be made available within a reasonable time at reasonable rates to the cooperatives and public bodies.

It is my understanding that one of the purposes of the continuing fund was to facilitate the interchange of power between SPA and other suppliers in our area, and the marketing of power by SPA.

If I remember rightly, the fund was first set up at the time SPA entered into the Texas contract with the power company down there. The interchange of power is, as I understand, an important part of that arrangement and it is good deal both for SPA and the power company.

Now that the Southwestern Power Administration and the Oklahoma Utilities have signed an operating contract, to which the chairman of the subcommittee has so eloquently and forcefully referred, the continuing fund of the Southwestern Power Administration must be used to make that contract operative. It is my understanding that because of the assurance that this contract would be signed, the Appropriations Committee was able to reduce the request of SPA for funds, actual and contractual, by approximately \$6,000,000. This saving results because the lines and facilities of the Oklahoma utility companies will be available for transmission of power to SPA customers, but the continuing fund is necessary for such an arrangement.

Mr. President, I assume that the language relating to the SPA continuing fund in the report was not intended to interfere in any way with the type of arrangement contained in the contracts which have been entered into by SPA and the utilities on the one hand, and on the other hand by SPA and the rural electric cooperatives in Oklahoma and nearby States, and which were described before the committee during the hearings.

I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if I am correct in that assumption.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. The Oklahoma situation is this: All the representatives of the REA's in Oklahoma who talked to me said that they were hopeful and anxious that an integrating contract might be made between the private power companies and the Southwestern Power Administration. They felt that was to their advantage in the area. On the other hand, I have heard no complaint from any private power company in Oklahoma as to the arrangement made by the Southwestern Power Administration with the REA development in that area.

The Senator is perfectly correct. It is just as important, so far as a revolving fund is concerned, that money be made available to meet balances of payments from time to time, either with the private power companies or with the Rural Electrification Administration. That is the purpose.

What we criticized in the report were developments above and beyond that, in other sections of the country. However, so far as Oklahoma is concerned, no one has complained about what has been done by the REA in that area, either publicly or privately. I understand that the arrangement is entirely satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. KERR. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee very much.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator from Arizona will remember, I am sure, that this controversy has been before the Congress, and especially before the Senate subcommittee, for some 3 or 4 years.

I think the Senator also will remember that recently the Southwestern Power Administration made a contract with the Texas Power & Light Co. So far as I am aware—and I think the Senator from Arizona knows more about this matter than I do—that contract is working satisfactorily.

Is it not a fact that the contract which has recently been made is a replica of the Texas Power & Light Co. contract, but is adapted especially to conditions in Oklahoma?

Mr. HAYDEN. The difference between the Texas Power & Light contract and the Oklahoma contract is that in the Texas agreement nothing was said or done and no arrangements were made in regard to supplying power to municipalities, whereas in the case of the Oklahoma contract a municipality or the Rural Electrification Administration or the Government itself—any or all of them—get the combined service of the company's power and of the Government's development of power, by means of the integration.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Am I correct in saying that the present Oklahoma contract is more favorable both to the Government and to consumers, the consumers being, first, the REA and preferred customers under the Flood Control Act of 1944?

Mr. HAYDEN. That was the real difficulty, namely, to see that there was no distinction as between preferred customers, as set forth under the water power act—that is to say, regardless of whether it was a municipality or a Rural Electrification cooperative or the Government itself or any public agency. It was necessary to see that all were treated alike.

That was not the case under the Texas contract, because, as a matter of fact, there were no municipalities there that wanted any power, and that question did not arise as an issue. However, it was bound to arise in Oklahoma. It has been solved to the satisfaction both of the Southwestern Power Administration and to the private power companies.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that under the Oklahoma contract the Government is able to sell to the existing utilities all the power it can produce, both firm power, secondary power, and even dump power?

Mr. HAYDEN. The situation in that area, so far as hydroelectric power is

concerned, is somewhat different from the situation elsewhere, where the Government is producing large quantities of firm power. If my recollection is correct, there are approximately eight rivers which are to have flood-control dams built on them. Those rivers vary in flow a great deal. For that reason, as the dry season comes on, the volume of water in the reservoir lowers, and the amount of firm power which can be developed lessens. If ideally situated, it is possible to fit that fluctuating power into a steam-plant system, whereas if the fluctuating hydro-electric power were not available, the steam plant system would have to have stand-by steam plants, and large amounts of money would have to be invested for that purpose.

So this arrangement—utilizing the Government power, which is mainly uniform—integrates that power into the system of the private power companies. Then when the Government takes out power to supply to its preferred customers, it is firm power, available 24 hours a day and every day the year 'round.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. As a matter of fact, the State of Oklahoma has a great many rivers which are fed by flash floods coming from northwest Arkansas, southwest Missouri, southern Kansas, southeast Colorado, northeast New Mexico, and western Texas. Those floods flow into the rivers which carry the water across my State, and eventually the water goes either into the Arkansas River, which flows through Arkansas, or into the Red River, which flows through Louisiana.

In our State there are no rivers which are constant in flow. So the only water we have, as a rule, is the water coming from the so-called flash floods.

Therefore, in order to provide power, we must catch the water in reservoirs, and must hold it there. By doing so, we serve flood control, and later on we run the water through turbines and create electricity.

My point is that under the Oklahoma contract the Government is able to sell all the power it can create, both firm power, secondary power, and dump power, because the utilities can take the power when they want it and can close down their steam plants to some extent and can depend on the use of the floodwaters. Then when the floods have abated and are over, the private power companies can fire up their steam plants and can begin to operate again on the basis of steam power.

So this system enables us to get the greatest possible amount of revenue; and at the same time, according to the Southwestern Power Administration's announcement, the rate will be 5.6 mills per kilowatt-hour, which is the second cheapest rate in the entire country, so I am advised.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand that the rate to public bodies in Oklahoma will be among the very lowest in the United States, and that it is advantageous to pursue this course, as demonstrated by the testimony of Mr. Wright, who justified our action in recommending that, under this bill, \$6,000,000 be taken from

the cash and contract authority. His testimony further is that it means a saving of at least \$850,000 a year during the years to come; and as he so aptly pointed out in his remarks, that saving inures to the benefit of the consumers of power in the Oklahoma area.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is a fact, I believe—and I think the Senator from Arizona will confirm what I say—that by virtue of this contract, the Government will be able to avoid the appropriation of vast sums of money for the building of transmission lines; but, instead, the Government will be able to use the existing transmission lines for transmitting the power, and thus will make the saving. There will be a saving to the Government, and also, as I think the Senator will agree, all money invested in transmission lines eventually must be repaid by the consumers of electricity.

Mr. HAYDEN. Wherever a transmission line is built, either by a private utility or by the Government, the rate for electricity must be fixed at such a point as to make it possible in the course of time, to amortize the payments for the transmission line.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I think time will demonstrate the wisdom of the Oklahoma contract, in that both parties will be benefited—a somewhat unusual situation under a contract. The Government will be benefited, and also the consumers will be benefited, because both will have the advantage of the second cheapest power rate in the entire country.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Government had unfirm, fluctuating power, which by itself could not bring a very good price. The private power companies had steam plants which they would have to maintain in excess capacity for standby service, but which they are not now required to build or to maintain, because they can obtain the Government power. So one hand washed the other.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. For some time the Members of the Senate who handle the Interior Department appropriation bill in the Appropriations Committee have been very anxious to hold hearings to develop a Federal public power policy. Does not the Senator from Arizona believe that the Oklahoma contract, together with the Texas power and light contract, go a long way toward developing a national policy?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think they will be highly valuable in that respect.

I may add that the same policy which we adopted, as applied to the United States Reclamation Service, has borne good fruit. First we provided in the bill money with which to construct transmission lines from the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana. That area is divided between the Reclamation Service, on the eastern slope, and the Bonneville Power Administration, on the western slope. The power company violently opposed the construction of any transmission line into Anaconda, but we provided for it.

As a result, they got together with the Bonneville Power Administration, and made a contract which is entirely satis-

factory both to the Government and to the company.

In Colorado there has been considerable difficulty. My information from the Reclamation Service is that there has been agreement in principle upon a wheeling arrangement which is entirely satisfactory. There remains in Montana one difficulty, which I shall discuss a little later, with respect to a transmission line.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will permit a further observation, let me say that I wish to pay my respects to the administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration, who has been working on this matter for all these years. I think it is to him that we must give credit for doing the detailed headwork in the preparation of both the Texas Power and Light Co. contract and the so-called Oklahoma contract. I believe he has rendered a signal service to the public, and especially to the electric light industry, by the development of those two contracts.

I also wish to pay my compliments and respects to the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], because he has been intently interested all these years in trying to work out something which will relieve his committee and the Congress of the necessity of guessing as to appropriations for these purposes.

With these contracts in existence, so far as these two States and the Southwest are concerned, we have a pattern, and if the private companies are unwilling any for any reason refuse to build the lines which are necessary, I think it is understood that the Congress will be called upon to build them. As one member of the committee, so long as I am here, I shall be very glad to go along and help build those lines. So I pay that compliment to the chairman of the subcommittee, because I give him credit for working out this matter to a very high degree.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, at this point I should like to offer for the RECORD a brief statement. It is a part of a speech I made at the dedication of the Dennison Dam, which took place on July 1, 1944. That was before section 5 of the Flood Control Act was enacted. I ask permission to incorporate that very brief statement at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How will this power be distributed?

Public power, as a rule, is produced as a by-product of flood-control, reclamation, and navigation developments.

The Government should not, in my judgment, enter the field of power development in such a manner as to destroy the value of existing power facilities which have served and are serving the wants and needs of the people.

It seems to me that a cooperative plan of power development and distribution may be worked out whereby the people in the cities and on the farms may receive the benefits of such power at reasonable rates.

Such a plan should embrace a program wherein the Government may create the electrical energy and the existing distributing systems may take the current at the point of manufacture and thereby both the Government and the existing systems may profit by such cooperative plan of operation.

Former Senator James P. Pope, now a Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has just made the following statement:

"There is no doubt but that this cooperative effort, which makes for efficiency, economy, and better service, is here to stay and will plan an increasingly important part in the future development of the public and private power industry."

Unless this policy is adopted the Government will be forced to build standby steam plants and in addition will have to build transmission and distributing lines in order to deliver the electricity to the consumers.

The Government is interested in making a success of its flood control, reclamation, and navigation power developments.

The public is interested in securing electricity at a reasonable price.

These two interests can be harmonized and adjusted to the benefit of both the Government and the consumers.

This is one of the problems that must be solved and when it is solved it must take into consideration the injury done by removing property from taxation and then it must give credit to the values which may be created as the direct result of the making available of an abundance of cheap power.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I understand the statement of the Senator from Arizona, in describing the Hungry Horse project, the point which the Senator was trying to make was that if this appropriation had not been made, the chances of getting private power companies and others together on a power contract would not have been so good as they were when the Southwestern Power Administration or the Government had the authority to do it if the others did not.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was the policy we adopted last year, and I am going to say it has proved to be practical and sound. In each case, when the private power company learned that if it did not make a contract satisfactory to the Government, the Government would build transmission lines to serve its own customers, they then arrived at a settlement which was mutually satisfactory.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I was very much interested in a question which the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] asked the Senator from Arizona with reference to the language on page 130 of the committee report dealing with the Southwestern Power Administration. I was very much pleased, I may say, with the answer of the Senator from Arizona. I was not at all surprised, but I was pleased that he made the answer he did, because, as he indicated in his answer to single out REA co-ops and deny them

the advantages of arrangements involving the use of the SPA continuing fund, while permitting its use to make payments to private power companies under the Texas and Oklahoma contracts, would be rank discrimination against the REA co-ops.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Wright made it perfectly clear in his testimony that this revolving fund was just as necessary in order to do business with the private power companies as it was to do business with the REA's or for the REA's to do business with the private companies.

Mr. HILL. Certainly the committee had no intention whatever of saying anything or doing anything that would discriminate against the REA cooperatives.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; they were to be treated alike.

Mr. HILL. Exactly alike.

SUMMARY TABLES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I desire now to conclude my remarks by saying that I have covered the larger items included in the bill, and without taking the time of the Senate to discuss the committee's recommendations on appropriations for all of the bureaus and services in the Interior Department, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the

RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain summary data and tables included in the committee's report, which set forth the over-all action of the committee on chapter VII and its recommendations with respect to each bureau and service.

There being no objection, the summary, data, and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget estimates, House action, and Senate committee recommendations

CASH APPROPRIATIONS

Amount of bill as passed by House ----- \$322, 134, 130

Amount of decrease by Senate (net) after including \$5,698,000 of supplemental estimates sent to Senate after bill passed House ----- 5, 128, 100

Total of bill as reported to Senate ----- 617, 006, 030

Amount of 1951 budget estimates:

Regular estimates ----- 609, 251, 505

Supplemental estimates (S. Docs. 154, 157, and 186) ----- 5, 720, 000

Total regular and supplemental estimates -- 674, 971, 505

Amount of 1950 appropriations ----- 590, 203, 947

Cash appropriations

Office or bureau	1950 appropriation	1951 budget estimate	Recommended in House bill, 1951	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+), decrease (-), House bill compared with estimates		Increase (+), decrease (-), Senate committee bill compared with 1950 appropriations		Increase (+), decrease (-), Senate committee bill compared with estimates		Increase (+), decrease (-), Senate committee bill compared with House bill	
					Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent
Office of the Secretary.....	\$6, 178, 075	\$14, 251, 800	\$14, 075, 000	\$11, 974, 000	-\$176, 800	0.12	+\$5, 795, 925	63.81	-\$2, 277, 800	15.98	-\$2, 101, 000	14.92
Commission of Fine Arts.....	12, 000	12, 530	12, 530	12, 530	-----	-----	+530	4.41	-----	-----	-----	-----
Bonneville Power Administration.....	30, 284, 500	47, 250, 000	46, 500, 000	44, 000, 000	-750, 000	1.58	+13, 715, 500	29.02	-3, 250, 000	6.87	-2, 500, 000	5.37
Bureau of Land Management.....	6, 580, 200	9, 650, 000	7, 356, 800	7, 927, 810	-2, 293, 200	23.76	+1, 347, 610	13.86	-1, 722, 190	17.84	+571, 010	7.76
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	59, 605, 246	85, 996, 375	76, 793, 000	80, 746, 055	-9, 203, 375	10.70	+21, 140, 809	35.46	-5, 250, 320	6.10	+3, 953, 055	5.14
Bureau of Reclamation.....	356, 754, 510	359, 318, 500	325, 108, 000	324, 104, 000	-34, 210, 500	9.52	-32, 650, 510	9.15	-35, 214, 500	9.80	-1, 004, 000	.30
Geological Survey.....	16, 044, 460	20, 275, 000	19, 129, 000	19, 382, 000	-1, 146, 000	5.65	+3, 337, 600	20.30	-896, 000	4.40	+253, 000	1.32
Bureau of Mines.....	24, 046, 500	25, 208, 700	24, 235, 600	24, 131, 100	-973, 100	3.86	+84, 600	.35	-1, 077, 600	4.48	-104, 500	.43
National Park Service.....	29, 749, 950	39, 406, 500	36, 745, 200	36, 118, 300	-2, 661, 300	6.75	+6, 368, 350	21.40	-3, 288, 200	8.34	-626, 900	1.70
Fish and Wildlife Service.....	12, 936, 500	14, 350, 500	14, 375, 500	14, 547, 950	+25, 000	.17	+1, 611, 450	12.45	+197, 450	1.37	+172, 450	1.19
Government in the Territories.....	45, 736, 066	58, 777, 600	57, 329, 500	53, 588, 285	-1, 448, 100	2.46	+7, 852, 219	17.16	-5, 189, 315	8.82	-3, 741, 215	6.52
Subtotal, Department of the Interior.....	587, 927, 947	674, 497, 505	621, 660, 130	616, 532, 030	-52, 837, 375	7.83	+28, 604, 083	4.86	-57, 965, 475	8.59	-5, 128, 100	.82
Virgin Islands Corporation.....	2, 276, 000	474, 000	474, 000	474, 000	-----	-----	-1, 802, 000	79.17	-----	-----	-----	-----
Grand total, ch. VII, Department of the Interior.....	590, 203, 947	674, 971, 505	622, 134, 130	617, 006, 030	-52, 837, 375	7.82	+26, 802, 083	4.54	-57, 965, 475	8.58	-5, 128, 100	.82

CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Total.....	\$65, 251, 700	\$44, 750, 000	\$38, 250, 000	\$37, 830, 000	-\$6, 500, 000	14.52	-\$27, 421, 700	42.0	-\$6, 920, 000	15.46	-\$420, 000	1.09
------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	-------	-----------------	------	----------------	-------	-------------	------

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion at this point?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With respect to the Columbia Basin appropriation, the House committee allowed the full amount requested by the Budget Bureau. The Senate committee cut \$3,700,000, as I recall, or \$4,000,000 from the amount. I was wondering whether, for the purpose of the record, the Senator could give us a brief explanation of the reduction.

Mr. HAYDEN. The reason the Senate committees reduced that amount

under the Budget Bureau's estimate, and under the amount appropriated by the House, was that we were trying to recover as much money as we could in different places in the bill, to equal the cut that would be made if the Taber-Thomas amendment were adopted. In doing that, we found that, so far as the Columbia Basin was concerned, as in other instances, there was a carry-over of an unexpended balance, which, in the estimate of the engineers of whom we inquired, made it safe to make a reduction at this time. In other words, we wanted to be sure there was sufficient money in the bill to meet all contractual

The bill as reported to the Senate:

Under the regular and supplemental estimates for 1951 ----- \$57, 965, 475
Exceeds appropriations for 1950 ----- 26, 802, 083

CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Amount of contract authorizations included in bill as passed by House ----- \$38, 250, 000

Amount of reduction in contract authorizations by Senate (net) ----- 420, 000

Total of contract authorizations as reported to Senate ----- 37, 830, 000

Amount of 1951 budget estimates for contract authorizations ----- 44, 750, 000

Amount of contract authorizations, 1950 ----- 65, 251, 700

The bill as reported to the Senate:

Under the 1951 budget estimates for contract authorizations ----- 6, 920, 000
Under the 1950 contract authorizations ----- 27, 421, 700

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY TABLE

The table following shows the over-all action on chapter VII of the bill setting forth the 1951 budget estimates, the amounts allowed by the House, and the amounts recommended by the Senate committee:

payments for construction projects which were going on during the year, but, where there was more than that, we preferred to let it go over to another year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In regard to this particular instance-----

Mr. HAYDEN. We are quite confident that this would in no manner interfere with the orderly progress of construction on the project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Adequate planning for next year will be taken care of, because of the overlays and the amount that was given. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona a question: In his judgment, and in the judgment of the committee, are there sufficient funds to make it unnecessary to curtail any of the developments of the REA programs which have been brought before the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. The REA money, I may say to the Senator, is carried in the agricultural chapter of this bill, and I am sure the amount allowed is ample for that purpose. The only purpose of this section of the bill, chapter 7, with respect to REA, is to provide for cases in which some service is rendered by the Southwestern Power Administration in the Senator's area.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. That is what I am getting at.

Mr. HAYDEN. The way I understand the situation, so far as southeastern Kansas is concerned, and so far as southwestern Missouri and Arkansas are concerned, is that the Oklahoma contracts as they have been developed, are to serve as a model or basis for similar contracts elsewhere within the area, and, where suitable integrating or wheeling arrangements can be made with private companies in the Kansas or Missouri area, or elsewhere, it then will not be necessary for the Southwestern Power Administration to construct transmission lines to serve preferred customers; just as it happened in Oklahoma. If, however, suitable arrangements cannot be made, there is then authority to see that the preferred customers of the Government are served, customers such as the municipalities and REA.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment in chapter VII. The clerk will state the amendment.

The first amendment, under the heading "Chapter VII—Department of the Interior—Title I—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and expenses," was on page 230, line 12, after the word "service", to strike out "\$2,315,000" and insert "\$2,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 230, after line 12, to insert:

STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the act of July 25, 1947 (43 U. S. C. 364), including personal services in the District of Columbia and printing and binding, \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Enforcement of the Connally Hot Oil Act," on page 231, line 3, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$180,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and maintenance, southeastern power marketing area," on page 232, line 7, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction, Southwestern Power Administration," on page 232, line 14, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$10,350,000" and insert "\$8,620,000", and in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$1,730,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration," on page 233, line 7, after the word "area", to strike out "\$760,000" and insert "\$660,000."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, for and on behalf of the senior Senator from Oklahoma, we desire to ask the chairman of the committee to eliminate that amendment and to let the figure stand as passed by the House, at \$760,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. I may say to the Senator that the sole and only reason the committee had for making that reduction was the assumption that, having reduced the amount of appropriation and authorization by some \$6,000,000—the appropriation part of it by a little more than \$1,000,000—we thought that perhaps there would not be as much operation and maintenance to be undertaken, and so we made this cut with the idea of taking it to conference and then determining what it actually should be. In other words, we had no testimony of any kind from anyone upon which to base the cut or to justify the cut. We simply acted on general principles.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator that his assumption that the costs of operation with reference to construction have decreased is accurate and well founded. However, as he is probably as well aware as is any other Member of this body, upon the completion of the contract between the Southwestern Power Administration, the utility companies, and the REA, we have now advanced many years in the scope of area served and the extent of operation carried on, and where we will have some saving with reference to the operation and maintenance of construction projects which will not be built there will be a corresponding increase in the operation and maintenance with reference to the over-all picture of the operation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska is a member of the subcommittee, and my understanding is that the appropriation does carry a percentage increase over the figure for last year. The figure last year was \$525,000. I may be in error, but my understanding is that we increased the figure to \$660,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amount carried last year was \$525,000. The budget estimate this year was \$785,000, of which the House allowed \$760,000, and we took off another \$100,000. We took it off by guess, without any particular reason.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that the budget estimate was increased to

take care of the very situation which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has mentioned, and that when the facilities were reduced about \$1,000,000 out of \$6,000,000 the administration cost was reduced in that amount?

Getting back to my original question, is it not a fact that the increase this year is \$660,000 to continue the improvements which the distinguished Senator is talking about?

Mr. HAYDEN. The justification reads as follows:

It is anticipated that approximately 340 miles of additional transmission lines and related facilities will be completed and ready for operation and maintenance in the fiscal year 1951. These additional facilities, together with the 500 miles of transmission lines already being operated and maintained, will entail an estimated cost of \$575,000 in the fiscal year 1951 as compared with \$375,000 in the fiscal year 1950. The costs for fiscal year 1950 did not represent a full year's operation and maintenance cost, as the program was initiated in that year, and the necessary staff to operate and maintain the 500 miles of transmission lines was not required until the latter part of that fiscal year.

Mr. WHERRY. This justification was made prior to the time the contract was negotiated which permitted a cut in the appropriations for construction.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. There is no connection, if the Senator will bear with me, between the reduction in the amount of money and the appropriation of this amount of money for operation and maintenance except that in the future, according to the testimony, there will be more lines brought into operation this year than were brought in last year.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps I did not state it correctly, but there is the connection that, if lines are not brought in, the increase allowed will take care of the costs this year.

Mr. HAYDEN. If we appropriate money this year to construct a line, until the line is built we do not operate and maintain it.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bonneville Power Administration—Construction," on page 234, line 9, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$41,500,000" and insert "\$39,500,000", and in line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$21,750,000" and insert "\$20,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and maintenance," on page 234, line 22, after the word "energy", to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$4,500,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to discuss this amendment very briefly. I am not objecting to the reduction in construction, but there is a very serious matter involved in the operation-and-maintenance figure, and I

wish to point it out in the hope that when the bill goes to conference the conferees will be able to provide a better figure than that which is suggested by the committee.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$5,250,000 for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville power transmission system in fiscal 1951. The House approved \$5,000,000, a reduction of \$250,000. The Senate committee cut this an additional \$500,000, leaving the Administrator only \$4,500,000 to carry out all of the vital functions required to operate and maintain a transmission system relied upon by almost every community in the entire Pacific Northwest.

I urge the Senate to reject the committee amendment. By so doing we will insure that the \$5,000,000 allowed by the House is available to BPA in the coming year.

The potential adverse effect of the \$500,000 Senate committee cut is out of all proportion to the dollars involved. Let me give the Senate just one example of how serious could be our failure to provide adequate operation and maintenance funds.

Everyone here by this time has become aware of the importance of aluminum production both to a peacetime and to a preparedness economy.

The most essential ingredient in the manufacture of aluminum is large quantities of low-cost electric power available 24 hours a day without interruption. I repeat, without interruption.

Aluminum metal is made in factories called potlines.

The term is descriptive.

Each potline is a building with 128 large cauldrons placed in a row.

Heavy electric fixtures are affixed to each pot so that strong, continuous electric current can be poured through it.

The pots are filled with a sugarlike crystal known as aluminum oxide. The current is turned on and other mineral is added.

It is a continuous process. I repeat, it is continuous.

As the metal is drained off the pots new raw material is added.

If the current should fail to supply one of these potlines for as much as three consecutive hours, it would take 2 weeks to get back into production again. The metal and other mineral would freeze in the pots. The electrodes might be damaged. The frozen minerals would be painstakingly chipped out. The 128 pots would be slowly brought back into production, one at a time.

The average aluminum potline produces about 100,000 pounds per day. Thus a 2-weeks' delay, due to a single 3-hour electric-power failure, would mean a production loss of 1,400,000 pounds of aluminum.

The Bonneville Power Administration serves electricity to 19 aluminum potlines in the Pacific Northwest. This represents half the aluminum production of the entire country.

The power system of the Bonneville administration has been consistently overloaded since the last war. There is so little reserve capacity left in it, due to growth of power use, that any little dis-

turbance can cause a power failure throughout the entire region.

The Bonneville transmission system is like a rubber band that has been stretched around a parcel too big for it. There is no spare stretch left. If any little thing goes wrong, the whole assembly flies apart.

Constant vigilance is required by the Bonneville substation operators to detect and forecast the possibility of trouble.

Constant alertness is required to cut repair time to a minimum after trouble develops. A little money goes a long way here.

A few hundred thousand dollars can mean maintenance crews stationed every 50 or 100 miles instead of every 200 miles.

And a single hour's travel time can mean the difference between 2-hour power failure for 19 aluminum potlines and a 3½-hour power failure.

A single hour's travel could mean a difference of 26,600,000 pounds of aluminum production for the Nation's needs.

The proposed reduction in the operation and maintenance funds of the Bonneville administration strikes directly at the reliability of service to plants which supply half the Nation's aluminum.

No utility can guarantee against occasional power failure. But inadequate funds for the operation and maintenance of the system can guarantee that there will be a considerable number of power failures.

Lack of a relatively few thousand dollars can mean too few men, too many miles apart to adequately service a 3,000 mile transmission system.

Too few men will inevitably mean overtime. Overtime will mean fatigue. Fatigue will mean human error and delay.

We must not speculate on our aluminum supply now. These Northwest aluminum plants must be kept in continuous production at all costs.

This means continuous power supply.

It is hoped that in view of the serious situation confronting us, which may grow even more serious due to events in the past few weeks, the conference committee will give very serious consideration to this matter, because it involves one of the most vital matters which exists today in our country, namely, the production of aluminum. The conferees may wish to reevaluate the operation-and-maintenance figure.

I urge full restoration of this cut in operation-and-maintenance funds for the Bonneville Power Administration.

This agency is paying a profit to the Federal Treasury each year.

From the standpoint of economics, from the standpoint of ordinary good business, and, above all, from the standpoint of national security, these funds should be restored.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure that Dr. Raver will make the necessary recommendations to the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. In view of the comments of the Senator from Washington with respect to pot lines, it should be noted that the amount originally re-

quested for 1951 for maintenance and operation of transmission lines was \$3,400,000. The amount for the over-all administration is \$4,500,000. I come from the Pacific Northwest, and I am interested in the proper operation of Bonneville. However, like every other activity of Government, it must have money appropriated for its operation, and in view of present conditions I hope the committee's action will be sustained.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say that the amount requested was \$3,500,000?

Mr. CORDON. For transmission maintenance and operation it was \$3,400,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understood it was \$5,250,000, and that the Budget Bureau approved that figure.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is in error in his understanding of the make-up of the appropriation item. Three million, four hundred thousand dollars was estimated for the operation and maintenance of the transmission system, \$600,000 for power marketing, and \$1,165,000 for general administrative activities. The point I make is that so far as the transmission system is concerned it is more than \$1,000,000 within the figure the committee reached. I join with the Senator from Washington in his suggestion that a careful check be made when the matter reaches conference. I am satisfied that the system can be operated within the figure which the committee has recommended.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, representing in part the State of Montana I am naturally interested in the Bonneville power program. I wish to record myself as being in accord with the distinguished Senator from Washington in this matter.

There seems little point in appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars over a period of years for the construction of vital electric power facilities and then permitting these facilities slowly to deteriorate for lack of adequate maintenance.

Yet the proposed reduction in the operation and maintenance funds of the Bonneville Power Administration will bring about this circumstance.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator from Montana that the Government has no intention of allowing that to happen. It does not intend that the plants should deteriorate. It has conducted a good job in the past, and it will conduct a good job in the future. The subcommittee in this case is one of the best subcommittees in the Senate. They went into the matter very thoroughly. They heard much testimony. They have pursued the matter with the greatest of care and deliberation. They will see to it that what the Senator fears will not happen.

Mr. MURRAY. I am sure of the intention of the committee.

During the past several years I have noticed a recurring pattern in the debates and action on this item.

The Bonneville and Department of Interior officials, in their contacts with Members of the Senate each year, have been uniformly reasonable and complaisant on most appropriations adjustments proposed by this body.

But for the past 3 or 4 years, they have told us a consistent story on operations and maintenance money.

In brief, they have pointed out that, while we have been adding to the size and value of their plant each year, we have not been making commensurate increases in allowances or maintenance and operation of that plant.

Furthermore, I am told, the Bonneville operations records reflect this situation. Each year, there is a little more news in the Pacific Northwest newspapers about severe power failures than in the previous year.

The amount of funds involved in this item is not large. The committee has cut the House figure by \$500,000. Without this \$500,000 much maintenance work on the Bonneville-Grand Coulee system will be left undone.

Now perhaps this would not matter if such work were delayed for a year; but I am reliably informed that much of this work has already been delayed for several years and that, due to rising costs and inadequate funds in past years, the backlog of incomplete maintenance work is slowly piling up and bringing nearer and nearer the evil day when failures in equipment will bring tremendous and serious losses.

This House should reflect carefully on the consequences of power failure in the Pacific Northwest. Half the Nation's aluminum production is in that region and is served directly by the lines for which this budget item is designed to keep operating.

Three-fourths of the weight of every military plane is aluminum and our national aluminum capacity right now is insufficient for civilian needs—let alone military requirements.

This half million dollars will buy a great deal.

Failure to spend it will inevitably cost us a great deal.

I urge that the House figure be restored.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I merely wish to say that not only is the subcommittee one of the best subcommittees of the Senate, but it is a sympathetic subcommittee. This subcommittee is philosophically favorable to the project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Both the Senator from Montana and I appreciate the fine work which the subcommittee has done. Our only suggestion was that the importance of keeping the aluminum-pot lines in operation may give rise to the advisability of perhaps reviewing the matter in conference.

Mr. MURRAY. I sincerely feel that the members of the subcommittee have done a splendid job. I know it is not their intention to permit any deterioration of these great works on the Columbia River. At the same time through accident or inadvertence appropriations may not be forthcoming to carry out the programs as they should be carried out. I do not think it is necessary to dwell on

the matter any further. I merely wish to record myself as agreeing with the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 234, line 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Land Management—Management of lands and resources," on page 235, line 22, after the word "Management", to strike out "\$6,756,800" and insert "\$7,127,810."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last year there was appropriated \$6,215,000. The House bill increased this sum by nearly a half million dollars more, to a total of \$6,757,000. The Senate committee now proposes to raise this sum by \$371,000 more, to a total of \$7,128,000. I am rounding off the figures to the last thousand. This would represent an increase over 1950 of \$913,000.

Mr. President, the House figures are already \$541,000 above the 1950 expenditure. In view of the stringent economic conditions of our country, and in view of the fact that the increases provided by the committee are for somewhat doubtful purposes, as I shall show in a minute, I hope very much the committee amendment will be rejected, or, better still, that the chairman of the committee, out of the kindness of his heart, will withdraw the committee amendment.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that in this increase of \$371,000 above the House figure, \$100,000 is for range reseeding. It seems to me the Grazing Administration would do much better to prevent over-grazing from occurring than to permit it to occur in the lands it leases, and then spend tax money to reseed the land which has been overgrazed.

There is a second item of \$75,000 for weed control in the California and Oregon forests. I do not know what particular weeds are flourishing there, but apparently they are seeking an appropriation to put down Scotch broom or similar weeds. At any rate if this program is necessary, expenditures for it should be taken from the increase already granted by the House.

There is an increase in the item for General Administration, although the House had already allowed \$903,000, making the total virtually \$1,000,000 for administration, which seems to me to be a very high figure.

Finally the committee provided an increase for what are called "cadastral surveys" of \$100,000. I was somewhat puzzled by this elaborate phrase "cadastral survey," and I looked it up in the dictionary and found that it means "an official register of the quantity, value, and ownership of real estate, used in apportioning taxes." In view of the fact that the House had already allowed \$743,000, and this is another \$100,000, this seems to me a rather expensive "cadaster."

I take it that another term for the "cadastral survey" is the "Domesday Book" which William the Conqueror imposed on England. Let us beware of

making this appropriation bill another Domesday Book for the American taxpayer and for the resources and manpower of the country at a time when we need them for defense.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Bureau of Land Management produces revenue for the Government. The amount of increase allowed by the subcommittee was no so much as I personally would have liked to see allowed. When we have an agency which handles income-producing property of the United States, which, if it has proper supervision, can bring greater revenue into the Treasury than the cost of the service, it is highly desirable to make adequate appropriations for it, just as it is to employ additional internal-revenue collectors when they can bring in more money than their salaries cost.

Mr. President, that is the situation with respect to this Bureau. I believe that if the Senator were as familiar with the facts as the subcommittee is, he would heartily agree with us that when it comes to supervising properly leases for oil and gas on the public domain, and for the handling of the grazing land to get a better income, and so on, that, from the standpoint of business enterprise the Bureau of Land Management has not been adequately supplied in the past.

For that reason, the Bureau of the Budget, realizing that this a revenue-producing agency, increased the amount recommended to Congress over the appropriation of last year to \$8,650,000. The committee did not allow that much, although I would have liked to see it allowed. I believe it would be a good investment for the Government of the United States to appropriate the full budget estimate. We would make money by doing that. But we compromised in the committee, and the figure in the bill is the amount the committee stands on. I hope the recommendation made by the Senator from Illinois will be rejected.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have worked on this subcommittee for some 3 years, and I believe that the recommendation of the subcommittee in the matter of the appropriation for the Bureau of Land Management is founded in sound logic, based upon testimony which wholly warrants these several increases.

In the instance of the Grazing Administration, the Government is faced with a condition and not a theory in the vast Columbia Plateau grazing areas. These areas were overgrazed many, many years ago, some of them to the point where there was hardly any grass growing year by year.

The reseeding will give an opportunity to bring into forage production vast areas where there is no value at the present time. In addition to that, the necessities in the grazing areas are well known to the people of the West, not, of course, so well known to those who have not lived there.

We in the West realize that there are uncounted thousands of acres of privately owned land which today have value because they can be used in connection with supplemental land that is

now administered under the Taylor Grazing Act. Without that supplemental range those privately owned lands would be substantially worthless, in many instances.

With respect to the item of \$75,000 for forest management, the Senator from Oregon has a particular and personal interest in that item in the bill, due to the fact that it represents a necessity in western Oregon, where the revested railroad grant lands are situated. The lands represent every other section, or every odd section, for some 200 miles north and south in western Oregon, and in an area that will run from 20 to 40 miles east and west.

The intermingled lands are privately owned. A noxious weed poisonous to livestock is now growing in that area. The State and local governments, counties and the like, have set up weed-control districts. They are fighting to save the range in that area from this noxious and poisonous weed. What they do on their lands will be of no value if they do not have cooperative effort from the United States. Hence the appropriation of \$75,000.

In the cadastral survey item, the committee was particularly interested in the necessity for early survey of the public domain in certain parts of Alaska. If I remember correctly, of the vast area of Alaska something like 3 percent has been surveyed. The greater portion of even those parts of Alaska which now are being settled is unsurveyed. There is little hope that there can be development in Alaska, as a Territory or as a State, until there can be a survey of the lands so that they may be alienated if, as, and when that is proper to the development of the Territory.

As to the general administration item, the subcommittee over a period of years past, in cooperation, I may say, with the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has urged the Interior Department to get its house in order with reference to its records in the public lands field. The reorganization of the Interior Department in the past 3 or 4 years has resulted in a great lessening in the number of applications for leases on the public lands. Due to this reorganization, at the present time we are hoping that the Bureau of Land Management may go forward with its perpetuation of land title records, something vitally important, as of course every lawyer immediately understands.

The base of title to land, of course, rests in the patent from the Government. We found that those records were in a deplorable condition. A very considerable portion of the money proposed to be added for general administration is going into the work of bringing the records up to date in the Land Department, and perpetuating those which are vital to land titles.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to supplement what has been said by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this chapter of the bill and by the Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Arizona has covered these particular items in some detail. I have sent for the record of the

receipts of the Bureau of Land Management, and I think the receipts are of such striking importance that they deserve a mention in the RECORD.

As the Senator from Arizona has said, the Bureau of Land Management produces revenue for the Federal Government. Several years ago Congress passed the so-called Taylor Grazing Act for the purpose of preventing overgrazing and of repairing the damage which had been wrought by overgrazing in the past. So that an appropriation for reseedling these lands is merely a part of the program of overcoming the results of overgrazing in many, many years past.

The total actual receipts of the Bureau of Land Management during the fiscal year 1949 amounted to \$37,149,433.89.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the able Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the very able Senator from Wyoming does not mean to contend that it has been the Bureau of Land Management which is producing this \$37,000,000. It has been the public lands that has produced it. The Bureau of Land Management has merely been a real estate agent managing the property and collecting the fees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes, the Bureau of Land Management has a great deal to do with the production of the revenue by the management of the leases and of the various holdings upon the public domain. For example, it would be utterly impossible to procure the revenue derived by the Government from the production of oil and gas and coal upon the public domain if we did not have an efficient Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The question is whether we are not paying too much for the whistle.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. I am sure if the Senator had the opportunity to examine the testimony adduced before this committee he would agree that we are not "paying too much for the whistle."

Mr. President, I was pointing out that the income in 1949 amounted to \$37,149,000. In 1950 it was increased to \$38,850,000. The best estimate submitted to us by the Bureau of Land Management—and these figures have not been questioned anywhere—indicate that in the fiscal year 1951 the revenue will be more than \$44,000,000.

With respect to the appropriation dealing with forest management, that includes expenditures of various kinds to make available for the commercial activities of the country and the sale of public timber the forests which are on the area administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

The O. and C. timber sales in 1949 amounted to \$3,532,000. It is estimated that in 1951 they will amount to approximately \$4,000,000, or an increase of almost half a million dollars over 1949.

It seems to me that an appropriation of \$75,000 for the management of these revested timberlands which are likely to produce a revenue of \$4,000,000, or in

excess of that, during the year in which the expenditure is to be made, is not at all out of line.

Other timber sales have increased from \$331,000 in 1949 to almost \$500,000 in 1950, and it is estimated that next year we shall have an increase of \$600,000.

I assure the Senator from Illinois that if he had searched for a place in which his argument for a reduction was less likely to apply than in any other place in the bill, he has found it when he has tackled the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can appreciate the Senator's argument but feel that the increase of \$541,000 over last year already allowed by the House should be sufficient. I therefore hope the committee increase will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 235, line 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was on page 236, line 1, after the word "Management", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That of the appropriations herein made in connection with the Revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, expenditures may be made for weed control on such lands, including those under cooperative weed-control agreements with the State and counties.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 236, line 14, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$800,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the fiscal year 1949-50 no direct appropriation was made for this purpose, but a contract authorization of \$200,000 was approved. The House bill provided for an appropriation for the coming year of \$600,000, of which \$200,000 was for the liquidation of the prior contract authority, leaving \$400,000 in new money. The House appropriation therefore doubled the volume of last year's operation. The Senate ups this figure by \$200,000, thus nearly trebling last year's figures.

In view of the fact that the House figure already doubled last year's figure, I think the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the access roads enable the Government to secure a higher price for its stumpage. If we do not build access roads into the forests, then the large lumber companies that can afford to build roads make a low bid for the timber in the area, and that figure is all the Government gets from the stumpage. Whereas with construction of access roads, the increased price for the timber as a result of competition between the different buyers, enables the Government to make money out of the transaction. If there is in this bill a money-making provision, designed to put more money into the Treasury, it is in this item. I should like to remind the Senator from Illinois that there are two

ways of balancing the budget. One is to cut expenditures and the other is to bring more money into the Treasury.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that there seems to be no way of solving this question; there are not two ways, there seems to be no way of doing it.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, with respect to this particular item I should like to say to the Senate that here and there over the United States the Government is in business, as distinguished from its primary duty and obligation of governing. This is a case where the Government stands in the shoes of private ownership. It is managing, operating, and selling timber on a vast area of approximately 2,400,000 acres. This is a large area of timber land, much of it still untouched, so far as cutting is concerned. It is in a very mountainous area, which is inaccessible except as roads are built, and they are very expensive to build because of the mountainous terrain. Unless access roads can be built much of the timber will not be sold. We will not get money for it, but we will lose it, because it will go the way of all over-mature timber, through rot, insect pest, windfalls, and the like. The building of access roads into these areas is a sound business approach to the management problem. The private owners who have vast holdings build access roads; they build many more miles of such roads per section than the Government has ever dreamed of building. The private owners do so because it is sound business and a good investment.

The Government seeks each year to add a few miles to its access roads program. It loses no money by doing so, for it is repaid by means of the increased stumpage value of the timber which is brought out, which, by the way, Mr. President, returns an annual profit to the United States Treasury. Furthermore, the access roads permit of management looking toward the regrowth of the forests, so that timber can be harvested again, and so that finally a complete reproduction stand of timber will be developed, and will be there for our children and their children. So it is a sound investment and is good business.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not also a fact that the building of the access roads enables the smaller, independent producers of timber to bid on the Government stumpage; and, therefore such roads are an aid to small business?

Mr. CORDON. There can be no question at all about that. Although there are not many what we would call big-business lumber enterprises in that particular area, there are many which are very small, many which have no privately owned timber, but which depend for their operations upon Government timber. This type of access road will aid them and will increase the number of bids; and when the number of bids is increased, the price on the bids goes up.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to ask one other question. I think the Senator is well aware of this matter. Is it not a fact that timber which has passed maturity is not the best timber? In other words, when timber reaches maturity, that is the time to cut it, and if it is not cut then, we run the risk of losing the timber. Is that not true?

Mr. CORDON. There can be no question about that. Mature timber is not subject to deterioration for a considerable number of years after it reaches maturity, but it is more susceptible than is thrifty, growing stock. Once it starts going downhill, it deteriorates rapidly, and every dead tree is a menace to thousands of live trees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 236, in line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 237, line 4, after the word "title", to strike out the following provisos:

Provided, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands shall be reimbursed from the 25 percent referred to in section c title II, of the act approved August 28, 1937, of the special fund designated the "Oregon and California Land Grant Fund" and section 4 of the act approved May 24, 1939, of the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund": *Provided further*, That no part of such appropriations shall be available for expenditure in connection with such lands in excess of such reimbursements during the current fiscal year.

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management, expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands for payment of current expenses in connection with the management of such lands of a type paid from the separate appropriation heretofore made in connection with such lands shall be reimbursed from the 25 percent referred to in section c, title II, of the act approved August 28, 1937, of the special funds designated the "Oregon and California Land Grant Fund" and section 4 of the act approved May 24, 1939, of the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund": *Provided further*, That no part of such appropriations for such current expenses shall be available in excess of such reimbursements for the current fiscal year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Range improvements," on page 238, line 11, after the word "received", to insert "(not to exceed \$350,000)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Payments to States (proceeds of sales)," on page 238, line 19, after the word "lands", to insert "and materials"; and in line 22, after the word "receipts", to insert "(not to exceed \$20,000)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Payment to Oklahoma," on page 239, line 8, after the word "received", to insert "(not to exceed \$4,000)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Leasing of grazing lands," on page 239, line 16, after the word "receipts", to insert "(not to exceed \$6,000)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Payments to States (grazing fees)," on page 239, line 22, after the word "received", to insert "(not to exceed \$300)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs—health, education, and welfare services," on page 240, line 14, after the word "lands", to insert "research among mixed Indians and non-Indian groups including cooperation in medical research of benefit to Indians."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 240, in line 19, after the word "festivals", to strike out "\$37,929,000" and insert "\$40,252,328."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I can appreciate the desire of both the House committee and the Senate committee to improve the welfare of the Indians. I think we all owe a debt to the Indians, and I commend the House committee and the Senate committee for their desire to help them.

However, I should like to point out that in the current fiscal year the appropriation for the health and welfare of the Indians is \$32,535,000.

The amount carried in the House version of the bill, therefore, is an increase of approximately \$5,400,000 over the appropriation for the present fiscal year. The proposal of the Senate committee is to make a further increase of approximately \$2,325,000.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we are making proper progress in our care of the Indians.

In view of the present international situation, despite my natural sympathies for this program, I believe we should slow down the rate of increase in the provision of such funds. Probably it hurts me more to propose this amendment than it hurts anyone else in the Senate. It pains me exceedingly. However, I submit that an increase of \$5,400,000 over last year's appropriation is sufficient.

Therefore, Mr. President, much as it distresses me to make this request, nevertheless in the interest of economy and of conserving our resources for the difficult international situation, I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will be filled with compassion and will withdraw the committee amendment, and will accept the munificent amount proposed by the House, namely, \$37,929,000.

I await the generosity of the chairman of the subcommittee in this matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am sorry, but I cannot follow the Senator's reasoning.

In the first place, we were compelled to restore the amount for the California Indians, which everyone agrees should be done. We restored funds for California Indians on the same basis as funds were allowed for Indians in other States.

The House had deleted \$1,286,883 for California Indians.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the item for the California Indians over \$1,000,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator then compromise on a figure to be made up of the amount of the appropriation as voted by the House of Representatives plus the amount required to care for the California Indians? I should be very happy to agree to that, even though I should think that the five million four hundred thousand already granted by the House should be enough to cover this situation.

Mr. HAYDEN. There was another item which was not properly accounted for by the House of Representatives, in the judgment of our committee.

The Senator, as an educator, will agree with me, I am sure, that the best way to teach the Indian children the English language and to become participating American citizens is to enable them to associate with other children on the playgrounds of public schools. I am sure the Senator from Illinois will agree as to that, namely, that if an Indian child can be sent to a public school, where he can play on the playground with white children, he will learn more than he will learn in any other way the lessons which will teach him to become an American. That has been demonstrated over and over again by the failure of day schools on the Indian reservations and the failure of boarding schools to bring the Indian children into accord with American ideas so that they can become a part of our civilization.

In order to meet the requirements of the States with respect to providing for the need in the case of Indian children attending public schools, it is necessary to increase this appropriation above the amount voted by the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives did not allow sufficient to meet the pending contracts with the States for payments for Indian children in the public schools. That item accounts for \$326,000 of this increase.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then would the Senator settle for the increased cost for the California Indians plus the increased cost of taking care of the boarding-school Indians? I still think that a \$5,400,000 increase should be enough, but I shall not be unreasonable.

Mr. HAYDEN. When I state the third reason for making the increase, I think the Senator will agree that the increase should be made. The committee included \$400,000 for public-assistance payments to other than Navajo and Hopi Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, which is the same as the amount appropriated for 1950 for this purpose. In the absence of this item in this bill, there is no other provision for these Indians who are in need of public assistance.

Furthermore, the Congress passed an act increasing the amounts of money to be made available to Navajo and Hopi Indians for their education, their welfare, and rehabilitation generally.

In this appropriation bill, however, the Senate committee has not voted to

allow the full amount of money requested for 1951 to start carrying out the Navajo-Hopi authorization of last year; but the committee did increase the amount above that allowed by the House of Representatives in order to meet that new authorization passed by Congress last year.

Those are the three reasons why the increase should be made. All those reasons are sound and proper, and they should meet with the approval of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only is the policy sound, and not only is the item sound, but the committee was most conservative in approving the item as it appears in the bill as reported by the committee.

I wish the Senator from Illinois would understand what is behind this particular item. I am sure he would if he would only investigate the situation and would study the evidence adduced before the committee.

If there is one item that is worthy of consideration in connection with this particular bill, it is this item. The Indians can not take care of themselves in the way that the Senator from Illinois can take care of himself.

Of course, the Indian is called upon to go to work, and he is drafted, and of course he can raise the flag on Iwo Jima; but then we complain because he is helped by a small amount of money.

I think that if the Senator from Illinois would investigate the situation which exists among the Indians he would be as enthusiastically in favor of the pending amendment as is any member of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 240, line 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Resources management," on page 241, line 6, after the word "exhibits", to strike out "\$10,542,000" and insert "\$10,814,576."

The amendment was agreed to.

E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & CO.'S RELATIONS WITH SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I am rather reluctant to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate when the general appropriation bill for 1951 is under consideration, but I have a few words I should like to have the Members of this distinguished body hear.

As the Senate well knows, Mr. President, I have always been opposed to outright monopoly which tends to stifle competition among small enterprises. As a small businessman myself, I am well aware of how much these modest-sized organizations have contributed to the growth and development of our great free enterprise system. The continued existence of American business is the economic lifeblood of the United States. Surely we all recognize that fact, and, as part of our responsibilities here, the Congress has from time to time taken steps to assist small business through the extension of loans and other services.

The terms "small business" and "large business" are somewhat relative. Arbitrarily, we may say a business is small if its assets do not exceed, say, \$25,000. It is a large business, perhaps, if its holdings total a million dollars. No doubt some would use other figures in making this comparison.

In my State of Delaware, we have businesses of all sizes—hundreds of them—stretching from one end of the State to the other. In the city of Wilmington, which some choose to call the chemical capital of the world, there are located the main offices of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. This organization, which started many years ago from a very modest and humble beginning on the banks of the Brandywine River, has grown to be one of the largest chemical companies in the Nation. Its assistance, incidentally, to the United States Government, particularly in times of emergency, has been especially notable. This was clearly shown in the field of atomic energy. The du Pont Co. played a tremendous part in the successful development of the atomic bomb. Since then, I believe, it has withdrawn from endeavors along that line because of the fact that its work is primarily in the field of chemistry.

In the present emergency, I am sure the company's facilities and its personnel stand ready at any time for a call by the Government.

However, Mr. President, I am not making these brief remarks to cite the du Pont Co.'s war record or to heap praise on its many contributions to better living. What I do want the Senate to know about is an incident concerning the operations of the du Pont Co. and its relation to small-business organizations which came to my attention within the past week.

As everyone knows, cellophane, developed and manufactured by du Pont, is one of the greatest single contributions for the preservation and sanitary safekeeping of foods and dozens of other commodities that has ever been developed. Cellophane is a byword among American housewives, many of whom would not think of purchasing food products, particularly, which are without its protection. The development of cellophane was hailed as an accomplishment of tremendous proportions when it was first successfully produced. Manufacturers throughout the country who make and market scores of products leaped at the opportunity to enhance the appearance and to insure the protection of their goods by packaging them in cellophane. As a result, the sales of cellophane increased, and its demand became more and more widespread.

A few years ago, the du Pont Co., which had foreseen this increased demand, proposed to increase its cellophane producing capacity in order to take care of the expanding market. It went ahead with preliminary plans, estimates, and the investigation of plant sites. All this was well under way when the Department of Justice, in December 1947, brought suit against the company, charging that its position in the cellophane business constituted a monopoly.

As a result, the company considered it unwise to proceed with its expansion program.

I want it clearly understood, Mr. President, that I am taking no position with respect to either the charges of the Department of Justice or the countercharges of the du Pont Co. in this case. I feel that since this matter is now before the courts, it would be improper for me to take a stand, even if I were inclined to do so.

In any event, the situation in which the du Pont Co. found itself with respect to the production of cellophane, as a result of this suit, was quickly reflected throughout the country as the demand for cellophane continued and the supply became short.

I now cite the incident to which I referred in my remarks a few moments ago.

There is a business in Gloucester, Mass., known as the Davis Fisheries. This company, I understand, puts out fish products and proposes to wrap them in cellophane. In order to obtain the various cellophane sheets that it required, the company endeavored to purchase for its needs through the du Pont Co. I learned through the office of the distinguished majority leader of the United States House of Representatives that a company representative was desirous of contacting a person of authority in the du Pont Co. with whom to discuss the buying of cellophane. I was pleased to suggest to the majority leader, for the information of his constituent, that I would contact the du Pont Co. and ask that one of its salesmen call on the Gloucester businessman to discuss the matter. When I did, however, the du Pont Co. informed me that though it would be glad to send a representative to talk over the Davis Fisheries' needs, I was advised that the current situation with respect to the availability of cellophane was not hopeful, and when I asked why, the company explained the situation, which I have just recited.

Mr. President, as I have said, I deplore the existence of monopolies of any kind when their operation stifles competitive enterprise. But I ask the Senate if it is fair to penalize the operations of this New England company and scores of others by making it so difficult for them to buy a product which is almost essential for the profitable operation of their business.

It may appear that the Government did not force the du Pont Co. to suspend its plans for enlarging cellophane facilities, but certainly the threat of the Justice Department's lawsuit has amounted to virtually the same thing.

Cellophane is now in short supply. Demands cannot be met, and prospective buyers of this product are forced to make out as best they can without it.

I might say further that the du Pont Co. has endeavored equitably to allocate the supply of cellophane which is currently being produced. In addition, the company has actively sought to interest others in the manufacture of cellophane in order that additional supplies will be available to the trade as soon as possible. However, it required more than a year

and a half to find a company willing and able to invest the large amount of capital—approximately \$20,000,000—which was necessary to enter the field on an economically efficient basis. At the present time, construction is under way on a new cellophane plant, designed and being built by du Pont for Olin Industries, Inc., in North Carolina. It is to have an initial capacity of approximately 33,000,000 pounds annually. All du Pont cellophane patents and know-how are being made available to this company. It is hoped that this plant will be in production by the middle of next year. I am sure Senators will agree with me that these are rather extreme steps for the company to take in increasing the available supply of cellophane.

It therefore seems to me, Mr. President, that at a time when our capitalistic system and the democratic way of life is being so ruthlessly challenged, we should encourage rather than restrict the continued activities of American business, both small and large.

A company is not good or bad merely because of its size. Its right to exist, and to manufacture and sell its products can most properly be determined by the American people themselves. The developments in the field of chemistry by the du Pont Co. and others have resulted in the creation of goods which have found world-wide acceptance. Cellophane is just one. In addition, there are nylon, orlon, and countless others. In my opinion, if the du Pont Co., or any other company, manufactures a product which is needed and accepted so universally as is cellophane, I feel it should be allowed to do so without being charged with monopolistic practices. American consumers and American business want chemical products and they want them now.

I should like to say that the cost of cellophane has been reduced in price several times since its first appearance on the market. It is my opinion that this does not seem to substantiate the charges of fixing prices at higher and higher levels which is usually attributed to monopolies.

I ask, therefore, Mr. President, why this company, or any other, should not be allowed to fulfill the desires of its potential customers?

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 241, line 13, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$22,422,000" and insert "\$23,635,151"; in line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$5,000,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following provisos:

Provided, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona,

California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General administrative expenses," on page 242, line 14, after the word "offices", to strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$3,644,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 242, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "two hundred and twenty-seven" and insert "two hundred and fifty."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a further commitment for additional Government automobiles. Two hundred and twenty are for replacements, and thirty are a net increase in the total number. My general observation is that if there is any product of which the Government has an excess supply, it is automobiles. I have noticed that wherever there is a Government bureau there is a large number of automobiles. I do not always object to replacing automobiles that are truly worn out; I am even willing to add seven to the total, so that the hard-worked Indian agents as they go about their ministering tasks may have additional transportation. But why they should have 30 more automobiles I do not know. I shall probably be informed that this is the most meritorious item in the bill, and that to take away these automobiles will be striking a blow at the heart of "lo, the poor Indian"; but, personally, I hope we can hold to the House figure of 227.

Mr. HAYDEN. The budget estimate was not 227 but was 327. The Bureau of the Budget, after canvassing all of the recommendations made by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as to its needs throughout the United States, recommended 327 automobiles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from Arizona that we have, naturally, a high opinion of the Bureau of the Budget, but members of that Bureau are human beings, like the rest of us; they breathe and move, eat, and drink. They are not superhuman. They are also Government employees. If there is one thing that makes a Government employee slightly lose his balance, it is the prospect of riding around in a big automobile. They seem to have an instinctive bias in favor of having more and bigger automobiles and more costly automobiles. Therefore the committee has done well to cut the number down to 250, but we should not make our standard the ideas of the Bureau of the Budget. I am willing to provide 7 automobiles, but I do not want to provide 30.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are 110 Indian jurisdictions scattered throughout the United States. They cover a vast area. We must realize that many of the automobiles which are now in operation have been in operation a very long time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am willing to provide for replacements in this instance. That is not the issue between us. The question is the rate of growth of the governmental automobile family. I think we should place a certain restriction on the degree to which the family should be allowed to extend. Incidentally, I think it would be better if we had less expensive operation.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is a strict limit on the cost of automobiles. They are all of medium price. The only automobiles costing any amount above the medium price are those for Cabinet officers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the committee hear testimony and determine the number, after going into the facts, and did it determine what was the right and proper number the agency should have?

Mr. HAYDEN. We took neither the number recommended by the Bureau of the Budget nor the number recommended by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

These automobiles are necessary in the performance of the service, and are primarily for additional personnel provided for in the Navajo-Hopi long-range program of educational and health activities.

This item does not carry any sum for the purchase of vehicles, but stipulates the number that may be purchased from funds elsewhere provided in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am not a member of this subcommittee and I have taken no part in its deliberations, except in a very general way; but I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that he has a very wrong idea about the duties of an Appropriations Committee, and especially this particular subcommittee. A committee does not go off half-cocked. It takes proof from witnesses who appear before the members of the committee. The members of the committee go into the facts very carefully. They do not merely jump at conclusions. They do not guess, as perhaps the Senator from Illinois is guessing when he talks of what ought to be done and what ought not to be done. They hear proof. That has been done for 20 or 30 years. Upon the proof before them they exercise their best judgment.

I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will not undertake to compromise with the Senator from Illinois unless the Senator from Illinois brings some facts before him, rather than merely entertaining an idea that we might trim the budget on this small matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the contention of the very able senior Senator from Tennessee, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that the Senate should accept without question every item as it is proposed by subcommittees and committees?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; not at all. However, I do say that the subcommittee ought not to be guided by the Senator from Illinois, who during this day has not suggested a single fact upon which the position that he takes can be sustained. The Senator has not heard the facts. I doubt if the Senator has ex-

amined into the question of how many automobiles ought to be given to this activity. In order that I may be certain about it I shall ask the Senator from Illinois if he has examined into this matter and has heard witnesses testify?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was not present when witnesses testified.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator know anything about it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. What does he know about it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think there is a general presumption—

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; we do not go on presumptions. We go on proof.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that what we know as men we cannot pretend to be ignorant of as Senators.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me point out that the House of Representatives has provided for additional doctors, additional nurses, and additional school teachers on the Indian reservations. If the Senator will tell us how the additional doctors, the additional nurses, and the additional school teachers can go about their business with the same old number of decrepit automobiles, I wish he would do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the first place, we are providing 220 cars as replacements. I am willing to provide something toward growth. However, it is a question of whether we should go overboard on this large additional number of vehicles.

Mr. HAYDEN. We did not go overboard on it. We allowed a reasonable number for the increased number of doctors, nurses, and school teachers. Is it consistent to provide new positions and not means of transportation for those thus employed?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. How many automobiles does the Indian Department have now?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not have the figure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to put the figures in the RECORD. I have them here. I wish to support the position of the Senator from Illinois in opposing the committee amendment with regard to the number of automobiles to be provided for this agency. The Department of the Interior in 1933 operated with 1,481 automobiles. At the present time it has 4,433 automobiles. I do not have a breakdown for this particular agency. However, another increase is proposed. Therefore, I wish to join with the Senator from Illinois in protesting this continuous increase in the number of automobiles which are made available to Government agencies. I see no sense to it whatever.

We have, according to the Bureau of the Budget, 20,119 automobiles in use in the executive branch of the Government, not counting the military authorities. I think that is entirely too many cars. Each year the appropriations call for an increase. I think it is time we put a stop to it. According to the number of automobiles and replace-

ments which have been authorized in recent years it would seem to me that these cars are relatively new and should be in good condition.

Mr. LANGER. As I recall, there are only 233,000 Indians. According to the report, at page 405, the Bureau of Indian Affairs already has 1,531 passenger vehicles. Some of them are 7, 8, or 10 years old, and it is claimed that they are no longer economical to operate. Does not the Senator think, however, that 1,531 cars are sufficient for that agency?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; they are not. We must remember that the cars must be distributed among 110 jurisdictions. Then we must remember that we have Indian boarding schools, as the Senator knows, and Indian hospitals. When we take them altogether, the total number is not too high, in my judgment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is there any reason why some of the people in the agencies in Washington should not furnish their own automobiles? Why should we furnish cars for them to drive back and forth between their office and homes?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is an entirely different situation. When an agent is out on the Navajo Indian Reservation, which is larger than the State of West Virginia, he must travel about to see the Indians. An agent may be out in the Sioux country, where we have large reservations. The Senator may make his argument with respect to the city of Washington, and it may be true that certain employees should not be provided with cars. However, that is not true out in the field.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In view of the fact that the Department of the Interior has approximately 3,000 cars more than it had a few years ago, why do they not move some of the cars from Washington into the field?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 242, line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Tribal funds," on page 244, line 3, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "\$2,430,965" and insert "\$2,437,965."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 245, line 1, after the word "laws", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary. Any tribal funds advanced under this authority shall be reported to the Congress in the annual budget for the next succeeding fiscal year.

And in line 8, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington, either inside or

outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment. On page 245, line 10, I move the following amendment:

After the word "Oregon", strike out the word "and"; after the word "Washington", insert the words "and Wyoming" and a comma. If the distinguished chairman of the committee will accept my amendment, I shall not discuss it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall be very glad to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, several years ago a similar provision was inserted in an appropriation bill. It provided for the acquisition of land. I recall that it involved Arizona, New Mexico, and some other States. Does this amendment refer to that particular subject?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will look at page 241, he will find the provision which relates to the acquisition of land outside of reservations in Arizona, California, New Mexico, and other States. This provision relates to the acquisition of land within reservations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General investigations," on page 246, line 5, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$5,150,000" and insert "\$6,500,000", and in line 6, after the word "which", to strike out "\$4,400,000" and insert "\$5,791,000."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood that at 5 o'clock, by unanimous consent, the Senate was supposed to proceed to the consideration of the nominations to the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was no unanimous-consent agreement. The senior Senator from Illinois announced that he would make a motion.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely desired to find out what the situation was.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, last evening I did advise the Senate that at 5 o'clock today I would move that the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of the consideration of the Export-Import Bank nominations.

I dislike very much to disrupt the consideration of the pending bill, which seems to be moving along very well. But

these nominations are exceedingly important. The members of the Board of Directors of the Bank are serving without salary, and not much business is being done by the bank or can be done until these nominations are confirmed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no desire to disrupt the consideration of the Interior Department chapter of the appropriation bill, but I wondered if the Senator from Illinois intended to bring the nominations up after that chapter of the bill had been completed.

Mr. LUCAS. If I could have some assurance that it would not take too long, perhaps that chapter could be completed. I hope we may get through with the nominations in a couple of hours.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely desire to ascertain what the situation is. I want the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Arizona distinctly to understand that I do not intend to hold up the pending bill, but I have a few remarks to make about the directors of the bank, against whom no one appeared in the committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, United States Army, retired, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

NOMINATIONS TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for a term of 5 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for a term of 5 years.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized. The question before the Senate is, Will the

Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the nomination.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may suggest the absence of a quorum? I had an understanding with the minority leader that I would call for a quorum when these nominations were taken up.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator makes the request in behalf of the minority leader, I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota will withhold his suggestion until I may ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota withhold the suggestion?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Just for a moment. Is it the intention that we proceed with the Interior Department appropriations when we are through with the executive calendar, or does the majority leader intend to move a recess?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], in charge of the bill, has stepped out of the Chamber.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think we can finish with the Interior Department section of the bill in an hour.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is speculative as to how long it will take to finish this particular phase of the appropriation bill. The nominations before the Senate are important, and I served notice yesterday that we would proceed to consider them today. If the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from Oregon, and the Senator from South Carolina do not take too long in the debate, we might get through with the nominations and finish with the Interior Department appropriations.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should very much like to proceed until that section of the appropriation bill is complete. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from North Dakota, we could then take up the nominations. I merely wanted to ascertain what we were going to do.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am sure that if we give the chairman of the subcommittee, who has charge of the appropriation bill, a bare chance, and do not bring in something else for discussion, we can get through with the Interior Department portion of the bill in 30 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not think that would be possible, because there are several matters in the bill which will take considerable time.

Mr. LUCAS. I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is the calling of the roll. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Martin
Anderson	Hayden	Maybank
Benton	Hendrickson	Millikin
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Butler	Holland	Myers
Byrd	Humphrey	Neely
Capehart	Hunt	O'Connor
Chapman	Ives	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Jenner	Pepper
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Darby	Kem	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Leahy	Stennis
Eaton	Lehman	Taft
Ellender	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McCarran	Thye
Frear	McCarthy	Tydings
Fulbright	McClellan	Watkins
George	McFarland	Wherry
Gillette	McKellar	Wiley
Graham	Magnuson	Williams
Green	Malone	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield to me, I merely wish to say that I am sorry that the question of confirmation of the nominations of the members of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank is brought up at this late hour in the day.

As the distinguished Senator from Oregon mentioned yesterday, the Secretary of the Treasury tells us that the Export-Import Bank has more or less discontinued operations because its directors have not been confirmed, and their terms expired on July 1.

I think the Members of the Senate know the nominees to those positions. They come from various States, and all of them have been endorsed by the Banking and Currency Committee.

So I trust that the nominations will be confirmed by the Senate very promptly, so that the directors of the Export-Import Bank can resume their work.

On the other hand, the Senator from Oregon has submitted a resolution calling for an investigation of the Export-Import Bank. I assure him that I shall welcome an investigation by the Banking and Currency Committee of the Export-Import Bank and any of its operations. Similarly, I shall welcome the appearance of the Senator from Oregon before the Banking and Currency Committee.

However, Mr. President, I do not think action on the nominations should be held up any longer, because the Secretary of the Treasury has advised us that no business can now be transacted by the Bank, in view of the failure to confirm the nominations of the directors.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, is a quorum present?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I believe that the record will show that I yielded to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct, Mr. President.

Will the distinguished Senator from Oregon yield further to me for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say that I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon in yielding to me. I wish to stress the fact that unless the nominations of the directors of the Export-Import Bank are confirmed, the operations of that bank are stopped.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I seldom differ with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, on matters of principle; but in this instance I differ with him on a question of procedure.

I shall discuss the recommendation I have made as to how this question can be resolved. Depending on how that recommendation is handled, I shall or shall not discuss further phases of these nominations tonight.

Mr. President, I propose to continue my remarks uninterrupted for a time, in the interest of continuity and clarity.

I wish to assure the Senate that I do not enjoy being in the position in which I find myself this afternoon, because I have no desire to do an unkindness or an injury to a single member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank. I think there is danger that an injury may be done them even by raising certain questions which it may become necessary to raise here this afternoon. I preferred to raise these questions in executive session of the committee. That is where these questions should be raised. That is where the information which the junior Senator from Oregon seeks to obtain from the Export-Import Bank should be obtained. I want to keep the Record perfectly straight as to the procedure which the junior Senator from Oregon has followed on this matter.

Insofar as I have any personal acquaintance with any of the members of the Export-Import Bank, I like them personally. I may have some fundamental differences with them in regard to certain of their loaning policies and practices, if I am correctly informed as to what those policies and practices are. I have certain serious differences with them in regard to some procedure which I am advised they follow in reaching their decisions as to what loans should be made. But, so that the Record will be perfectly clear, let me enumerate now the steps which have brought us to the point at which the Senator from Oregon presently finds himself on the floor of the Senate.

These nominations were sent to the Senate on Friday, June 16, 1950. They were then referred to the Banking and Currency Committee. The committee held hearings on small business, previously scheduled, on June 22, 23, 27 and 28.

A committee hearing, scheduled to consider the Export-Import Bank nominations on Monday, June 26, was canceled because of a Senate Republican conference held on that day—at least,

I am advised by a staff member of the committee that that was the reason for the cancellation of the hearing. I think it is too bad that the hearing was canceled; it is too bad that the hearing at least was not postponed.

On June 27 the members of the committee were polled regarding the nominations, and thereafter the nominations were favorably reported to the Senate, the same day, by my good friend the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. However, no formal committee meeting was held on the nominations.

Since the nominations were not formally considered by the committee, there are no committee minutes covering any committee action on the nominations.

The Record shows that on June 27 the junior Senator from Oregon offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the loan policy pursued by the Export-Import Bank of Washington and the loans made by such bank, with special emphasis on the loan policy pursued by such bank with respect to, and the loans made by such bank to, the countries of Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico, and private borrowers in such countries.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1951.

On June 27, when I offered that resolution, I commented at some little length as to the reasons why the junior Senator from Oregon felt that such a resolution should be adopted. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that on that date the junior Senator from Oregon suggested that these nominations not be pressed for confirmation until there could be a meeting of the committee and the Senator from Oregon could be heard in executive session. I think that was a fair request. It was a request so fair that its granting should have been automatic. That is the first major point I want to state, Mr. President, because when any Member of this body, on a matter as important as this, respectfully requests, as I did on the floor of the Senate, on June 27, that he be heard in executive session by a committee, in order to discuss certain phases of the policy of the Export-Import Bank which he believes have a direct bearing on the nominations themselves, the request of the junior Senator from Oregon should have been automatically granted by the committee.

I want to be fair to the committee. It is true that at that time the Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the committee, found it necessary—and I think for perfectly good cause and justification—to absent himself from Washington in order to go to South Carolina. I assume he left Washington in connection with the campaign which was then being waged in South Carolina. I have no objections to that. But, Mr. President, I think there were two alternatives available to the committee. It could have proceeded in the absence of the chairman, which I think the committee should have done in the interests of hav-

SITUATION IN KOREA

MESSAGE

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

A REPORT ON THE SITUATION IN KOREA

JULY 19, 1950.—Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

To the Congress of the United States:

I am reporting to the Congress on the situation which has been created in Korea, and on the actions which this Nation has taken, as a member of the United Nations, to meet this situation. I am also laying before the Congress my views concerning the significance of these events for this Nation and the world, and certain recommendations for legislative action which I believe should be taken at this time.

At 4 o'clock in the morning, Sunday, June 25, Korean time, armed forces from north of the thirty-eighth parallel invaded the Republic of Korea.

The Republic of Korea was established as an independent nation in August 1948, after a free election held under the auspices of the United Nations. This election, which was originally intended to cover all of Korea, was held only in the part of the Korean peninsula south of the thirty-eighth parallel, because the Soviet Government, which occupied the peninsula north of that parallel, refused to allow the election to be held in the area under its control.

The United States, and a majority of the other members of the United Nations, have recognized the Republic of Korea. The admission of Korea to the United Nations has been blocked by the Soviet veto.

In December 1948 the Soviet Government stated that it had withdrawn its occupation troops from northern Korea, and that a local regime had been established there. The authorities in northern Korea continued to refuse to permit United Nations observers to pass the

thirty-eighth parallel to supervise or observe a free election, or to verify the withdrawal of Soviet troops.

Nevertheless, the United Nations continued its efforts to obtain a freely elected government for all of Korea and, at the time of the attack, a United Nations Commission, made up of representatives of seven nations—Australia, China, El Salvador, France, India, the Philippines and Turkey—was in the Republic of Korea.

Just 1 day before the attack of June 25, field observers attached to the United Nations Commission on Korea had completed a routine tour, lasting 2 weeks, of the military positions of the Republic of Korea south of the thirty-eighth parallel. The report of these international observers stated that the Army of the Republic of Korea was organized entirely for defense. The observers found the parallel guarded on the south side by small bodies of troops in scattered outposts, with roving patrols. They found no concentration of troops and no preparation to attack. The observers concluded that the absence of armor, air support, heavy artillery, and military supplies precluded any offensive action by the forces of the Republic of Korea.

On June 25, within a few hours after the invasion was launched from the north, the Commission reported to the United Nations that the attack had come without warning and without provocation.

The reports from the Commission make it unmistakably clear that the attack was naked, deliberate, unprovoked aggression, without a shadow of justification.

This outright breach of the peace, in violation of the United Nations Charter, created a real and present danger to the security of every nation. This attack was, in addition, a demonstration of contempt for the United Nations, since it was an attempt to settle, by military aggression, a question which the United Nations had been working to settle by peaceful means.

The attack on the Republic of Korea, therefore, was a clear challenge to the basic principles of the United Nations Charter and to the specific actions taken by the United Nations in Korea. If this challenge had not been met squarely, the effectiveness of the United Nations would have been all but ended, and the hope of mankind that the United Nations would develop into an institution of world order would have been shattered.

Prompt action was imperative. The Security Council of the United Nations met, at the request of the United States, in New York at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, Sunday, June 25, eastern daylight time. Since there is a 14-hour difference in time between Korea and New York, this meant that the Council convened just 24 hours after the attack began.

At this meeting the Security Council passed a resolution which called for the immediate cessation of hostilities and for the withdrawal of the invading troops to the thirty-eighth parallel, and which requested the members of the United Nations to refrain from giving aid to the northern aggressors and to assist in the execution of this resolution. The representative of the Soviet Union to the Security Council stayed away from the meeting, and the Soviet Government has refused to support the Council's resolution.

The attack launched on June 25 moved ahead rapidly. The tactical surprise gained by the aggressors, and their superiority in planes, tanks, and artillery, forced the lightly armed defenders to retreat.

The speed, the scale, and the coordination of the attack left no doubt that it had been plotted long in advance.

When the attack came, our Ambassador to Korea, John J. Muccio, began the immediate evacuation of American women and children from the danger zone. To protect this evacuation, air cover and sea cover were provided by the commander in chief of United States forces in the Far East, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. In response to urgent appeals from the Government of Korea, General MacArthur was immediately authorized to send supplies of ammunition to the Korean defenders. These supplies were sent by air transport, with fighter protection. The United States Seventh Fleet was ordered north from the Philippines, so that it might be available in the area in case of need.

Throughout Monday, June 26, the invaders continued their attack with no heed to the resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations. Accordingly, in order to support the resolution, and on the unanimous advice of our civil and military authorities, I ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support.

On Tuesday, June 27, when the United Nations Commission in Korea had reported that the northern troops had neither ceased hostilities nor withdrawn to the thirty-eighth parallel, the United Nations Security Council met again and passed a second resolution, recommending that members of the United Nations furnish to the Republic of Korea such aid as might be necessary to repel the attack and to restore international peace and security in the area. The representative of the Soviet Union to the Security Council stayed away from this meeting also, and the Soviet Government has refused to support the Council's resolution.

The vigorous and unhesitating actions of the United Nations and the United States in the face of this aggression met with an immediate and overwhelming response throughout the free world. The first blow of aggression had brought dismay and anxiety to the hearts of men the world over. The fateful events of the 1930's when aggression unopposed bred more aggression and eventually war, were fresh in our memory.

But the free nations had learned the lesson of history. Their determined and united actions uplifted the spirit of freemen everywhere. As a result, where there had been dismay there is hope; where there had been anxiety there is firm determination.

Fifty-two of the 59 member nations have supported the United Nations action to restore peace in Korea.

A number of member nations have offered military support or other types of assistance for the United Nations action to repel the aggressors in Korea. In a third resolution, passed on July 7, the Security Council requested the United States to designate a commander for all the forces of the members of the United Nations in the Korean operation, and authorized these forces to fly the United Nations flag. In response to this resolution, General MacArthur has been designated as commander of these forces. These are important steps forward in the development of a United Nations system of collective security. Already, aircraft of two nations—Australia and Great Britain—and naval vessels of five nations—Australia, Canada, Great Britain, the Netherlands, and New Zea-

land—have been made available for operations in the Korean area, along with forces of Korea and the United States, under General MacArthur's command. The other offers of assistance that have been, and will continue to be made, will be coordinated by the United Nations and by the unified command, in order to support the effort in Korea to maximum advantage.

All the members of the United Nations who have endorsed the action of the Security Council realize the significance of the step that has been taken. This united and resolute action to put down lawless aggression is a milestone toward the establishment of a rule of law among nations.

Only a few countries have failed to support the common action to restore the peace. The most important of these is the Soviet Union.

Since the Soviet representative had refused to participate in the meetings of the Security Council which took action regarding Korea, the United States brought the matter directly to the attention of the Soviet Government in Moscow. On June 27, we requested the Soviet Government, in view of its known close relations with the North Korean regime, to use its influence to have the invaders withdraw at once.

The Soviet Government, in its reply on June 29 and in subsequent statements, has taken the position that the attack launched by the North Korean forces was provoked by the Republic of Korea, and that the actions of the United Nations Security Council were illegal.

These Soviet claims are flatly disproved by the facts.

The attitude of the Soviet Government toward the aggression against the Republic of Korea is in direct contradiction to its often expressed intention to work with other nations to achieve peace in the world.

For our part, we shall continue to support the United Nations action to restore peace in the Korean area.

As the situation has developed, I have authorized a number of measures to be taken. Within the first week of the fighting, General MacArthur reported, after a visit to the front, that the forces from North Korea were continuing to drive south, and further support to the Republic of Korea was needed. Accordingly, General MacArthur was authorized to use United States Army troops in Korea and to use United States aircraft of the Air Force and the Navy to conduct missions against specific military targets in Korea north of the thirty-eighth parallel, where necessary to carry out the United Nations resolution. General MacArthur was also directed to blockade the Korean coast.

The attacking forces from the north have continued to move forward, although their advance has been slowed down. The troops of the Republic of Korea, though initially overwhelmed by the tanks and artillery of the surprise attack by the invaders, have been reorganized and are fighting bravely.

United States forces, as they have arrived in the area, have fought with great valor. The Army troops have been conducting a very difficult delaying operation with skill and determination, outnumbered many times over by attacking troops, spearheaded by tanks. Despite the bad weather of the rainy season, our troops have been valiantly supported by the air and naval forces of both the United States and other members of the United Nations.

In this connection, I think it is important that the nature of our military action in Korea be understood. It should be made perfectly clear that the action was undertaken as a matter of basic moral principle. The United States was going to the aid of a nation established and supported by the United Nations and unjustifiably attacked by an aggressor force. Consequently, we were not deterred by the relative immediate superiority of the attacking forces, by the fact that our base of supplies was 5,000 miles away, or by the further fact that we would have to supply our forces through port facilities that are far from satisfactory.

We are moving as rapidly as possible to bring to bear on the fighting front larger forces and heavier equipment, and to increase our naval and air superiority. But it will take time, men, and material to slow down the forces of aggression, bring those forces to a halt, and throw them back.

Nevertheless, our assistance to the Republic of Korea has prevented the invaders from crushing that nation in a few days—as they had evidently expected to do. We are determined to support the United Nations in its effort to restore peace and security to Korea, and its effort to assure the people of Korea an opportunity to choose their own form of government free from coercion, as expressed in the General Assembly resolutions of November 14, 1947, and December 12, 1948.

In addition to the direct military effort we and other members of the United Nations are making in Korea, the outbreak of aggression there requires us to consider its implications for peace throughout the world. The attack upon the Republic of Korea makes it plain beyond all doubt that the international Communist movement is prepared to use armed invasion to conquer independent nations. We must therefore recognize the possibility that armed aggression may take place in other areas.

In view of this, I have already directed that United States forces in support of the Philippines be strengthened, and that military assistance be speeded up to the Philippine Government and to the Associated States of Indochina and to the forces of France in Indochina. I have also ordered the United States Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack upon Formosa, and I have requested the Chinese Government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland. These steps were at once reported to the United Nations Security Council.

Our action in regard to Formosa was a matter of elementary security. The peace and stability of the Pacific area had been violently disturbed by the attack on Korea. Attacks elsewhere in the Pacific area would have enlarged the Korean crisis, thereby rendering much more difficult the carrying out of our obligations to the United Nations in Korea.

In order that there may be no doubt in any quarter about our intentions regarding Formosa, I wish to state that the United States has no territorial ambitions whatever concerning that island, nor do we seek for ourselves any special position or privilege on Formosa. The present military neutralization of Formosa is without prejudice to political questions affecting that island. Our desire is that Formosa not become embroiled in hostilities disturbing to the peace of the Pacific and that all questions affecting Formosa be settled by

peaceful means as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations. With peace reestablished, even the most complex political questions are susceptible of solution. In the presence of brutal and unprovoked aggression, however, some of these questions may have to be held in abeyance in the interest of the essential security of all.

The outbreak of aggression in the Far East does not, of course, lessen but, instead, increases the importance of the common strength of the free nations in other parts of the world. The attack on the Republic of Korea gives added urgency to the efforts of the free nations to increase and to unify their common strength, in order to deter a potential aggressor.

To be able to accomplish this objective, the free nations must maintain a sufficient defensive military strength in being and, even more important, a solid basis of economic strength, capable of rapid mobilization in the event of emergency.

The strong cooperative efforts that have been made by the United States and other free nations, since the end of World War II, to restore economic vitality to Europe and other parts of the world, and the cooperative efforts we have begun in order to increase the productive capacity of underdeveloped areas, are extremely important contributions to the growing economic strength of all the free nations, and will be of even great importance in the future.

We have been increasing our common defensive strength under the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro and the North Atlantic Treaty, which are collective security arrangements within the framework of the United Nations Charter. We have also taken action to bolster the military defenses of individual free nations, such as Greece, Turkey, and Iran.

The defenses of the North Atlantic Treaty area were considered a matter of great urgency by the North Atlantic Council in London this spring. Recent events make it even more urgent than it was at that time to build and maintain these defenses.

Under all the circumstances it is apparent that the United States is required to increase its military strength and preparedness not only to deal with the aggression in Korea but also to increase our common defense, with other free nations, against further aggression.

The increased strength which is needed falls into three categories:

In the first place, to meet the situation in Korea, we shall need to send additional men, equipment, and supplies to General MacArthur's command as rapidly as possible.

In the second place, the world situation requires that we increase substantially the size and matériel support of our Armed Forces, over and above the increases which are needed in Korea.

In the third place, we must assist the free nations associated with us in common defense to augment their military strength.

Of the three categories I have just enumerated, the first two involve increases in our own military manpower, and in the matériel support that our men must have.

To meet the increased requirements for military manpower, I have authorized the Secretary of Defense to exceed the budgeted strength of military personnel for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and to use the Selective Service System to such extent as may be required in order to obtain the increased strength which we must have. I have also authorized the Secretary of Defense to meet the need for military

manpower by calling into active Federal service as many National Guard units and as many units and individuals of the Reserve forces of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces as may be required.

I have directed the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to keep our military manpower needs under constant study, in order that further increases may be made as required. There are now statutory limits on the sizes of the armed forces and, since we may need to exceed these limits, I recommend that they be removed.

To increase the level of our military strength will also require additional supplies and equipment. Procurement of many items has already been accelerated, in some cases for use in Korea, in others to replace reserve stocks which are now being sent to Korea, and in still others to add to our general level of preparedness. Further increases in procurement, resulting in a higher rate of production of military equipment and supplies, will be necessary.

The increases in the size of the armed forces, and the additional supplies and equipment which will be needed, will require additional appropriations. Within the next few days, I will transmit to the Congress specific requests for appropriations in the amount of approximately 10 billion dollars.

These requests for appropriations will be addressed to the needs of our own military forces. Earlier, I referred to the fact that we must also assist other free nations in the strengthening of our common defenses. The action we must take to accomplish this is just as important as the measures required to strengthen our own forces.

The authorization bill for the Mutual Defense Assistance Program for 1951, now before the House of Representatives, is an important immediate step toward the strengthening of our collective security. It should be enacted without delay.

But it is now clear that the free nations of the world must step up their common security program. The other nations associated with us in the Mutual Defense Assistance Program, like ourselves, will need to divert additional economic resources to defense purposes. In order to enable the nations associated with us to make their maximum contribution to our common defense, further assistance on our part will be required. Additional assistance may also be needed to increase the strength of certain other free nations whose security is vital to our own.

In the case of the North Atlantic area these requirements will reflect the consultations now going on with the other nations associated with us in the North Atlantic Treaty. As soon as it is possible to determine what each nation will need to do, I shall lay before the Congress a request for such funds as are shown to be necessary to the attainment and maintenance of our common strength at an adequate level.

The steps which we must take to support the United Nations action in Korea, and to increase our own strength and the common defense of the free world, will necessarily have repercussions upon our domestic economy.

Many of our young men are in battle now, or soon will be. Others must be trained. The equipment and supplies they need, and those required for adequate emergency reserves, must be produced. They must be made available promptly, at reasonable cost, and without disrupting the efficient functioning of the economy.

We must continue to recognize that our strength is not to be measured in military terms alone. Our power to join in a common defense of peace rests fundamentally on the productive capacity and energies of our people. In all that we do, therefore, we must make sure that the economic strength which is at the base of our security is not impaired, but continues to grow.

Our economy has tremendous productive power. Our total output of goods and services is now running at an annual rate of nearly 270 billion dollars—over 100 billion dollars higher than in 1939. The rate is now about 13 billion dollars higher than a year ago, and about 8 billion dollars higher than the previous record rate reached in 1948. All the foregoing figures have been adjusted for price changes and are, therefore, a measure of actual output. The index of industrial production, now at 197, is 12 percent higher than the average for last year, and 81 percent higher than in 1939.

We now have 61½ million people in civilian employment. There are 16 million more people in productive jobs than there were in 1939. We are now producing 11 million more tons of steel a year than in the peak war year 1944. Electric power output has risen from 128 billion kilowatt-hours in 1939, to 228 billion hours in 1944, to 317 billion hours now. Food production is about a third higher than it ever was before the war, and is practically as high as it was during the war years, when we were sending far more food abroad than we are now.

The potential productive power of our economy is even greater. We can achieve some immediate increase in production by employing men and facilities not now fully utilized. And we can continue to increase our total annual output each year, by putting to use the increasing skills of our growing population and the higher productive capacity which results from plant expansion, new inventions, and more efficient methods of production.

With this enormous economic strength, the new and necessary programs I am now recommending can be undertaken with confidence in the ability of our economy to bear the strains involved. Nevertheless, the magnitude of the demands for military purposes that are now foreseeable, in an economy which is already operating at a very high level, will require substantial redirection of economic resources.

Under the program for increasing military strength which I have outlined above, military and related procurement will need to be expanded at a more rapid rate than total production can be expanded. Some materials were in short supply even before the Korean situation developed. The steel industry, for example, was operating at capacity levels, and even so was not able to satisfy all market demands. Some other construction materials, and certain other products, were also under pressure and their prices were rising, even before the outbreak in Korea.

The substantial speed-up of military procurement will intensify these shortages. Action must be taken to insure that these shortages do not interfere with or delay the materials and the supplies needed for the national defense.

Further, the dollars spent now for military purposes will have a magnified effect upon the economy as a whole, since they will be added to the high level of current civilian demand. These increased pressures, if neglected, could drive us into a general inflationary situation. The best evidence of this is the recent price advances in many raw

materials and in the cost of living, even upon the mere expectancy of increased military outlays.

In these circumstances we must take action to insure that the increased national-defense needs will be met, and that in the process we do not bring on an inflation, with its resulting hardship for every family.

At the same time we must recognize that it will be necessary for a number of years to support continuing defense expenditures, including assistance to other nations, at a higher level than we had previously planned. Therefore, the economic measures we take now must be planned and used in such a manner as to develop and maintain our economic strength for the long run as well as the short run.

I am recommending certain legislative measures to help achieve these objectives. I believe that each of them should be promptly enacted. We must be sure to take the steps that are necessary now, or we shall surely be required to take much more drastic steps later on.

First, we should adopt such direct measures as are now necessary to assure prompt and adequate supplies of goods for military and essential civilian use. I therefore recommend that the Congress now enact legislation authorizing the Government to establish priorities and allocate materials as necessary to promote the national security; to limit the use of materials for nonessential purposes; to prevent inventory hoarding; and to requisition supplies and materials needed for the national defense, particularly excessive and unnecessary inventories.

Second, we must promptly adopt some general measures to compensate for the growth of demand caused by the expansion of military programs in a period of high civilian incomes. I am directing all executive agencies to conduct a detailed review of Government programs, for the purpose of modifying them wherever practicable to lessen the demand upon services, commodities, raw materials, manpower, and facilities which are in competition with those needed for national defense. The Government, as well as the public, must exercise great restraint in the use of those goods and services which are needed for our increased defense efforts.

Nevertheless, the increased appropriations for the Department of Defense, plus the defense-related appropriations which I have recently submitted for power development and atomic energy, and others which will be necessary for such purposes as stockpiling, will mean sharply increased Federal expenditures. For this reason we should increase Federal revenues more sharply than I have previously recommended, in order to reduce the inflationary effect of the Government deficit.

There are two fundamental principles which must guide us in framing measures to obtain these additional revenues:

(a) We must make every effort to finance the greatest possible amount of needed expenditures by taxation. The increase of taxes is our basic weapon in offsetting the inflationary pressures exerted by enlarged Government expenditures. Heavier taxes will make general controls less necessary.

(b) We must provide for a balanced system of taxation which makes a fair distribution of the tax burden among the different groups of individuals and business concerns in the Nation. A balanced

tax program should also have as a major aim the elimination of profiteering.

At an appropriate time, as soon as the necessary studies are completed, I shall present to the Congress a program based on these principles to assure the financing of our needs in a manner which will be fair to all our citizens, which will help prevent inflation, and which will maintain the fiscal position of the Nation in the soundest possible condition.

As a further important safeguard against inflation, we shall need to restrain credit expansion. I recommend that the Congress now authorize the control of consumer credit and credit used for commodity speculation. In the housing field, where Government credit is an important factor, I have directed that certain available credit restraints be applied, and I recommend that further controls be authorized, particularly to restrain expansion of privately financed real-estate credit. These actions will not only reduce the upward pressure on prices, but will also reduce the demand for certain critical materials which are required for the production of military equipment.

Third, we must take steps to accelerate and increase the production of essential materials, products, and services. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress authorize, for national-defense purposes, production loan guaranties and loans to increase production. I also recommend that the Congress authorize the making of long-term contracts and other means to encourage the production of certain materials in short supply.

In the forthcoming Midyear Economic Report, I shall discuss in greater detail the current economic situation, and the economic measures which I have recommended. If these measures are made available promptly, and firmly administered, I believe we will be able to meet military needs without serious disruption of the economy.

If we are to be successful, there must be sensible and restrained action by businessmen, labor, farmers, and consumers. The people of this country know the seriousness of inflation, and will, I am sure, do everything they can to see that it does not come upon us. However, if a sharp rise in prices should make it necessary, I shall not hesitate to recommend the more drastic measures of price control and rationing.

The hard facts of the present situation require relentless determination and firm action. The course of the fighting thus far in Korea shows that we can expect no easy solution to the conflict there. We are confronted in Korea with well-supplied, well-led forces which have been long trained for aggressive action. We and the other members of the United Nations who have joined in the effort to restore peace in Korea must expect a hard and costly military operation.

We must also prepare ourselves better to fulfill our responsibilities toward the preservation of international peace and security against possible further aggression. In this effort, we will not flinch in the face of danger or difficulty.

The free world has made it clear, through the United Nations, that lawless aggression will be met with force. This is the significance of Korea—and it is a significance whose importance cannot be overestimated.

I shall not attempt to predict the course of events. But I am sure that those who have it in their power to unleash or withhold acts of armed aggression must realize that new recourse to aggression in the

world today might well strain to the breaking point the fabric of world peace.

The United States can be proud of the part it has played in the United Nations action in this crisis. We can be proud of the unhesitating support of the American people for the resolute actions taken to halt the aggression in Korea and to support the cause of world peace.

The Congress of the United States, by its strong, bipartisan support of the steps we are taking and by repeated actions in support of international cooperation, has contributed most vitally to the cause of peace. The expressions of support which have been forthcoming from the leaders of both political parties for the actions of our Government and of the United Nations in dealing with the present crisis, have buttressed the firm morale of the entire free world in the face of this challenge.

The American people, together with other free peoples, seek a new era in world affairs. We seek a world where all men may live in peace and freedom, with steadily improving living conditions, under governments of their own free choice.

For ourselves, we seek no territory or domination over others. We are determined to maintain our democratic institutions so that Americans now and in the future can enjoy personal liberty, economic opportunity, and political equality. We are concerned with advancing our prosperity and our well-being as a nation, but we know that our future is inseparably joined with the future of other free peoples.

We will follow the course we have chosen with courage and with faith, because we carry in our hearts the flame of freedom. We are fighting for liberty and for peace—and with God's blessing we shall succeed.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 19, 1950.*



Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is to be an International Trade Conference, to be held in Tonquay, England, in September of this year, at which 10 delegates from 17 countries will meet to discuss reducing reciprocal tariff rates; and

Whereas the price of dairy products has already been reduced about 30 percent in the last 2 years and

Whereas the tax on oleomargarine has been removed; and

Whereas, already, many foreign countries, because of the high value of the American dollar, are shipping all their dairy products to this country; and

Whereas the same countries which are flooding our markets with their dairy products, are for their own domestic use, importing oleomargarine from the southern countries;

Therefore we, the members of the Pine Rock Grange, ask you to contact the delegates, who will represent the United States at this meeting, and urge them to oppose the lowering of tariffs on dairy products shipped to this country.

MILTON HAUG,

Master.

MRS. ADDIE LUNDIN,

Secretary.

**AMENDMENT OF RAILWAY LABOR ACT—
RESOLUTION OF CARVER CAVE LODGE,
NO. 4, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY
CARMEN, ST. PAUL, MINN.**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted by Carver Cave Lodge, No. 4, of the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, St. Paul, Minn., in support of S. 3295, a bill of which I am a cosponsor, providing for a union shop under the terms of the Railway Labor Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARVER CAVE LODGE, No. 4,
BROTHERHOOD RAILWAY CARMEN
OF AMERICA,

St. Paul, Minn., July 5, 1950.

The Honorable H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At our last regular meeting the following resolution was unanimously adopted;

"Whereas all pay increases in the past 30 years that the railroad worker has received, has been gotten for him by his union; and

"Whereas the retirement plan now enjoyed by thousands of railroad men, was put into law through the insistence of the railroad unions; and

"Whereas the working conditions on the railroads were improved through the unions; and

"Whereas we have men who do not belong or contribute one cent for all the above benefits to any union; and

"Whereas these men work side by side with the union men, who through union dues have gained all these improvements; and

"Whereas we have 100 percent union membership on the Milwaukee Railroad at St. Paul; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we unanimously endorse the union-shop bill, which is now before Congress; and therefore, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators urging their support of Senate bill 3265."

Trusting you will give your favorable attention to this resolution, and with best wishes, I am,

WALTER F. MEIHOFFER,
Recording Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 3832. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the Ogden River Water Users' Association, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2103); and

S. 3833. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the South Cache Water Users' Association, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2104).

By Mr. LEHMAN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 4942. A bill to regulate the collection and disbursement of moneys realized from leases made by the Seneca Nation of Indians of New York, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2105).

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 3659. A bill to amend title IV of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the issuance of dealers' identification tags for use on trailers, to provide for the revocation and suspension of dealers' registration and identification tags, to change the fee for dealers' identification tags, to provide for the issuance of temporary identification tags, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2106).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2614. A bill for the relief of O. O. Haugen; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2107).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 3936, to establish a system of priorities and allocations for materials and facilities, authorizing the requisitioning thereof, provide financial assistance for expansion of productive capacity and supply, strengthen controls over credit, regulate speculation on commodity exchanges, and by these measures facilitate the production of goods and services necessary for the national security, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. TYDINGS introduced Senate bill 3937, to authorize the President to extend enlistments in the Armed Forces of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3938. A bill for the relief of Harriet T. Johnston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3939. A bill to suspend restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 3940. A bill for the relief of John E. Turri and Edward H. Turri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 3941. A bill for the relief of Robert Stokvis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 3942. A bill for the relief of Dr. F. Hamburger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3943. A bill for the relief of Wang Chi-Yuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3944. A bill for the relief of Satoko Matsushima Hoglund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**BIPARTISAN SENATORIAL COMMISSION
ON DISLOYALTY AND SECURITY**

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 310) which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That (a) with a view to ascertaining the facts with respect to disloyalty on the part of employees of the Department of State and security of the Department against foreign penetration and taking appropriate action with respect thereto, there is hereby established a bipartisan senatorial commission to be known as the Commission on Disloyalty and Security (in this resolution referred to as the "Commission") to be composed of eight members appointed as follows:

(1) Two members who are Senators, one from each of the two major political parties, to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(2) Three members from private life to be appointed by the President of the Senate upon the recommendation of the majority leader of the Senate;

(3) Three members from private life to be appointed by the President of the Senate upon the recommendation of the minority leader of the Senate.

(b) The six members of the Commission who are not Members of the Senate shall be chosen from a panel submitted by the President of the United States, comprised of persons who as a result of training, experience, and attainments are exceptionally qualified to ascertain the facts with respect to the matters referred to in subsection (a) and to make recommendations with respect thereto.

(c) All appointees to the Commission shall be confirmed by the Senate.

(d) The persons recommended by the majority leader of the Senate shall be approved by a majority vote of the Senators of the majority conference, and the persons recommended by the minority leader of the Senate shall be approved by a majority vote of the Senators of the minority conference.

(e) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(f) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(g) Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 2. (a) Members of the Senate who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Senators; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members from private life shall each receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the Commission, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized (1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed

under the Classification Act of 1949, for comparable duties; and (2) to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths, to take such testimony; to have such printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services in reporting hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. Subpoenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman or any member of the Commission designated by him and shall be served by any person designated by the Chairman or any such member.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall study and investigate fully charges of disloyalty on the part of persons who have been or are now employed by the Department of State. All proceedings of the Commission shall be conducted in secret.

(b) Upon concluding its study and investigation, the Commission shall make a public announcement of its findings on or after December 1, 1950, and shall make a report thereon to the Senate with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Such report may be made to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session. Upon the submission of such report the Commission shall cease to exist.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the Commission under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$—, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the Chairman.

AMENDMENT OF HATCH ACT— AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3873) to amend the Hatch Act, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—AMEND- MENTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. Ives) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and other Senators) to House bill 7786, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. McCARRAN, and Mr. KERR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 7786, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 6228. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of James Ermini;

H. R. 6386. An act for the relief of Amos Chen, a native of Jamaica, British West Indies;

H. R. 6746. An act for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn;

H. R. 6332. An act for the relief of Choko Nishida;

H. R. 7370. An act for the relief of Kiyoko S. Barr and Harue Barr;

H. R. 7683. An act for the relief of Dr. Nicola Di Palma;

H. R. 7919. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yukiko Yoshii French and her son;

H. R. 8093. An act for the relief of Regolo Gagliaccio and his wife, Gina;

H. R. 8383. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gerald Goodwin;

H. R. 8473. An act for the relief of Kimiko Tomita;

H. R. 8558. An act for the relief of Kimiko Yamaguchi;

H. R. 8684. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yumiko Kawai Misanin and her daughter, Maria Mari Misanin;

H. R. 8740. An act for the relief of Erika Kuhn;

H. R. 8742. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tokiko Amano Roloson;

H. R. 8780. An act for the relief of Leila M. Dodd;

H. R. 8826. An act for the relief of Yaeko Nakajima;

H. R. 8918. An act for the relief of Mary Rynik Baran; and

H. R. 8973. An act for the relief of Archibald Walter Campbell Seymour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6697. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Howard H. Moran;

H. R. 6958. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Francis Lee Edwards;

H. R. 7017. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Edgar S. Bigman; and

H. J. Res. 487. Joint resolution to confirm title in fee simple in Joshua Britton to certain lands in Jefferson County, Ill.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Happenings in Washington," delivered by him on July 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him as to the proposed legislation introduced by him in the Eighty-first Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GUATEMALAN CRISIS—ARTICLE FROM READER'S DIGEST

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by J. P. McEvoy entitled "Trouble in Our Own Back Yard," published in the Reader's Digest for August 1950, and an article from the La Crosse (Wis.) Register, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE DAIRY AND BROOM INDUSTRIES— ARTICLES FROM NEBRASKA ON THE MARCH

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles published in the July issue of Nebraska On the March, one relating to the dairy industry and the other to the Deshler broom factory, which appear in the Appendix.]

VOICE OF THE WORLD—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Voice of the World," published in the New York Times of July 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY MICHAEL TIERNEY IN CON- FERRING DEGREE ON DR. JOSEPH E. CARRIGAN, OF VERMONT

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Michael Tierney, vice chancellor of the National University of Ireland, on the occasion of conferring the degree of doctor of economic science on Dr. Joseph E. Carrigan, Administrator of ECA in Ireland, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway," written by Senator Young and published in the Dakota Farmer of June 3, which appears in the Appendix.]

EFFECTS OF INFLATION ON BUSINESS— ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHERRY

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by himself on inflation broadcast July 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

RADIO BROADCAST BY SENATOR WATKINS

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast made by him over Utah stations on July 17, which appears in the Appendix.]

WATER RESOURCES OF NEW MEXICO— ADDRESS BY SENATOR ANDERSON

[Mr. ANDERSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address, dealing with the water resources of New Mexico, delivered by him on July 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BRAZILIAN NAVY IN WORLD WAR II—ARTICLE BY HOMER C. VOTAW

[Mr. ANDERSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Brazilian Navy in World War II," by Homer C. Votaw, which appears in the Appendix.]

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I suggest that the clerk continue to read the bill for amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was on page 246, line 5, under the heading "General investigations," to strike out "\$5,150,000" and to insert "\$6,500,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The Senate will be in order. Those who are compelled to leave the galleries will do so quietly.

Mr. DOUGLAS rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois desire recognition on the amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. May I inquire what page of the bill we are considering?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Page 246, line 5.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, because of the degree of noise in the Chamber, I do not believe many Senators heard the clerk when he read the committee amendment, and I wondered if we could

not now proceed to the consideration of that amendment, instead of treating it as having been agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announced that without objection the amendment was agreed to. If the Senator wishes recognition on the amendment, the Chair will withdraw the announcement. The Senate will please be in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the bill as passed by the House appropriated \$5,150,000 for general investigations and planning on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation. I may point out that according to the Senate hearings, on page 541, the Bureau of Reclamation has already a substantial carry-over from previous appropriations for this purpose. This amount was stated as approximately a million dollars, although it may be that later testimony indicated that there might be some downward adjustment in that figure.

Furthermore, the Missouri Basin appropriations for the Bureau include about three and one-half millions dollars for planning, as is seen on page 149 of the Senate committee report. It is labeled "phase C." The Bureau therefore already has about a million dollars, so far as we can tell, and if the Missouri Basin appropriations are agreed to, there will be a further \$3,500,000. The Senate committee has now increased the House appropriation from \$5,150,000 to \$6,500,000, or an increase of \$1,350,000.

Mr. President, we have just heard read a message from the President of the United States asking an appropriation of \$10,000,000,000 for military purposes. This in itself would be extremely serious, but we know it will be followed, in all probability, by additional requests for appropriations. Yet here we are apparently going on with business as usual, carrying out elaborate and increasing investigations for further reclamation and power projects which we know in our hearts, if we are to carry out the duty imposed upon us, will be postponed or not put into effect.

Mr. President, I think that as we are considering measures to adjust the civilian economy of the country to the new tasks imposed by the military situation we should gear our own actions now to accomplish the same result, and this is a pretty good place to begin. Here is where we can save \$1,350,000 to begin with.

These plans are merely the beginning. First, provision is made for planning; then come authorizations; and then come appropriations. So we are starting upstream on a series of gigantic projects to help the engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation spend not merely millions of dollars, but literally billions of dollars, on the projects they already have on the drawing boards. And they want to get the drawing boards ready for still further projects.

Mr. President, I hope very much that the Senate will reconsider its action, which was taken in great haste, and that it will sustain the House figure of \$5,150,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I take it from what the Senator has just said that he believes that in the past we have made a great mistake by developing reclamation and hydroelectric projects. The Senator may remember that it was the Reclamation Service that built the Grand Coulee Dam. If we had not had the plans for it it could not have been built. The Senator knows that most of the money, when actually expended, goes into hydroelectric projects.

The Senator from Illinois will further remember that in the days of the depression we did not have any such plans, and because of the lack of plans there arose the necessity for WPA. So we spent more money on inconsequential projects, and added nothing much to the life of the Nation, simply because of the lack of information. The Budget Bureau's estimate, recommended by the President of the United States, is \$7,800,000. The committee has not allowed that much, but has cut it more than \$1,000,000. We always have difficulty with these appropriations because of misunderstandings respecting them.

First, I should like to have the Senator to know that \$500,000 of this money is not taxpayers' money at all. It comes from the money collected from the Boulder Canyon project and is expendable in that Colorado River area. The remainder of the money, all except some \$200,000, is reimbursable. That is, it is not going to be an ultimate loss to the Treasury of the United States.

I cannot understand how at any stage of the proceedings any person can determine that we should not have plans so that we may know what we are doing. Without plans we will simply be working in the dark, and all of a sudden, when the demand comes, we will have to take quick action, and, as a result, make many mistakes. My judgment is that the appropriation is a sound one and in a proper amount, and that the Senate should allow it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I point out that the budget estimates were prepared in December 1949, and were submitted to the Congress on the 3d of January 1950. They are, therefore, at least 7 months behind time, and in the past 7 months many things have happened, particularly in the 3½ weeks since the North Koreans went south of the thirty-eighth parallel. What we are having now is widespread police action in South Korea, and the President has just asked for \$10,000,000,000.

I say to my colleagues that if we have to appropriate \$10,000,000,000 to drive the North Koreans back and to prepare our defenses for other points—and I am perfectly ready to do it, and the country is ready to do it—it is time that we trimmed ordinary civilian expenditures, and I submit that here is a very good place to trim.

We are already appropriating large sums for planning. Last year we appropriated, as I remember, \$100,000,000 for plans to be drawn in the event a depression should occur. We have made large authorizations in various parts of the

budget for planning. According to a chart in the hearings, we already have nearly \$1,000,000 carried over from last year. Then there are the Missouri Basin planning appropriations of three and one-half million dollars. I do not propose that planning be cut out entirely. I think we ought to reduce it to a minimum in view of the national emergency.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Illinois should be consistent. He should move to cut the amount much below what the House allowed in this case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am perfectly willing to make such a motion.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Illinois should be consistent; he should do that all the way through the bill. I may remind him that at the beginning of the last war when I had charge of the Interior Department appropriation bill, it looked like we were going to get into war. I said I wanted the Senate to understand and the country to understand that the appropriations in that bill were all subject to review in case the money was needed elsewhere. The President did impound the money, and, if necessary, the President will do the same thing again.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why should we depend on Executive action? Why do we not have power of independent judgment in this matter?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because we are acting today. The President can act tomorrow and the next day as the occasion requires.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We know that there is a full-scale war in South Korea. We know that we are going to spend \$10,000,000,000 at a minimum. We know, in view of that situation, that we should curtail on civilian expenditures. Here is an item for future planning for public works which in all probability will not be carried out for years, if at all.

Why is not this a chance to show the country that we want to make some savings? Why should we always make appropriations and then depend on the President to take the rap in making the cut?

Mr. HAYDEN. If it is a question of making a showing, that is one thing. If it is a question of doing a sane piece of business, to undertake proper planning, that is another thing. I insist that the appropriation should not be reduced.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I rise only in the hope that I can clear up for the Record a false impression which may have been created by the colloquy relating to planning developments, particularly for power. When anyone suggests that in any all-out war effort power is not just as important as a tank, a gun, or an airplane, he is under a misapprehension. The Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the subcommittee, pointed out that had it not been for the great power dams on the Columbia River and in the Tennessee Valley, World War II probably would have lasted many, many months longer than it did. Had it not been for the hydroelectric power projects which were begun

back in the 1930's, over the opposition of many Members of Congress, who said we should not plan these things—but, nevertheless, Franklin D. Roosevelt and the administration went ahead with the work and started the construction—had it not been for the power resulting from that construction we would be 10 years behind in atomic development.

Mr. President, I hope that when we in Congress in the future or during the present emergency discuss the question of whether we shall limit, as we should, expenditures for nonessential purposes, that is production for purely domestic needs as compared with military needs, we will, in the light of experience, place the development of hydroelectric power in the category of a purely military item.

The President even today in his message, when he pointed out what we must spend for this war, and for what may happen, makes the situation clear. I quote from his message:

Nevertheless, the increased appropriations for the Department of Defense, plus the defense-related appropriations which I have recently submitted for power development and atomic energy, and others which will be necessary for such purposes as stockpiling—

And so on, and so forth. In other words, he urges that the amount of money we have to spend in this emergency should not affect in any way our planning for power, reclamation, and the internal development of our country.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not also a fact that at the present moment there is a shortage of hydroelectric power in various parts of the country, and that if that shortage continues during the effort to rearm it will be very difficult to carry on the program?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The President points out in his message of today that it is not only the Korean matter that should be considered, but that it looks like a long-time operation in order to stamp out the ideologies of communism in the world. That may last for a long time. During that time we must keep our armament up to the point where it is sufficient to do the job for ourselves and the United Nations. Part of what is necessary to do the job is power. For instance, one-half of all our aluminum, which is most vital in any modern warfare, in the building of airplanes, and for other purposes, must be developed by power. Without Grand Coulee it would be impossible to have the atomic energy plant at Hanford. Without Grand Coulee we could not produce one-fifth of the aluminum we are now producing; and without Bonneville, we could not produce the power which is needed there. Two more pot lines are being installed at the aluminum plant, Mr. President.

So if we begin to reduce expenditures, I hope we do not cut out the real heart of our production, which is cheap hydroelectric power.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I dislike very much to enter this discussion, but I cannot remain silent under the circumstances. I wish to re-

late a little of American history with which all Members of the Senate are familiar.

During the debate on the strategic materials bill, a bill introduced in Congress many years ago, a great Senator, who became a vital leader in the war effort, made a strong plea for economy. He was opposed to entering upon a great program of stockpiling, and he asked the Senate not to do the things which I had said would be essential if we got into war. I had stated that America was in a perilous condition. The Senator who opposed me prevailed, however, with the result that on the floor of the Senate a bill providing for a 125,000,000 expenditure for the beginning of our stockpiling program was reduced to \$25,000,000. That step was taken by the Senate because Senators were economy-minded.

However, when the bill went to conference, the conferees on the part of the House were adamant; and the final result was that the full amount was provided. That bill was enacted and went on the statute books in time of peace.

It was most important to have that bill enacted into law and to have that program available, for the minute Hitler moved into Poland—and this is history which has not been related very often—the Russian organizations in the United States started to purchase our rubber. Rubber jumped 300 percent in price in one day, and it looked as if all the available rubber on our market would become controlled by a foreign government.

At that time there was in operation in the world a consortium for the control of rubber. It had a representative in New York, representing the governments of Great Britain, Holland, and France. That representative came to Washington and told me what was happening. There was nothing which could be done under the law to meet the necessities of that situation; but immediately following a call to the White House, we promised that in the first military bill which came before the Senate there would be included an embargo on the exportation of rubber. The result was that the price of rubber was brought down. However, what we were most concerned with was to have available an adequate supply of rubber. Therefore, before the embargo was imposed, I secured a promise that the rubber quota for the United States would be doubled for that year and would be tripled for the next year, and that all the rubber then at our disposal would be shipped at once to the United States. Mr. President, this is the part of the story which I wish to emphasize for the benefit of the Senate and the people of the United States: If on December 7, 1941, the Japanese had been able to capture that rubber when it was on the high seas, in shipment to the United States, they would have crippled the United States Government far more than they were able to do by the destruction of most of our fleet at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. President, in order to maintain the strength of our country, we must not rely solely on the military or on our manufacturers. Of course, agriculture, reclamation, and power, are most important; but we cannot have adequate

strength unless we maintain sufficient long-range programs. All the people of the United States benefit, either directly or indirectly, from such programs. If those programs are curtailed, our economy suffers; attacks on such programs are attacks at the very heart and soul of the economy of the United States. Curtailments in such programs reduce the strength of our soldiers in the field.

Only yesterday the comment was made that the war now going on in Korea is the silliest war ever waged, because our men armed with rifles are being sent to repel heavy tanks. Of course, such a situation seems preposterous. It comes about because of a lack of planning and a lack of understanding.

Mr. President, I am not criticizing anyone in this connection, but in considering what action the Congress should take, at least let us realize that if we attempt to save a dollar or two in connection with these long-range programs, we are likely at the same time to destroy our strength which has been built up as a result of the expenditure of millions and millions of dollars. If that happens our whole defense effort and all that we are trying to do in the world will fail, and at the same time the American economy will collapse. After all, what more does any enemy of the United States want than to have our economy collapse?

Mr. President, upon what does the strength of the West depend except on its ordinary economy, which has been developed as a result of reclamation and the electric energy produced in connection therewith. From those developments we obtain food, power, water, all the resources of the entire west. The only strategic steel plant ever built in the history of the Nation is directly dependent upon water and water power developed at one of the reclamation projects, a project built long before the war.

Mr. President, these things are serious. We must be sure that the all-around strength of the United States is maintained, or else the United States will never succeed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if it were not for the aspect of public power which is involved in this committee amendment, I should be very much impressed by what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has said. But we cannot afford to think of business as usual or Government as usual in the face of the present crisis. The fact remains that if it had not been for public power in the Northwest, in the Tennessee Valley, and wherever else the funds of the United States have been invested in the construction of power plants, it would have been utterly impossible for this country to have produced the munitions of war which were so necessary during the conflict in which the shooting ended in 1945—a conflict which, however, has not yet terminated.

It is utterly futile to think that private capital will go into the building of

hydroelectric power plants at this time. The facts before the committee are clear: There is a far greater demand now for hydroelectric power than can be served by both private power plants and public power plants. The President advised us today that he will ask increased funds for military preparedness. If we are to expend those funds for that purpose we shall require a great deal more electric power energy than we now have.

Moreover, Mr. President, in the areas for which these plans are devised there are great natural resources, the development of which is absolutely essential. Let me speak of one—and I should like to have the attention of my friend from Illinois to this matter. Alumina, the material from which aluminum is made, is presently being manufactured chiefly from bauxite which is imported into the United States. There are all over the West, alumina clays from which alumina can be made, and as the result of the development of which the United States will be independent of foreign sources of supply of bauxite. These alumina clays cannot be developed in the West without additional electric power. We had an example during World War II of how these developments could be brought about. As a result of the Grand Coulee project, as has been indicated by the Senator from Washington, it was possible to establish in the Northwest the manufacture of aluminum, which would have been utterly impossible without that public power.

As I have said, Mr. President, under ordinary circumstances, if it were not for this matter of public power, I should be very much inclined to go along with the Senator from Illinois. We must have economy. We must not follow business as usual. We must concentrate upon building up our economy. It cannot be

denied that public power is one of the essential ingredients of the sort of military preparedness which we are now about to engage upon in a more intensified degree than heretofore.

I have advised the Senator from Arizona that it is my purpose later in the consideration of this measure to offer an amendment similar to that which I presented at the time the flood-control bill was under consideration, so that, following the recommendation of the Hoover Commission, there may be set up in the executive office a board of engineers whose duty it will be to examine every one of the projects contained in this bill, so far as reclamation is concerned, and every project which is contained under the civil functions chapter of the bill, so that no new project may be initiated unless a certification is received from the engineers that the initiation of the project would help the national defense. In other words, instead of saying we shall not investigate, let us go along with investigations, so that we may know where public power projects can be developed, or even reclamation, if necessary; but let us be certain that in this emergency the funds shall not be expended to initiate projects which would be open to the criticism that they constituted only business as usual.

In those circumstances, Mr. President, and in the light of the suggestion which I make with respect to such an over-all amendment to curtail expenditures which cannot be geared into the national defense, I hope that this committee amendment may be accepted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, by the comments of various Senators, one would have thought that my proposal to diminish the appropriation for planning further projects in the field of reclamation was of direct aid to the soldiers of North Korea, and as though the fate

of the American troops in South Korea depended upon lavish planning of public works in the West. I think up reflection Senators will conclude that this is a very grievous overstatement of the situation.

I think I have been known as quite sympathetic to public-power projects. I favor public-power projects on rivers and in river basins where there is a sharp fall of rain, where the rivers have rather precipitous fall and, therefore, have rather great potentialities of power development, and where the surrounding hills are of such height that it is possible to get depth in the reservoirs without flooding much adjacent meadowland. I have always been a supporter of the TVA, and I am a supporter of public-power projects in the Columbia Valley. I hope we develop more projects in the Snake River, and so forth. But there is a time and a place for everything.

At present we are in a virtual war. We also need to remember that we have a very large backlog of existing projects for which the plans have virtually been drawn. I hold in my hand part 4 of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior, of our sister branch, the House. On page 662 there is a list of the reclamation projects in this bill which have already been authorized and approved. Incidentally, the initial cost of those projects was estimated at \$1,682,000,000—no small figure. But their present estimated cost is \$5,252,000,000. I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the full table showing these figures in columns (2) and (3), the foregoing totals of which I have myself supplied.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement of estimated project costs, construction period, and power-development data

Project and State (1)	Original estimated cost (2)	Present estimated cost ¹ (3)	Date first construction appropriation (4)	Total power capacity (kilowatts) (5)	Date power available		Project completion date (8)
					First (6)	Final (7)	
Gila, Ariz.	\$32,491,500	\$53,560,235	1936				After 1956.
All-American Canal, Ariz.-Calif.	38,500,000	76,993,213	1934				October 1951.
Colorado River front work and levee system, Arizona-California. ²	16,295,000	16,295,000	1926				June 1954.
Boulder Canyon, Ariz.-Nev. ³	126,500,000	173,900,000	1930	1,332,300	October 1936	May 1954	June 1955.
Davis Dam, Ariz.-Nev. ³	41,200,000	114,438,000	1942	225,000	November 1950	April 1951	June 1954.
Central Valley, Calif.	170,000,000	581,886,000	1936	815,000	June 1944	After 1956	After 1956.
Santa Barbara, Calif.	32,210,000	34,189,000	1949				May 1954.
Colorado-Big Thompson, Colo.	44,000,000	150,503,000	1935	177,400	May 1943	April 1943	June 1953. ³
Paonia, Colo.	1,071,200	4,747,000 { 45,146,000 }	1940				June 1953.
San Luis Valley, Colo.	17,365,000	(4,200,000)	1935				September 1951.
Boise, Idaho, Payette division	6,678,300	17,173,000	1905				June 1951.
Lewiston Orchards, Idaho	997,000	2,500,000	1948				December 1950.
Buffalo Rapids, Mont., first division	1,935,000	2,735,000	1935				June 1954.
Fort Peck, Mont. ²	5,732,554	16,250,000	1943				After 1956.
Hungry Horse, Mont. ²	38,648,000	108,800,000	1946	285,000	October 1952	October 1953	June 1954.
Milk River, Mont., Fresno Dam	2,000,000	2,000,000	1904				October 1950.
Sun River, Mont., Greenfields division	7,372,400	9,700,000	1928				June 1951.
Fort Sumner, N. Mex.	2,464,000	2,464,000	1948				June 1952.
Tucumcari, N. Mex.	8,155,000	16,730,000	1937				December 1952.
Rio Grande, N. Mex.-Tex.	21,150,000	14,178,000	1905	24,300	November 1940	November 1940	June 1952.
W. C. Austin	5,600,000	13,206,000	1937				June 1955.
Deschutes, Oreg.	8,400,000	12,850,000	1922	1,500	April 1946	April 1946	June 1953.
Klamath, Oreg.-Calif.	4,400,000	18,146,601	1905				June 1955.
Provo River, Utah	15,774,000	28,050,000	1934				June 1953.
Columbia Basin, Wash.	393,000,000	773,339,000	1934	1,974,000	April 1942	October 1951	After 1956.
Yakima, Wash., Roza division	15,000,000	22,868,000	1905	10,000	June 1953	June 1953	June 1953.
Eden, Wyo.	2,045,000	4,828,000	1941				June 1954.
Kendrick, Wyo.	20,000,000	25,000,000	1934	32,400	August 1939	August 1939	June 1955.

Footnotes at end of table.

Statement of estimated project costs, construction period, and power-development data—Continued

Project and State (1)	Original estimated cost (2)	Present estimated cost ¹ (3)	Date first construction appropriation (4)	Total power capacity (kilowatts) (5)	Date power available		Project completion date (8)
					First (6)	Final (7)	
Riverton, Wyo.....	\$9,500,000	\$21,813,403	1921	1,600	June 1925.....	November 1925.....	June 1954.
Shoshone, Wyo.....	8,851,360	16,851,705	1904	10,600	April 1922.....	December 1948.....	June 1956.
Rehabilitation and betterment—various.....	56,000,000	32,636,100	1949				Various 1950 and after.
Missouri River Basin—various.....	529,152,800	2,834,427,848	1946	1,130,200	May 1950.....	After 1956.....	After 1956.

¹ Differences between original and present estimated costs are due to the approved changes in project programs and changes in price levels.

² Projects for which irrigation is not directly involved.

³ Project to be complete except for additional transmission facilities at present in a deferred status.

⁴ Conejos division only—now under construction.

⁵ Estimated cost embraces cost of power division only.

⁶ Estimate was prepared for a greater number of projects than is currently under consideration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, \$5,-250,000,000 worth of reclamation projects have already been authorized, and the general plans for them are virtually drawn.

As a matter of fact, of the \$6,500,000 in this item of the bill, only a little more than \$1,000,000 is for advance planning upon these authorized projects. Something like \$5,048,000 goes under the general term "engineering and economic investigations." I cannot believe that the total of \$6,500,000 is so essential to the war effort, so necessary to developing public power projects and getting aluminum, that we must approve it to the last jot and tittle. There probably are certain projects in the West which should be carried through. They are in general quite well under way now, and all that is needed is further work upon them.

But, Mr. President, I do not see the advantage of appropriating the full \$5,000,000 more so that we can develop an additional set of plans, over and above the \$5,250,000,000 worth of projects that we have authorized.

The Bureau of Reclamation moves by stages. Planning is the first stage, then authorization, and then appropriation. It has \$5,250,000,000 worth of work in projects we have authorized, and it is coming before the Congress and asking to have appropriated \$300,000,000 of it. It now wants to capture further territory with \$5,000,000 of planning and investigation funds so it can increase its backlog of authorized projects to possibly \$6,000,000,000 or \$7,000,000,000. We have enough fat of potential public works to live upon for a time, and we can cut down economic investigations and the development of new projects and carry on the projects we already have under way.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move to strike out the figure "\$6,500,000" and insert in its stead "\$3,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction and rehabilitation," on page 247, line 2, after the word "facilities", to insert "and emergency reconstruction of the La Prele unit, Wyoming."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the committee amendment which probably should have been submitted before action on the committee amendment—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is now pending.

Mr. MAGNUSON. My amendment is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 247, line 3, after the word "Wyoming", it is proposed to insert the following: "and initiation of construction on the Kennewick Division of the Yakima project, Washington."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not want to burden the Senate, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a explanation which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPELLING REASONS FOR PROVIDING FUNDS
TO INITIATE CONSTRUCTION ON KENNEWICK
DIVISION, YAKIMA PROJECT—STATEMENT BY
SENATOR MAGNUSON

I have at the desk an amendment to provide funds to initiate construction in fiscal 1951 on the Kennewick division of the so-called Yakima project. This is a multiple-purpose project in the State of Washington.

The Kennewick division is located directly above the junction of the Yakima and the Columbia Rivers. It will service approximately 21,000 acres of land. It includes a power plant of 12,000 kilowatts. Hydroelectric power from this plant will go into the Northwest power pool.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$175,000 for continuation of plans and specifications on the project. No construction funds were authorized by the Bureau on the mistaken theory that the Kennewick division constitutes a so-called new start.

I appeared before both House and Senate Appropriations Committees to take issue with the Budget Bureau's contention that the Kennewick is a "new start."

After weighing the facts, both committees concluded that this is merely a division of the Yakima project—a project, parts of which have been in operation over 40 years. I will not repeat my arguments here. I do

wish, however, to quote the conclusion reached by the two committees.

On page 172 of its report, the House Appropriations Committee makes the following statement:

"The President's budget message on page M-65 contains the following statement:

"The activities of the Bureau of Reclamation and the flood-control program of the Corps of Engineers, involving the construction of dams, power facilities, canals, channels, and levees will be limited in 1951 to continuation of work on projects started in prior years."

"The committee does not agree with the determination of the Bureau of the Budget in rejecting appropriations for the construction of the Kennewick division, Yakima project, Washington, under this expression of policy. The committee has considered this division and has determined that it is not a new project but is part of the Yakima project under such policy."

On page 146 of the Senate committee's report there appears the following:

YAKIMA PROJECT, KENNEWICK DIVISION,
WASHINGTON

"The committee concurs with the determination of the House Appropriations Committee on page 172 of its report No. 1797 to the effect that the Kennewick division of the Yakima project 'is not a new project but is a part of the Yakima project.'"

It is unmistakably clear from the language I have just quoted that both committees of Congress agree that the Kennewick division is not a new start, and there is strong implication in both statements that the Bureau of the Budget was in error in denying construction funds on that basis.

Early completion of this project is of vital importance to what is called the tricity area of eastern Washington. The tricity area includes the great atomic energy plant at Hanford.

Prior to the location of the Hanford plant in this section of eastern Washington, the economy was geared to agricultural production—packing and processing of farm produce.

In acquiring land for Hanford activities, the Atomic Energy Commission took by condemnation over 7,000 acres of rich, irrigated land. In addition, about 150,000 acres of the most desirable land in the entire Columbia basin project have been placed in a safety zone.

Development of the atomic energy plant has brought with it a vast increase in population. To sustain this population more jobs, more produce, more of everything is required.

An area geared to agricultural production of necessity incurs heavy investments in packing sheds, processing plants, coal storage facilities, etc. Heavy withdrawal of land which formerly grew the products to sustain these investments has a depressing effect upon their value and in the long run would

demand drastic readjustments. Early completion of the Kennewick division—bringing into production 21,000 acres of land—will go far toward minimizing the effect of the readjustment.

I repeat, both committees of Congress have considered carefully our contention that the Kennewick is not a new project, but one of the five divisions of the Yakima project—a division planned almost 40 years ago.

They specifically state in their reports that this is not a new start. My amendment does not increase the over-all appropriation allotted the Bureau of Reclamation for construction and rehabilitation. It simply makes it clear beyond any possible misunderstanding that if the Bureau can find the funds within its over-all appropriation it is free to initiate construction on the Kennewick division of the Yakima project.

I hope the Senate will adopt this amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Kennewick project, in the State of Washington, lies on the slope of the Columbia River across the river from the atomic-energy plant at Hanford. When the Yakima project was planned—again getting back to planning—sufficient acreage was included to take care of what would be the normal population increase. But along came the atomic-energy plant, which took some 21,000 acres of tillable land in that area. The people there feel that the Yakima project, which is included in what we call a section of it, the Kennewick project, could be developed on the other side of the river in lieu of the 21,000 acres taken by the atomic-energy plant.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Kennewick project was not considered to be a new project. We wanted to make certain in the text of the bill that it was a part of the Yakima project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I have no objection to taking the amendment to conference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 382. An act for the relief of Wong Suey Wing;

S. 841. An act for the relief of Michele Bartolomeo Marchisio;

S. 976. An act for the relief of Vartan Chamsarian;

S. 1262. An act for the relief of Juliana Mendiola Alastra;

S. 1779. An act for the relief of Phil Meyers, also known as Gil Meyers;

S. 2077. An act for the relief of Francisco Gonzalez Perez;

S. 2277. An act for the relief of George A. Voregarethos (George Spiro Chatmos);

S. 2296. An act for the relief of Maria Cicerelli; and

S. 2676. An act for the relief of Kimie Yamada Ina and her daughter, Ritsuko Ina.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 247, in line 4, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$297,467,000" and insert "\$294,713,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we now come to the heart of the coconut. This is a general appropriation of approximately \$295,000,000 to the Bureau of Reclamation for construction and rehabilitation.

I believe the appropriation bill introduces an innovation at this time in that it does not list the projects upon which the money is to be expended, but they are given in the committee report on pages 142 and 143, and I would suggest that Members of the Senate who are interested in the question consult the report at that point.

Mr. President, if this appropriation is agreed to we shall be appropriating virtually \$295,000,000 for reclamation projects in the West.

NEW, OR SUBSTANTIALLY NEW, STARTS

We have gone to some trouble to find out with reference to those projects which ones constitute new starts, according to the figures which we can get, and the projects which are virtually new starts, namely, where only a small fraction of the total appropriation has already been expended. It may be assumed in such cases that only planning money has been spent thus far. I should like to give that list, if I may.

For instance, in the Central Valley, in the case of the Sly Park Dam, as to which there is a total estimated cost of \$6,220,000, we find that no money has been expended to date, so that any appropriation would, in effect, constitute a fresh start.

In the case of the Folsom power facility, the total estimated cost is \$47,800,000, and no money has been expended to date.

In the case of the Fort Peck project, Glendive-Williston transmission line, the total estimated cost is \$2,000,000, and nothing has been spent to date according to the hearings.

Mr. President, we are thus appropriating for projects which have not been started at all, and we are also appropriating large sums of money for projects upon which only small amounts have been expended.

Let us consider parts of the so-called Gila project, for the Wellton Canal, the total estimated cost is \$1,570,000. It was estimated by the Bureau that there would be expended through the fiscal year 1950, \$15,291, or only 1 percent of the total.

On the Wellton lateral unit, the total estimated cost of which is \$2,358,000, only \$25,537 or a little over 1 percent was estimated to be expended by June 30, 1950.

On the Dome lateral unit the total estimated cost is \$1,919,000, and the amount spent to June 30, 1950 was estimated as \$7,516, or one-third of 1 percent. This can be checked in the House hearings.

Similarly, on the Colorado River front project, the total estimated cost of the levee system is \$16,295,000, and the estimated amount spent is \$414,428. The Bureau's justification stated that a preliminary report on levee plans had to be completed before construction could be initiated—House hearings, page 681.

On the Colorado-Big Thompson project, for the Brush substation, the total estimated cost is \$2,513,500, of which \$431,795 has been spent.

On the Flatiron, Fort Collins, Creely tap line, the total estimated cost of which is \$799,100, \$28,758 has been spent. The Bureau's justification states that with these requested 1951 appropriations construction on these items will be started.

On the Spring Creek Dam in the Paonia project, the total estimated cost of which is \$3,300,500, the sum of \$272,200 has been spent. Again the justification reveals that this appropriation will start the construction.

In the case of the Big Sandy Dam and Reservoir in the Eden project, the estimated cost is \$2,000,000, and the amount estimated to be spent by June 30, 1950, is \$42,025. This project was stopped by order of the War Production Board in 1942. This bill will let the construction go ahead.

On the Kendrick project, Seminole-Baroil line, the estimated cost of which is \$242,000, the sum of \$25,000 has been spent. This bill will let construction be initiated.

In the Missouri River Basin, the Jamestown unit, the estimated cost of which is \$10,749,000, the estimated amount spent by the end of fiscal 1950 is \$214,573. Our own Senate committee report, page 150, states that this appropriation will allow construction to start.

On the Missouri-Souris project and I shall have more to say about that project, because it will probably be said that it is essential to the prosecution of the war in Korea, judging by what has happened today—only \$1,218,000 is estimated to have been spent, although the ultimate cost will be \$68,855,000.

Mr. President, there are projects here totaling appropriations of \$6,593,000. If they are new or substantially new starts, according to my figures, it is also interesting to note that the total estimated cost of the foregoing projects for which we shall be asked to make increased appropriations in the next few years, is \$166,404,100.

If we make the starts this year and carry on this year, it will be said, "Well, we have gone so far. We must continue." Then we shall be involved in a further appropriation of approximately \$160,000,000. I think this is a very crucial time for us to stop, look, and listen on this kind of appropriation.

MISSOURI-SOURIS PROJECT

I want to say a further word, if I may, about the last project I mentioned, the Missouri-Souris division. According to the testimony before the House, as I read it, no final decision has been made on the location of the canal and lead-off from the diversion dam to the related work in the so-called phase B, namely, units being prepared for construction. I ask Senators to refer to the House hearings at page 911. The Assistant Secretary frankly stated:

There is a great deal of work that needs to be done before the ultimate feasibility of the irrigation plans can be worked out for the Crosby-Mohall unit or the Jamestown unit, or any of these distant units.

The estimated cost of the phase A aspects of Missouri-Souris, Missouri diversion unit—phase A signifying units selected for construction—is \$68,855,000, and the Crosby-Mohall and Devils Lake units in phase B will cost \$269,000,000 and \$21,000,000, respectively. In addition, the Jamestown unit of Missouri-Souris, which the committee action has moved from phase B to phase A, is estimated to cost \$10,749,000.

By taking the first big steps on these projects of Missouri-Souris, we would be getting involved in costs which would run close to \$370,000,000. It seems wiser therefore to halt this construction now, since only \$1,432,000 has been spent on phase A, until all doubts have been removed concerning the economic feasibility of the project. How can we justify starting out on a road which leads to enormous expenditures when so many questions are still unanswered, and when the President of the United States is asking for a \$10,000,000,000 appropriation to conduct a war. I suspect, although the record is not clear, that the provisions for the repayment of the irrigation costs of this project are likewise most incomplete.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The conclusion I draw from the Senator's remarks is that we made a mistake in the past in adopting a reclamation policy, and that we should not attempt to institute any new projects, either now or in the future, because they would cost money. I believe the Senator overlooks the fact that these projects create wealth. They create much more wealth than they cost. Their construction adds to the wealth of the Nation, and that fact can be proved with respect to all reclamation projects. The taxes paid into the United States Treasury, following the creation of this new wealth, have more than repaid the cost of new projects, and will continue to do so. If the Senator looks at it in terms of dollars and cents, and does not take into considera-

tion the homes which have been provided for people and the wealth which has been added to the Nation, I would agree with him. If the Senator takes the broader view, and considers the wealth which has been created and the taxes which have been paid into the Treasury, I think he is utterly mistaken.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is the ultimate premise, which the very able Senator from Arizona defends, that these projects pay for themselves. In that connection I may say it has been found that most irrigation projects must seize power revenues in order to pay for themselves. We found that to be true with respect to many irrigation projects.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is mistaken. He is correct if he looks merely at the amount of money which the Federal Government has paid out and the amount of money which has been paid back. If we look at the wealth that has been created by a project, he is not correct. Let us take, for example, the Salt River project in my State. On that project the Government spent \$20,000,000. It created wealth on the basis of which \$66,000,000 in income taxes were paid into the Federal Treasury last year. That amount of money would not have been paid into the Treasury if the project had not been constructed, because the land would have remained a desert.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have analyzed some of the irrigation projects which have been proposed during this session. I find the cost per acre of land to be \$600, \$700, and, in some cases, as high as \$1,100. I see before me the very able and beloved Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. Land in Vermont is supposed to be the least fertile of any land in the United States. I know he denies it, but it has been alleged to be true.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At least the hillsides of Vermont are not particularly fertile. If we were to spend \$700 or \$1,000 an acre on the hillsides of Vermont we could literally make them bloom like a rose, and we would have abundant crops. I should like to know why we should spend \$700, \$800, or \$1,000 an acre on semiarid land and not upon the stony hillsides of Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to correct the Senator's estimate. I think he said the cost per acre was \$700 or \$800. I think he should have said \$1,700.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is my nature to be conservative. Does the Senator from Vermont say the cost has been \$1,700 an acre?

Mr. AIKEN. The cost is estimated to be \$1,700 an acre on some projects. If that amount of money were spent the yield per acre would not be any greater than if \$100 an acre were spent on that land in Vermont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Vermont. I may say that I have been going over figures showing the price at which land sells north of Bloomington, Ill. The Bloomington area produced not only the very able majority

leader of the Senate, but also the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], whom we claim as a native son of Illinois. That land is supposed to be the richest land in the Nation. Its selling price does not much exceed \$400 an acre. Here we learn that for some projects we are asked to pay \$1,700 an acre for desert land.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps there is no project proposed in this bill in which an investment would begin to yield the returns which would come from the development of the St. Lawrence seaway. That is a project which would be entirely self-supporting, self-sustaining, and self-liquidating. It has been amazing to me that so many Senators who encourage this type of construction, which at best is of doubtful economic value, insist on objecting to the development of the greatest of all natural resources in North America as to which there is no question of economic feasibility. It is a project which must be developed in the interest of the security of the Nation.

It seems to me that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway should come far ahead of these proposed projects for which we are asked to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars, and perhaps eventually billions of dollars.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Vermont is entirely correct, as he generally is, that from the ultimate standpoint the St. Lawrence project is probably one of the best projects before us, and that in terms of emergency it is very much more important than the irrigation projects in the Southwest.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Illinois will permit me to say so, I should like to add that it is entirely possible that if the United States should become engaged in an all-out war, as seems likely, the outcome of that war would depend on whether the St. Lawrence seaway were developed, and whether the great steel industry of America could be maintained in the Central States without the development of the St. Lawrence seaway. It seems to me unthinkable, in view of the position in which the United States finds itself, that there should be any opposition in Congress or out of Congress to the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, because it is so vital to the national economy and security.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the speech by the Senator from Vermont, who has been the most persistent and certainly one of the most intelligent advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway. At the moment what I am trying to do is to save money in these appropriations for power and reclamation projects in the West. I am a friend of the West; but we have already provided large appropriations for this area. We have committed ourselves to projects which are extremely costly. Please let us not start new projects, and let us also slow down, in view of the war emergency, the rate at which we build the projects which are already under way.

REDUCTIONS IN RATE OF CONSTRUCTION

Mr. President, in addition to cutting out these new starts and substantially new starts, I believe we should slow down

existing projects in general, and reduce appropriations by 25 percent for projects already substantially under way, with the exception of the Colorado-Big Thompson project. This may make the Senator from Colorado wince, but in that case I think we should slow down by 40 percent. And I can defend those suggestions.

If I may make a reference to the Colorado-Big Thompson project, the original estimate of cost was \$44,000,000. At that time it was provided that the water users should repay half the cost, but not to exceed \$25,000,000. That seemed perfectly fair at the time. If I am incorrect, will Senators check me up by reference to the House hearings, page 733? Now we find that the estimated cost is \$150,503,000, but the water users cannot be charged more than \$25,000,000, so that \$125,000,000 is to be loaded upon the general taxpayer, or upon the power users, one or the other.

I believe it would help if we slowed down the rate of construction. It might even help the Bureau of Reclamation in carrying on negotiations with the water users, so that they would assume a larger proportion of the cost that at present.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAPMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator recall that the same argument for slowing down he now is making was made against the Grand Coulee project in 1940 and 1941, but by the time we were a little way along with the war emergency, we were very glad we did not slow down the Grand Coulee project?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The amendment which I shall shortly submit, to cut \$90,000,000 from this appropriation, will not call for any specific cut on any given project. It is merely a reduction in the total amount, and the Bureau of Reclamation will then have the power and authority to pick out the \$204,000,000, let us say, of projects which it regards as most essential for the war effort and the national interest, and derate its energies to them. But it will not have the power to use the full \$294,000,000, as would be provided in the pending appropriation bill. Every time a Senator proposes a reduction, other Senators rise and act as though he was intending to cut the heart out of the West. We are not trying to do that. We love the westerners, but we do not believe they should walk off with the National Treasury.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUNT. Will the Senator from Illinois yield for an observation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; if I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, the very skilled economist from my native State is exceptionally clever in presenting his arguments for reductions in appropriations for reclamation projects purely from the standpoint of reading the nu-

merals in the book. I should like to say to the very distinguished junior Senator from Illinois that had he lived on and immediately adjacent to a reclamation project, as I have, for the past 30 years, he would not today be making the argument he is making, for the reasons which I shall state.

In my own county there is a small reclamation project known as the Riverton project, upon which there has been expended some \$13,000,000, to bring land under water. The crops already produced on that project total in excess of \$17,000,000.

Aside from that, the small town, which is the center of this reclamation project, Riverton, Wyo., only a few years ago had a population of perhaps 1,000. The census just completed shows this town now has a population in excess of 4,500. The property in that area in the last several years, perhaps the past 5 years, shows appreciation in value from \$12,000,000 to \$41,000,000.

I should say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that carloads of furniture, carloads of automobiles, carloads of many things manufactured in the east, come to that section, and payment for those various commodities comes from the pockets of the people living on the reclamation project there. So the end result of reclamation is pumping prosperity into the home State of my distinguished colleague from Illinois.

Mr. President, some years ago a committee from the Congress was investigating reclamation projects on the ground. It so happened that a distinguished Representative from Michigan was a member of the committee. He did not favor reclamation. When the committee detrained and were going up the street, one member of the committee called the attention of the distinguished Representative from Michigan to the line of automobiles on either side of the street. He said to him, "Where do you think those automobiles come from?" Of course the distinguished Representative said, "Michigan." "Where do you think the money came from to pay for them? It was from the reclamation project."

Mr. President, I could go on endlessly reciting the tremendous increase in value of land, valuation of property, and increase in business, around that reclamation project, due solely and only to that project, which today has a tremendous impact on our total economy, with which the distinguished professor from the University of Chicago is so familiar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate my good friend the junior Senator from Wyoming for this eulogy of the advantages of water. Let me say, to allay his fears about his particular project at Riverton, on which so much seems to depend, including the future of the automobile industry, that instead of the \$3,200,000 contemplated in the Senate committee report, cut-backs which I have suggested would bring the appropriation for Riverton to about \$2,250,000. Riverton would not be denied the opportunity of getting water, but there would be merely a slowing down in the rate at which the

water would be brought to Riverton and adjacent communities.

Mr. President, many of the irrigation projects have been very fine, but we are beginning to wake up to the fact that with present construction costs, the costs per acre in many cases are apparently in excess of the benefits conferred. If the value conferred were only equal to the costs, we could recover by means of special assessments upon the water users; but in virtually every irrigation project that is proposed, the water users ask to be exempted from participating in all of the costs. They will take only a portion of the costs and shoulder the rest of the cost onto the power users, or upon the Federal Treasury.

Mr. President, I may remind my good friend of what he perhaps is fully aware of, while on the power projects interest is included, in the irrigation projects interest is not included as a cost, though I think it properly should be.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wyoming has said to me, sotto voce, that he would like to ask me a question, and I now yield to him for a question.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief observation, and then ask the distinguished Senator a question. For a great many years it has been very evident that businesses in the area of a reclamation project profit to an equal extent, or perhaps to a greater extent, than do the settlers on the project. Yet, with the exception of the income from power, the settler himself is expected to pay the total cost of the project.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Without interest, however.

Mr. HUNT. I now want to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois a question. It is not a leading question, and I can assure the Senator that it is a question asked in perfect good faith. I should like to ask the distinguished economist—and I say that because the answer to the question bears on economy—does he not think that those who profit so greatly from a reclamation project, other than the settler, should, through some method of taxation, help to pay for the project? I mean the lumberman, the banker, the garageman, indeed, everyone who moves into the community and becomes a successful businessman. Should they not help to pay through taxes some part of the cost of that reclamation project?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from Wyoming that the idea of secondary benefits and tertiary benefits is a very delusive one. The same argument could be advanced if we want to develop the banana industry in Illinois or in Vermont. We could build hot-houses for the purpose and grow bananas, and as a result of growing bananas in either Illinois or Vermont there would be increased employment in the surrounding towns, which would boom, and there would be a demand for glass, there would be a demand for power, so that other industries would benefit, and therefore they should contribute to the cost of the project.

The question comes down to total cost as compared to the total benefit. When irrigation costs rise to \$600 and \$700 or \$1,000 an acre—and the Senator from Vermont has assured us that he knows of some projects where the cost is \$1,700 an acre—whereas the most fertile land in America, north of Bloomington, the land which gave the junior Senator from Wyoming to the world, sells for only \$425 an acre, I submit that, in the words of Benjamin Franklin, we are "paying too much for our whistle."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Illinois has stated that the land above Bloomington, which certainly is as fine land as there is in any farming area, is selling for \$400 an acre.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Perhaps \$425.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to suggest to the Senator that citrus groves in California sell for \$3,000 or \$4,000 an acre. I see the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] on the floor. He may say that similar land will probably sell for more than that in his State. Does not the Senator from Illinois believe that the going price for this land is some indication of its value; that if it sells for \$3,000 an acre, with water on it, or if it sells for \$4,000 an acre, the man who farms it knows what he is doing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then let the water users pay the cost to the Government, plus interest.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to suggest that there was a time in this country when it was regarded as economically not feasible to have an irrigation project where the cost per acre exceeded \$45. It took us many years before we reached the point where we would say that the cost should exceed \$90. When I received an assessment against my own lands of \$90 an acre I thought it was outrageous, because other lands similarly situated had been assessed at \$45 an acre. Now an assessment of \$150, \$200, or \$250 an acre is not regarded as excessive. Does not the Senator from Illinois believe that the change in the value of the dollar has something to do with the extra costs?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; certainly. I would not object to \$150 or \$200 or possibly \$250 an acre in areas where the figures show it can pay out, but when we get up to \$600 or \$700 or \$1,000, it is pretty high. While I hold no brief for the State of California, and have only been a tourist there occasionally—and we cannot expect that every State will be like California—I do not believe that with all the native pride which the people of the Southwest have they would claim that the fertility of New Mexico is the same as the fertility of California.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not, of course, try to compare anything in my State with the excellence of California. But I do wish to suggest that an acre of land in California or in the reaches along the Rio Grande south of El Paso that produces two and a half bales of cotton to the acre, is more valuable than an acre of land that produces one-half bale to the acre, and that farming costs, being

what they are, the land producing more is worth very much more to the farmer than land producing less. The Senator should bear in mind that this process of irrigation has been going on for a long time. The first project took the best locations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. The finest dam sites were picked out. The valleys that were most easily irrigable were chosen. And now we are getting a little bit toward the end of the stack, and the projects are more costly. But I believe the Senator should have a yardstick by which to measure accurately. It is not just a question of how many dollars, but it is a question: Is the project economically worth while to the country itself? The point the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] made, and which the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] has made many times is, that in the Central Valley is a project which cost \$20,000,000 but which each year returns back into the Treasury \$60,000,000 in income taxes. That is true with respect to every irrigation project, not perhaps to the same degree. The collateral benefits to the Treasury of the United States I think need to be borne in mind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say it is undoubtedly true that on many of the early irrigation projects the costs were more reasonable, but with his characteristic frankness the Senator now states that we are now scraping the bottom of the barrel, and we are undertaking new projects on which the unit costs are extremely high. I think we have probably reached the point where we should not go much further, particularly in the present national emergency.

I am glad to see my good friend, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] on the floor, because in his absence I was compelled to say something about the Colorado-Big Thompson project, the cost of which originally was estimated to be about \$44,000,000, half to be repaid from water; but the present cost is estimated to be \$150,000,000, and now only one-sixth of the cost of the Colorado-Big Thompson is to be paid by the water users and five-sixths will have to be paid either by the power users or by the taxpayers.

The other day I jumped into a hornets' nest in dealing with an attempt to cut the appropriations for roads. I have discovered now that the hornets which grow in the Southwest, while a very lovable type of hornets, are nevertheless extremely powerful and potent, and I feel that the hornets' nest of the other day is as nothing as compared to the hornets' nest of today. I see that a number of my good friends from the Southwest are on their feet seeking to obtain the floor, and I think I will have to take them in turn. I yield first to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND].

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to my good friend from Illinois that I am afraid he is a hornet, because he goes around trying to sting everyone else except the people of his own State. I should like to demonstrate that now, I hope to his satisfac-

tion. Let us consider flood control projects in Illinois. By keeping the water of the rivers in their channels the land adjacent to the rivers is made very valuable. The main difference between irrigation and flood control is that in irrigation water is taken out of the channel and put on the land, whereas in the case of flood control water is kept in the channel, thereby making the adjacent land very valuable.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois is advocating that the farmers pay interest on irrigation developments. The people whose land adjoins the rivers which are controlled by flood-control projects have land which is made more valuable by expenditure of money for flood control. Does the Senator from Illinois feel that the people of his State who have benefited very much by flood control should be made to pay principal and interest on such flood-control projects? If he does, I hope the next time there comes before the Senate a flood-control bill which deals with the State of Illinois he will ask that on that particular project the people who are benefited be made to reimburse the Government for the cost, and pay interest on the project. Otherwise, I do not want to hear the Senator talk about the necessity for such action to be taken in connection with irrigation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The question the Senator from Arizona has asked is a very pertinent one. It is very true that in connection with many flood-control projects adjacent land which is benefited and largely redeemed from being alluvial swamp land and made into good farm land, is improved very greatly by such flood control. But I am afraid my good friend from Arizona was not present when the rivers and harbors bill was considered, because I submitted an amendment to it which provided that half the cost of the construction of levees be assessed against the land directly benefited. I did not secure many votes for that amendment.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Was that in connection with an Illinois project?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am in favor of such assessment with respect to all flood-control projects, including those in Illinois.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I may say I did not hear the Senator from Illinois make any such proposal with respect to an Illinois project.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am in favor of such a proposal applying to all projects—including those in Illinois, Mississippi, Alabama, and so forth.

However, I think only about six Senators voted with me on my amendment. I do not remember that the Senator from Arizona voted with me, but he may not have been on the floor of the Senate when that vote was taken.

However, I am delighted to have the Senator from Arizona as a convert; and the next time such matters come before the Senate I hope he will be on my side.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senator has not converted me. I believe that flood control is worth all the money it costs, and even more. Likewise, I also believed that irrigation and reclamation are most important to

the economy of the United States. They constitute the only remaining frontier of our country.

I regret very much that our distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois, a man who has been so foresighted in so many respects and has believed in progress and has believed in affording an opportunity for the youth of the country and people generally who wish to make homes for themselves, cannot be sufficiently foresighted to realize the benefits of irrigation and reclamation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it so happens, of course, that the Bureau of Reclamation has no projects in Illinois, and therefore the proposals for economy which I am making now are proposals which, if adopted by the Senate, will result in the making of reductions at the expense of other States. However, Illinois' turn will come when the civil-functions bill—the so-called Army engineers' bill—comes before the Senate; and I shall not spare Illinois when that time comes.

I shall not launch upon any lengthy process of self-justification, Mr. President; but I think I can say that in Illinois I have opposed proceeding with two big river and harbor projects. There is one project—not yet authorized, but proposed—calling for an expenditure in excess of \$100,000,000, to widen and deepen the canal between Moline, on the Mississippi River, and Hennepin, on the Illinois River. I have gone to Moline and to Rock Island, and I have opposed that project; and I have gone up and down the canal and have said that I do not think it is needed any more than a Hottentot needs a white tie and tails.

Furthermore, there is in South Chicago another project, in regard to which I had a little exchange at arms with the esteemed senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] last year—the so-called Cal-Sag project, calling for an ultimate appropriation of approximately \$78,000,000. It is a worthy project in general, but I have declined to sponsor that project this year. I went to South Chicago, and there I helped to pay the cost of renting a hall for a meeting at which I explained that because of the need for economy, I was opposed to the project at this time.

Mr. President, I would not have mentioned these matters, had not the Senator said that I was in favor of economy at the expense of someone else. I fully understand that if we take the pathway of economy, we must be willing to apply it to ourselves and to our own States. I understand that, and I am willing to do so. However, I ask that all of us apply the same standard to ourselves.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has made some reference to the Big Thompson project, in Colorado.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to say that, generally speaking, I commend the Senator from Illinois for his efforts

along the line of economy. I think it is splendid that a fight is being made for economy and for a reduction in spending. I believe that is one of the very great needs of our country.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator—and I hope he will listen to what I am saying now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I certainly will listen to the Senator. I turned aside for a moment to obtain some figures bearing on a question which I believe the Senator will ask me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as I was saying, I am trying to pay a compliment to the Senator—a rather tortured compliment, perhaps.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am most grateful for any compliment which is paid me by the Senator from Colorado, even if it is tortured. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Illinois for his efforts to obtain economy.

Of course, there are two kinds of spending in the United States. One is spending which will result in an investment, the other is spending from which no return is obtained.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to make a wisecrack at the expense of the Senator from Colorado; but I would say that an investment is generally considered a spending of money in one's own State, whereas an expenditure is a spending of money somewhere else.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I do not make any such distinction as that. I think there is a very logical difference between an expenditure which brings no return and an expenditure for a project which not only will continue to serve the Nation, but will result in having returned to the Federal Treasury all the money it spent on the project.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, is the Senator from Colorado in favor of the St. Lawrence project, for which not only the principal, but the interest would be returned to the Federal Treasury?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In the Senate I have opposed the St. Lawrence project for a long time, but for entirely different reasons. I do not think that project can be compared with the reclamation projects.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The St. Lawrence project is located in the northeastern section of the United States; and that project, when constructed, will return to the Treasury not only the principal but the interest.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I do not care to get into a discussion of the St. Lawrence project, because it involves a question different from the one with which we are dealing now.

At this time I wish to talk about the Big Thompson project. As the Senator from Illinois has said, the over-all cost of the Big Thompson project has risen, until finally it is nearly three times what it was originally estimated to be. That increase has been caused by several factors. One is the increase in the cost of construction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the increase also due to a change to more elaborate plans?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I was about to mention that factor, also. The changes which have been made in the plans for that project are similar to the changes which often are made in the plans for building a house. After the plans for a house have been drawn up, sometimes it is decided to add a bay window or to make other changes, and of course such changes result in increasing the cost. A similar experience has been had in respect to the Big Thompson project. However, all the changes proposed for that project will serve well the people of that area.

The Senator from Illinois spoke of \$25,000,000 to be repaid by the locality. That is true. The people of the locality to be served by the Big Thompson project have placed a tax levy upon all their holdings in the towns and cities, and they have agreed to pay \$25,000,000 to the Federal Government to take care of some of the cost of building the Big Thompson project. At that time it was believed that the Big Thompson project would cost approximately \$50,000,000. However, now we know that it will cost approximately \$150,000,000. Nevertheless, that project has been begun.

Let me say that recently I read in the press a very wise statement which was attributed to the Senator from Illinois, namely, that once a man puts his hand to the plow, he must go on through to the end of the furrow. I thought that was a very wise statement, and it applies especially to the Big Thompson project, for in that case we have put our hand to the plow; the Federal Government has undertaken a great irrigation project and a great power project. We have begun it. Every time we hold back or restrict or delay the appropriations for that project in the annual appropriation bills, the more damage we do, not only to that locality, but to the Federal Government itself. Someday that project will be finished, and when it is finished it will begin to pay back. The more we delay the construction of the project, the longer it will take to get our money back.

I should like to say a word further, after which I shall not delay the Senator, because I note that other Senators desire to interrupt him. The Big Thompson will pay back every cent. The use of the water will pay a part of it. The sale of electricity will represent the balance. Our friends in Wyoming and Nebraska, as well as sections of Colorado who will get none of the water are sending in applications for the electricity to be generated there. There is already a greater demand for all the electricity to be generated by the Big Thompson project than it will be able to produce. So it is a good project. It is providing supplementary water to one of the finest and best agricultural regions in all the country. It does not need my defense. The Senator should come to Colorado, and go over the Big Thompson project. He ought to inspect the project, and see the tunnel through the Rocky Mountains which is 13 miles in length and, as I

understand, the longest tunnel in the United States. He should see the water being brought through that tunnel, the country which is to be irrigated, the fine little towns and cities which are to be supplied with electricity, and which pledged their credit to the payment of this project. Then I think the Senator would be very reluctant to propose delays to the progress and completion of the Big Thompson project.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there seems to be a process of antiphonal singing here, a verse by some distinguished Senator which calls for a reply.

I am not proposing that the work on the Big Thompson should be stopped. I am merely proposing that we shall proceed at a somewhat slower rate than is projected.

The present appropriations call for about \$21,000,000 worth of work to be done in the current year. I think that could be cut back. In general, I am suggesting that there should be a cut-back of 25 percent, but I think that in the case of the Big Thompson, where the water-payment situation is so uncertain and inadequate, the cut could be still more.

LARGE FEDERAL DEFICIT FEEDS INFLATION

There is another consideration which should be borne in mind. We already have a Government deficit of \$3,000,000,000 for the past year, and unless we cut the appropriation bill for the year 1950-51, we shall have a deficit of, say, \$4,000,000,000. On top of that, we are going to have the war expenditures. The President has asked for \$10,000,000,000, and we are going to give it to him, but we all know that probably beyond that requested appropriation of \$10,000,000,000 will be requests for further sums of money.

The prospects are that unless we put into effect a most rigorous tax-increase bill, the deficit for the year 1950-51 will be very great. How does the Government get the money for that deficit? It borrows from the banks, primarily. And what do the banks do? They create credit upon which the Government draws, and in effect we write up the credit and bank deposits of the country and increase the number of money counters which may be offered for goods, with the result that the prices are bid up and inflation results. The larger the deficit, the more the borrowing, the greater the rise in prices. The smaller the deficit, the smaller the rise in prices, and the less inflation.

I submit, Mr. President, that we have to make our decisions not merely in general terms, but as specific items come up, and we should decrease the deficit so that there will not be this great competition on the part of the Government with those bidding for scarce materials and scarce labor. Every million dollars we put into Big Thompson and into other projects, either directly or indirectly, bids labor and materials away from the war effort.

We must ask ourselves, Are dollars worth more on the Big Thompson than in producing munitions or artillery or tanks, or equipping troops? We must ask ourselves that question. If we ask

ourselves that question, I think it is pretty clear that it would be better in the national interest to slow down the rate of construction of these projects so as to release purchasing power, materials, and men for the more direct war effort, and then, when the war is over, as we hope it will be soon, these projects can be picked up again.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. YOUNG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I promised to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois referred a while ago to the Missouri-Souris project as a very colossal affair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I cited that particular case.

Mr. YOUNG. It would cost approximately \$270,000,000, but it is a project which is spread over three States—Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota. I do not know any project which would lend more stability to the economy of these States than that project. It would provide forage and feed in the dry years, and, as the Senator knows, we have some dry years there, and we have some very good ones. It is a very good trade territory for the city of Chicago, and I hope the Senator will come out to North Dakota and view our problems at first hand.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There could be nothing better than for the Senator to spend some time in North Dakota with the able junior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. The larger part of this irrigation project would be in North Dakota. The acreage would not be so great in comparison to total acreage of the States, but it would provide the feed necessary for carrying us over the dry years and many more profitable cash crops. It would make for us a more prosperous State and would help to maintain the national economy. The State of North Dakota passed what is known as a conservancy district act last year, guaranteeing to levy on all of the affected property its share of the cost of this dam. It would take a good many years to complete the project. I should like to point out also that it is in various units. The one on which it is proposed to start construction now is in Montana, in the northeastern area, probably the driest part of that State, where perhaps more than any other place in the United States a water project is needed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from North Dakota that, as he says, the ultimate cost of these projects is very great. The ultimate cost of phase A of the Missouri-Souris project is approximately \$79,000,000, since the Senate committee has transferred the Jamestown unit to phase A, and the Crosby-Mohall and Devils Lake units in phase B will cost approximately \$270,000,000 and \$21,077,000, respectively, or a total of \$369,000,000. But there has been expended upon these projects, as my figures indicated, about \$1,432,000, to date. As to the ultimate need of these projects, there is question by the Bureau of Reclamation, itself, because, as I quoted Mr.

Warne's testimony, he frankly admitted—and I quote again:

There is a great deal of work that needs to be done before ultimate feasibility of the irrigation plans can be worked out for the Crosby-Mohall unit or the Jamestown unit or any of the distant units.

And, in the case of the Missouri diversion unit, the location of the planned canal is not yet determined.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In a moment. In lieu of the doubts about the ultimate feasibility, in view of the fact that the amounts spent to date have been very slight, and therefore we would not lose so much if we halted the work, and in view of the national situation, it would seem to me unwise to plunge in with substantial additional appropriations now, which then would commit us to proceed more rapidly with this tremendous program, which will ultimately cost at least \$370,000,000. And we can be fairly certain that before the Bureau gets through, the cost would be \$500,000,000, because the Bureau, like the Army engineers, can always be trusted to have its projects cost infinitely more than they first estimated the cost to be.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. YOUNG. So far as the project in North Dakota is concerned, of course, there is no money being spent for construction there now. It is all being spent for investigation to prove its feasibility. There have not been large sums of money spent. In fact, if we proceed at the rate we are proceeding now, it would probably take a thousand years to complete the project, which, under normal circumstances, probably could be completed within 10 to 20 years. I may point out to the Senator that no construction is going on within the borders of the State of North Dakota.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But if this bill goes through, will not the construction of some of the dams actually start?

Mr. YOUNG. No. Regarding the Missouri-Souris project, that is on the Montana side, and it is a unit by itself.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the construction of dams will start.

Mr. YOUNG. There has been an appropriation for the Missouri-Souris diversion dam in Montana, but no definite date has been set for letting a construction contract.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But I mean that if a start is made on it, as the construction schedule of the Bureau indicated, it will be on page 906 of the House hearings, then we are committed to the project. And while this Montana unit costs \$69,000,000, the related units cost an additional \$300,000,000, and we shall be told we are committed to it all.

Mr. YOUNG. No, no.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is my point.

Mr. YOUNG. No; the Senator is in error about that. We are not committed to the entire project—just the Montana unit, which is a small part of that total project.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Illinois has noticed

in the message of the President this morning that the President reminded Senators of the fact that we cannot use the same men and materials in construction work that we have to have in fighting the war. I should like to quote from the message:

I am directing all executive agencies to conduct a detailed review of Government programs, for the purpose of modifying them wherever practicable to lessen the demand upon services, commodities, raw materials, manpower, and facilities which are in competition with those needed for national defense.

In other words, the President recognizes that we shall have to cut out some of these projects while we are engaged in war. It is not only a question of money; it is a question of men and materials which will be required. It seems to me it would be the best judgment simply to complete the projects which are nearly completed and which can be completed in time to be of some value in the war effort, and not to start a myriad of new projects at this time. We should wait until we see whether we win the war. I assume we shall win it, but let us be sure we shall win it. If we begin turning down absolutely essential projects, such as the St. Lawrence seaway, on which the great steel industries will soon be dependent, there is a possibility that we may not win the war. So let us not take any chances. Let us pay heed to the message of the President in which he plainly indicates that the starting of new projects will have to be discontinued for the time being.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont for the reinforcing testimony he has given. I tried to point out, in more imperfect fashion, that if we were trying to divert men and materials from less necessary civilian projects to war projects, there is a reciprocal obligation upon us to divert men and materials from less necessary governmental projects to war projects. I am surprised that the seeds which the Senator from Vermont and the junior Senator from Illinois have been trying to sow in the Senate seems to have fallen on such infertile soil.

I now yield to my beloved friend, the senior Senator from North Dakota, who, by the way, is one of my very best friends in the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator, indeed. I should like to ask my distinguished friend if he has ever been in Montana or North Dakota?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. In the northern part of Montana?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I spent a summer in Montana.

Mr. LANGER. Where?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In Glacier Park.

Mr. LANGER. That does not surprise me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But I went through a great deal of North Dakota and Montana in the struggle to get there. I enjoyed both States very much. They produce fine people and splendid Senators.

Mr. LANGER. May I ask what year it was when the Senator visited Montana?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was a great many years ago.

Mr. LANGER. More than 20 years ago?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was probably 20 years ago.

Mr. LANGER. That was when the Senator was a very young man.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I am rather advanced in years, now, so I was a middle-aged man at that time.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know that during a drought, in a distance of 500 miles from North Dakota all the way to Havre, Mont., on the Great Northern Railroad, only one carload of wheat was shipped from those millions of acres?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota was then the Governor of his State, and I am sure he knows everything that happens in North Dakota, and particularly what happened during that period. I would never question any fact that the senior Senator from North Dakota reports.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know that conditions were so bad that we had to ship out all our cattle except a foundation herd?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I say "Yes" to anything the Senator says is a statement of fact.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know, for example, that a man named Charles Whitman, who put in his life establishing a fine herd of white-faced cattle, had only seven head left under the program of Mr. Wallace? Does the Senator know that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know that, but I am sure the Senator would not tell an untruth, so I make my standardized reply, that I accept his statement.

Mr. LANGER. Does the honorable Senator know that up to 5 years ago Montana had 1,712,205 acres of irrigated land and North Dakota had only 17,409 acres?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know that. I think if the Senator will examine the Montana figures, it will be found that the amount was 1,712,205½ acres.

Mr. LANGER. I want to be accurate. Does not the Senator believe that we in North Dakota are entitled to have irrigation, the same as any other States?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from North Dakota that I wish his State well. If there are irrigation projects, the cost of which is not excessively high, I should be delighted to vote for them, but where the irrigation costs are in excess of the value of the land irrigated, I think it is pretty clear that the project should not be carried out.

Mr. LANGER. Wait a minute.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator has been asking me questions, and I want to ask him a question.

Mr. LANGER. I desire to comment on what the Senator has said. The Senator mentioned the cost of irrigation. The Senator knows that the cost is all paid back by the farmers who do the irrigating.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say, in the first place, the interest is not paid back, and, in the second place, we increasingly find

that a large portion of the capital costs are being unloaded on power, and I think it may be very questionable in some cases whether even under those conditions the capital cost can be repaid from power revenue.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know—

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I answer the Senator's question before he asks another one?

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know of a single irrigation project the cost of which has not been paid back?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say that time has a great many more years in which to unfold.

Mr. LANGER. I agree with that statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As to the cost per acre, when the cost is \$700 an acre or beyond that amount, we are reaching a point where the costs will not be repaid by the owners of land or the users of water, except a small percentage of cases.

Mr. LANGER. Can the distinguished Senator name one single project in North Dakota or in Montana where the cost ever went up as high as he has indicated?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have been going over some of the costs in Idaho and Nevada, and they are almost astronomical. Will the distinguished Senator please tell me what the cost per acre of irrigated land in the Missouri-Souris project will be?

Mr. LANGER. At the present time it is problematical, but whatever it is it will be paid back.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Instead of the Senator hiding behind the word "problematical," since he is so accurate in giving the acres of irrigated land down to the last digit, will he tell me within \$100 what the average cost will be in North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. Let me tell my distinguished friend that he knows it is impossible to answer that question, for this reason—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Take the estimated capital cost and divide by the number of thousands of acres of land to be irrigated. We are doing a little bit of arithmetic in the corner here, and we shall have the figures for the RECORD in a moment.

Mr. LANGER. There are approximately half a million acres which the Bureau of Reclamation has stated may not be capable of being irrigated. If we get the water up 10 feet and find the land cannot be irrigated, the cost of the project is great. But does the Senator know of a single project where the money has not been paid back?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a day of reckoning coming, may I say to my good friend.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had intended to speak for only a few minutes, but the questions asked have kept me on my feet for an hour and a half. I now yield to my beloved friend from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think the Senator will be unable to find any case in the State of Montana or the

State of North Dakota where the value of the improvements has been more than the value of the land.

The Senator would not want to see those sections of the United States completely destroyed as a result of failure of the reclamation programs. Populations are being lost in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana as a result of drought conditions. Without these projects which we propose to construct these States would be economically destroyed, because the soil is rapidly being blown away as a result of dry years.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent that I may ask the Senator from Montana three questions without the Senator from Illinois losing the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall yield in a minute. For the sake of enlightenment I should like to put some figures in the RECORD. The total cost of the projects would amount, under the present figures, to \$369,000,000. The maximum number of acres which could be irrigated, according to the figures of the Bureau of Reclamation, would be roughly 1,250,000 acres.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator's figures are wrong.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand that of that total a little more than 500,000 acres probably would not be irrigated, or at least there is some doubt about it. Therefore we have a unit cost of \$290 and possibly up to \$490 an acre if we allocated the entire cost to irrigation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The figures are entirely wrong.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If they are wrong we shall correct them. Since we do not have information as to cost allocations between irrigation, power, flood control and navigation, it is difficult to make estimates now. And that is my point. The feasibility of the project needs fuller analysis before we appropriate more money for it.

Mr. MURRAY. I have no other comment to make except to say that the Senator's position in reference to these reclamation projects is wrong. It does not seem to me that we can afford to deny these appropriations, because they are necessary to carry out reclamation projects in the Northwestern States. If we wish to keep the Northwestern States a great productive area, and as a supplier of food and material for our economy, we must carry out these programs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At the very time that we are withdrawing some land from cultivation under the acreage restriction program of the Department of Agriculture, we are throwing additional land into cultivation by means of irrigation. It is a contradictory policy, but I shall not press it further at this time. I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia, whom I observe on his feet.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, we have just witnessed the unusual spectacle on this floor of the scholarly Senator and beloved statesman from Illinois, with whom we do not always agree, shaking hands with his opponent in debate, the distinguished Senator from North Da-

kota [Mr. LANGER]. Let me admonish my friend from North Dakota to remember the following from the Holy Bible:

And Joab said to Amasa, "Art thou in health, my brother?" And Joab took Amasa by the beard with the right hand to kiss him.

But Amasa took no heed to the sword that was in Joab's hand; so he smote him therewith in the fifth rib and shed out his bowels to the ground.

In my opinion, the distinguished Senator from Illinois will, with his long, sharp, logical sword, soon follow Joab's example. Therefore, for once, it is my hope that the Senator, while he still has his bowels and brain, will promptly beat an orderly retreat to the other side of the aisle.

Mr. LANGER. I shall do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have no such intention as the Senator from West Virginia fears. The only possible thing I could have to thrust at the Senator from North Dakota would be a bouquet of roses.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the Senator's observation proves that he is a worthy successor of the renowned Senator "Ham" Lewis. On a certain occasion, as my good friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], will recall, Senator Lewis made a withering remark to a Senator from Indiana who had interrupted him. The rebuked Senator complained of the severity of Senator Lewis' retort. Thereupon, in his inimitable Chesterfieldian way, Senator Lewis said, "I assure my friend from Indiana that although I always wear my intellectual rapier loose in its scabbard, I shall never again thrust it at him, without first pointing it with a rose." Congratulations to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for his compassion and felicitations to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] for the safety which his opponent has just assured him.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the Senator yield for a comment with a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am sorry I had to leave the Chamber for a moment and missed the fine colloquy between the Senator from the West and the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I am wondering if, in making his calculations of the cost of land per acre for irrigation purposes in the West and of the cost of these reclamation projects, the Senator has taken into consideration the fact that of the total sum of money appropriated in this bill a large amount is provided for items other than reclamation and irrigation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh yes; power and flood control and navigation.

Mr. WATKINS. Has the Senator calculated the exact cost of the part allocated to irrigation to determine what the cost per acre would be?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that the Bureau of Reclamation itself has not figured the proper allocation between power and irrigation. In view of that fact, how can the Senator from Illinois do some-

thing which the Bureau of Reclamation itself confesses it is unable to do?

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator acquainted with the contracts which are made between the Bureau of Reclamation and water users, in which that distinction and the allocations are made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am acquainted with some contracts. I know that generally the effort is made to load the major part of the cost of construction upon the power users, and to free the water users.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator also understand that in the West the first priority on the streams of the West is for consumptive uses, not only for irrigation but for domestic use by human beings and by industry in a consumptive way? For example, a steel plant must have a certain amount of water to use in the making of steel. When all that is taken into consideration, does the Senator realize that the actual cost of the water is not the important consideration, for the simple reason that the water itself in a consumptive way must be put to beneficial use; otherwise the power will be valueless. In other words, it would not make any difference how many power projects we had in the West; if we did not have water for people and for industry to use in a consumptive way, the power would be absolutely valueless. As a matter of fact, the stream development which the Senator has been talking about must be considered on a basin-wide basis. If the income from the entire project—power, industry, and the consumptive use of water—makes the entire program self liquidating, the program is justified.

I think the Senator should also bear in mind that the resources and the possible development of the streams on an over-all basin-wide basis must be taken into consideration to determine whether a project is feasible. It is distinctly unfair to pick out the irrigation end and say it is being subsidized at the expense of the other features. There would not be any power development unless people are brought onto the land. People must have homes, farms, and industries.

I may also point out to the Senator that in view of the present situation in the world—and I am going to bring in the argument as to the war, because I think it is certainly material at this point—if people are going to move from the cities they must have a place to which to go, and there is no better place for safety than in the mountainous and the arid sections of the West. They must have homes, and water must be available for irrigation and for domestic uses and other uses. In that way we make an investment in security. Therefore the projects which are under way should not be delayed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Utah suggest doubling the appropriation in order to add to security against atomic attack?

Mr. WATKINS. I think that it would be one of the best investments this country could possibly make.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Utah suggest tripling the appropriation?

Mr. WATKINS. We would have to keep within our possibilities; but I would reduce the long-range reclamation projects and power projects we are building for Europe at the present time, and put the money in our projects at home. Certainly that would strengthen us more than putting the money in Europe would benefit us. At least we know it would be for our use, and it would not be put in the hands of a possible enemy by virtue of the desertion of a third or fourth of the population who are Communists at heart.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted to know whether the Senator had taken all these things into consideration in making his estimate of the value of irrigation in the West under the present program.

I should like also to call to the Senator's attention the fact that in World War II many reclamation projects were under way. There was one in Utah. It had not been quite finished, but along came a program for building a steel plant in Utah. One was desired there for making steel plates for the Navy. It was found the plant could not be operated without water, and it was fortunate we had a project halfway finished. Mountain water was necessary in making the steel. Other water would not do, because it would leave defects in the steel. The Government went ahead and finished the project so that the steel plant could be completed. Then they brought in thousands of people, and they found there was a shortage of water in the cities and towns. If there had been a drought many of the installations, the Army stores, the Navy camps, and the like, in that State, would have had to move out. It was fortunate we had a reclamation project under way which could be finished to such a degree that they could get water. So that the overall picture is favorable to the development of reclamation projects.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Utah will forgive me if I say that his argument reminds me of a passage in Benjamin Franklin's autobiography, in which he said that—

So excellent a thing it is to be a reasonable creature because one can then find a reason for what one wants to do.

Mr. President, I had not intended to take up as much time as I have taken. I think the RECORD will show that a vast portion of the time has been consumed in cross-examination.

I now move that the figure "\$294,713,000" in line 5, on page 247, be stricken out and the figure "\$204,000,000" be substituted in its stead.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point a brief justification and summary which I have prepared for this reduction, and which I have tried to state orally on the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell me who prepared the justification?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. McCulloch, my assistant, and I. The two of us prepared it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the justification was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS IN SUPPORT OF SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT TO REDUCE CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION APPROPRIATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, TO \$204,000,000

Page 247, lines 4 and 5: House bill, \$297,467,000; Senate bill, \$294,713,000; budget estimate, \$325,966,500.

The Bureau of Reclamation projects for which construction and rehabilitation appropriations are included in the present bill, include a number of new starts and items on which so little will apparently be completed by the end of fiscal 1950 that they may be considered essentially new starts. In line with the general policy against appropriations for such new construction starts this year, these should be omitted.

In view of the President's message today, the general need for reduction in Federal expenditures and the higher priority which other items in this omnibus bill should be accorded, the rate of expenditure for projects now under construction should be substantially reduced for 1951. I am suggesting in general that this reduction be in the amount of 25 percent of the proposed expenditure in the Senate committee bill.

Not only the general budget situation of the Federal Government, but also the certain expansion in the demand for funds and materials for other more essential Government work and for the crucial defense work which the President has outlined in the months ahead should persuade us to make reductions at least to the extent I have suggested.

With certain other decreases, which I shall note below, the suggested reduction in this appropriation is \$90,713,000, and the new figure which I propose that the Senate adopt by way of a substitute amendment to the committee amendment (of \$294,713,000) in line 5 on page 247 is \$204,000,000.

While I have itemized these new starts, weak projects and percentage reductions, it is not the intention of this amendment to bind the Bureau of Reclamation to these particular amounts. I recognize that it is preferable to leave discretion in this matter to the Bureau, so that it may cut back more sharply those projects that may best be deferred and accelerate those projects which in the national interest are most essential.

A. NEW, OR SUBSTANTIALLY NEW, STARTS

The new starts which my amendment proposes should be dropped from the bill are the following:

	Senate appropriations
Gila project:	
Wellton canal.....	\$30,000
Wellton lateral unit.....	70,000
Dome lateral unit.....	10,000
	110,000
Colorado River front work and levee system.....	950,000
Central Valley:	
Sly Park Dam.....	250,000
Folsom power facilities.....	750,000
	1,000,000
Colorado-Big Thompson:	
Brush substation.....	1,000,000
Flatiron, Fort Collins, Greeley tap line.....	377,000
	1,377,000

	Senate appropriations
Paonia project: Spring Creek Dam.....	\$800,000
Fort Peck: Glendive Williston transmission line.....	250,000
Eden project: Big Sandy Dam and Reservoir.....	206,000
Kendrick project: Seminol-Baroil line.....	150,000
Missouri Basin:	
Jamestown unit.....	750,000
Missouri Souris.....	1,000,000
	1,750,000
Total.....	6,593,000

It is also interesting to note that the total estimated costs of the foregoing projects, for which we shall be asked to make increasing appropriations in the next few years if these starts are permitted now, is \$166,404,000.

A table showing the total estimated costs of these projects, the amount estimated to be spent on them to June 30, 1950, and the pages of the House hearings where these figures and construction facts are given, follows:

Project name	Total estimated costs	To be spent through fiscal 1950	House hearings reference (pt. 4) page—
Gila:			
Wellton Canal.....	\$1,570,000	\$15,291	657
Wellton lateral unit.....	2,358,000	25,537	
Dome lateral unit.....	1,919,000	7,516	
Colorado River front and levee system.....	16,295,000	414,428	681
Central Valley:			
Sly Park Dam.....	6,220,000	0	698
Folsom power facility.....	47,800,000	0	
Colorado-Big Thompson:			
Brush substation.....	2,513,500	431,795	733-735
Flatiron, Fort Collins, Greeley tap line.....	799,100	28,758	
Paonia: Spring Creek Dam.....	3,300,500	272,200	743-744
Fort Peck: Glendive-Williston transmission line.....	1,783,000	0	759-760
Eden: Big Sandy Dam and Reservoir.....	2,000,000	42,025	817-818
Kendrick: Seminol-Baroil line.....	242,000	25,000	821-822
Missouri Basin:			
Missouri-Souris, Jamestown unit.....	10,749,000	214,573	1150
Missouri-Souris-Missouri diversion unit.....	68,855,000	1,218,174	905-906
Total.....	166,404,100		

¹ Senate report.

In the case of the last project, the Missouri-Souris Division, Missouri Diversion Unit, according to the testimony, there has been no final decision on the location of the canal to lead off from the diversion dam. (House hearings, pp. 907, 910.) And in reference to the related work of this division now in phase B, Mr. Warne, of the Bureau, frankly stated (House hearings, p. 911): "There is a great deal of work that needs to be done before ultimate feasibility of the irrigation plans can be worked out for the Crosby-Mohall unit or the Jamestown unit or any of the distant units."

Since the estimated cost of phase A aspects of Missouri-Souris is \$68,855,000, and the Crosby-Mohall and Devils Lake units in phase B will cost \$268,953,000 and \$21,077,000, respectively, in addition to \$10,749,000 for the Jamestown unit, it seems wiser to halt this construction now (with only \$1,432,747 spent on this phase A section through fiscal 1950), until all doubts have been removed concerning the economic feasibility of the project. How can we justify starting out on a road that leads to such enormous expenditures with so many significant questions unanswered? I suspect, although the record

is not clear at this point, that provisions for repayment of the irrigation costs of the project are likewise most incomplete.

B. ELIMINATE CERTAIN SENATE INCREASES

In addition, I am suggesting that the following Senate increases over the House committee figures ought to be dropped. No adequate reason is given in the report for these increases:

Provo River project.....	\$2,245,000
Riverton project.....	200,000
Missouri Basin project.....	3,000,000

C. FORTY-PERCENT REDUCTION IN COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON

My amendment also assumes a 40-percent, instead of a 25-percent, cut-back in the appropriation for the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

In justification for this higher cut-back, I note that the original estimate of the cost of this project was \$44,000,000. The present estimated cost is \$150,503,000 (House hearings, p. 662). A repayment contract, however, was made which provided that the water users should repay one-half of the cost of the project, but not to exceed \$25,000,000 (House hearings, pp. 733; 738-741).

In other words on the basis of present figures the Government will be repaid for only about one-sixth of the cost of the project and the balance must be repaid, if at all, by electric-power revenues. While the Bureau's justification states that negotiations are underway for an amendatory or supplemental repayment contract, I believe it might help to persuade the water users that this is desirable if the rate of construction were sharply cut back.

This seems to be another example of a case where rising costs and project changes result in enormous increases in total costs, far beyond the estimates made at the time of the original authorization by Congress.

D. OTHER MISSOURI BASIN DEDUCTIONS

In connection with the Missouri Basin project, I would also urge elimination of further appropriations for the following projects for the reasons stated below:

(a) Cheyenne division—Key Hole unit \$3,179,000
The Senate committee report (p. 152) states:

"The 1951 estimate for this project appears under phase A in the amount of \$3,179,000, which has been allowed by the committee. However, representations have been made to the committee that the water supply on the Belle Fourche River is such that under the Wyoming-South Dakota compact of February 18, 1943, it may be difficult to fill this proposed reservoir. Under the terms of the compact between the two States, there is no limitation upon the number of small reservoirs which may be built in Wyoming. It is the opinion of the committee that a comprehensive study of the future water supply should be made before construction is undertaken."

The best way to guarantee that there will be no wasteful new construction until the availability of water is assured is to omit further appropriations.

(b) Phase B items..... \$5,154,000

The total estimated cost of the Missouri Basin items listed in "Phase A" ("Units selected for construction") is \$769,157,884. Starts have been made on all elements of this phase A. Although the total amount of appropriations authorized by law for the Missouri Basin program of the Bureau is only \$350,000,000, the Government would appear to be effectively committed by the starts that have been made to the total of expenditures of \$769,000,000.

Until phase A is more fully authorized and completed, it would appear to me unwise by this appropriation bill to permit expenditures on phase B ("Units being prepared for con-

struction") which involves projects, the total estimated cost of which is an added \$944,933,000.

In view of the serious questions as to the adequacy of water supply for the whole basin project and in view of the relatively small part of the total irrigation costs which it is estimated that water users will be able to repay, it seems to me that we should not only eliminate all items in phase B but possibly make even more drastic reductions in phase A.

I believe the Senate should also take note of the extent to which project costs in general far out run original cost estimates, as I pointed out above in connection with the Colorado-Big Thompson project. As listed by the Bureau the original estimated cost of the projects included in the current bill was \$1,682,487,174. The present estimated cost is \$5,252,404,105. (House hearings, p. 662.)

E. SUMMARY

A complete tabulation of the project reductions which I am suggesting in this substitute amendment is as follows:

Summary of proposed reductions (with discretion left to Bureau for item revisions), Bureau of Reclamation—construction and rehabilitation

Project name	25 percent	New starts, etc.	Total reduction from Senate committee figure
Gila.....	\$1,552,000	\$110,000	\$1,662,000
All-American Canal.....	412,000		412,000
Columbia River front.....		950,000	950,000
Boulder Canyon.....	1,525,000		1,525,000
Davis Dam.....	3,405,000		3,405,000
Central Valley.....	10,515,000	1,000,000	11,515,000
Santa Barbara.....	1,454,000		1,454,000
Colorado-Big Thompson.....	17,849,000	1,377,000	9,226,000
Paonia.....	50,000	800,000	850,000
San Luis Valley.....	459,000		459,000
Boise-Payette.....	51,000		51,000
Buffalo Rapids.....	40,000		40,000
Fort Peck.....		250,000	250,000
Hungry Horse.....	7,375,000		7,375,000
Fort Sumner.....	170,000		170,000
Tucumcari.....	43,000		43,000
Rio Grande.....	260,000		260,000
W. C. Austin.....	65,000		65,000
Deschutes.....	125,000		125,000
Klamath.....	222,000		222,000
Provo River:			
Senate increase.....	2,245,000		2,782,000
25 percent of balance.....	537,000		
Columbia Basin.....	12,375,000		12,375,000
Yakima.....	56,000		56,000
Eden.....		206,000	206,000
Kendrick.....	200,000	150,000	350,000
Riverton:			
Senate increase.....	200,000		
25 percent of balance.....	750,000		950,000
Shoshone.....	29,000		29,000
Missouri Basin:			
Senate increase.....	3,000,000		
25 percent of balance.....	20,086,000		
Total.....	23,086,000		
Jamestown Unit.....		750,000	
Keyhole unit.....		3,179,000	
Missouri-Souris.....		1,000,000	
Phase B.....		5,154,000	
Total.....		10,083,000	33,169,000
Rehabilitation and betterment.....	750,000		750,000
Total.....			90,726,000

1 40 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bridges	Chavez
Anderson	Butler	Connally
Benton	Byrd	Cordon
Brewster	Capehart	Darby
Bricker	Chapman	Donnell

Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Eastland	Kem	O'Mahoney
Eaton	Kerr	Pepper
Ellender	Kilgore	Robertson
Ferguson	Langer	Russell
Flanders	Leahy	Saltonstall
Frear	Lehman	Schoepfel
Fulbright	Lodge	Smith, Maine
George	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Gillette	McCarran	Sparkman
Graham	McCarthy	Stennis
Green	McClellan	Taft
Gurney	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Thye
Hickenlooper	Malone	Tobey
Hill	Martin	Tydings
Hoey	Maybank	Watkins
Holland	Millikin	Wherry
Humphrey	Morse	Wiley
Hunt	Mundt	Williams
Ives	Murray	Young
Jenner	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment on page 247, in line 4.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement about the amendment, and then I shall ask for the yeas and nays.

The amendment I have submitted to the committee amendment proposes that the appropriation for construction projects in the Bureau of Reclamation be reduced from approximately \$295,000,000 to approximately \$204,000,000, thus effecting a saving of approximately \$91,000,000. In the discussion which has occurred, I have indicated that that reduction would be made, for example, by stopping all new construction starts and all essentially new starts, and by slowing up to the extent of 25 percent on projects already under way, with the exception of the Big Thompson-Colorado project, as to which I suggest a slowing-up rate of 40 percent. In the statement I have inserted, I have suggested several other possible reductions. However, the apportionment of the reduction to be made under my amendment to the committee amendment would be left in the hands of the Bureau of Reclamation, as is the case at the present time; and the Bureau of Reclamation could apportion the reduction to the extent of \$91,000,000 in the same way the Bureau would apportion the proposed appropriation of \$295,000,000—in other words, among the various projects; and the Bureau could do so in a way which would benefit those which are needed in the war effort.

Thus, Mr. President, the adoption of my amendment to the committee amendment would result in a reduction in the consumption of materials, and to that extent my amendment would aid the war effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment on page 247, in line 4.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment calls for an appropriation which is \$2,754,000 less than the amount voted by the House, \$31,253,500 less than the estimates, and \$39,248,638 less than the amount appropriated for 1950.

In my judgment, the proposal made by the Senator from Illinois would mean that after the committee has cut this appropriation to the bone, to a point where just enough money is carried in the bill in order properly to carry on the work which now is going on, the construction projects now under way, now in process of construction, would have to be shut down.

I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Illinois on this point, Mr. President, because I am sure he does not realize the situation. If his amendment to the committee amendment prevails, inasmuch as the bill as reported by the committee will provide only sufficient funds to pay the contractors under existing contracts for the work on which they now are employed, then, when the contracts are stopped—as they will have to be stopped if the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment is adopted—we shall have to pay the contractors the damages which result from such stoppage. We had an illustration of that situation in California, last year, when such a stoppage cost the Government \$700,000.

The effect of the Senator's proposal, if it is adopted by the Senate, simply will be that work now underway, which should be completed because it is in the interest of the war effort—for instance, the work involved in finishing hydroelectric projects, and similar work which is going on—will be delayed. Then, if the inflation which the Senator fears occurs, when we return to that work, it will take more dollars to finish it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I would be perfectly willing to cut back on the appropriations for reclamation projects, even though, as the Senator knows, I have voted, both on the floor of the Senate and in committee, for every reclamation project, because I believe in them.

At this particular time I think it would be perfectly legitimate to delay some of the reclamation projects, but I do not wish to have any delay occur in the case of the power projects, because I believe they have a direct bearing on the war effort we have to make. In my opinion we should increase the production of power in every possible way, rather than restrict it.

Therefore, Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Arizona to what extent the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment would, if adopted, interfere with the development of power facilities.

Mr. HAYDEN. First of all, Mr. President, in the case of the Colorado-Big Thompson project, to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, let me say that project can be finished, if there is any sort of a short war at all, in time to have the power from that project available for

use during the war. However, if the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment is adopted, we shall not be able to obtain the power from that project during the war.

The same is true of the power features of the Central Valley project. Practically all these projects are multiple-purpose projects, and their power features are being pushed ahead of almost any other features.

However, Mr. President, so far as the irrigation features of the projects are concerned, let me say that all of us realize that we may need additional irrigation facilities in order to be able to irrigate more land, so that it can be cultivated for the production of crops which will be badly needed if we get into a war, at which time there would be difficulty in regard to importations.

On the other hand, when we already are under contract to make payments for further construction on projects already under way, it is perfectly foolish to make appropriation cuts of the kind which would be required by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would it not be better to apply to hydroelectric lines which would supply power the funds which otherwise would be used for the construction of dams which would take years to complete?

Mr. HAYDEN. This amendment does not relate to new dams which will take years to construct.

Mr. FERGUSON. How long will it take to construct them?

Mr. HAYDEN. That will vary; but all the ones to which this item relates are under construction, and have been under construction for years.

All these projects were authorized before the war began. Construction on all of them was stopped during the war. Since the war, we have resumed construction on them, and construction has been continuing since that time.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that they are authorized years in advance.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; I mean that the money for their construction was carried in the appropriation bills in the 1940's. During the war period, construction on all of them was shut down for four or five years. Following the war construction work on them was resumed. We have been continuing with their construction since then; and they are reaching completion.

Mr. FERGUSON. But are not we now in the same position we were in when construction on them was shut down. In other words, we are in a war.

Mr. HAYDEN. But we made a mistake during the war, in my judgment, when we stopped the construction work. I know that is true in the case of the Davis Dam. We stopped the construction of that dam during the war, but there has been a crying need for power. It would have been the wisest thing to continue with the construction of that project and to have had the power from it available during the war. It was a

terrific mistake to stop the construction of that project during the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment on page 247, in line 4.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Again, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment on page 247, in line 4.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Arizona, who is in charge of this portion of the bill. I wish to inquire in regard to the action of the committee in proposing a reduction from \$297,467,000 to \$294,713,000.

I understand that the effect of such a reduction will be to deny the appropriation of \$1,400,000 for continuation of the work on the Havre-Shelby line or project, which now is nearing completion, and also to eliminate the appropriation of \$365,000 which is necessary to construct the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls transmission line, which connects with the Canyon Ferry project.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct; it will make a reduction of \$1,400,000 in the amount of money available for the Havre-Shelby line, and will also result in the other reduction which has been mentioned.

Let me explain to the Senator that, as he will remember, last year the Congress, in pursuit of a policy of arming the Reclamation Service with funds whereby it could negotiate on a basis of equality with the private power companies, provided funds for the construction of the Havre-Shelby line. I shall discuss it first.

At the time when that appropriation was made, it was understood that if the Montana Power & Light Co. would bring about a suitable wheeling contract to carry the power, the line would not necessarily be built.

It so happens that the situation which has developed in Montana is that in December the Reclamation Service made a contract for the construction of this line, but gave no go-ahead order to the contractor. The notice to proceed was issued on March 21, 1950. On April 12, the Montana Power & Light Co. obtained from the Montana Public Service Commission an order permitting it to reduce its rates to rural electric cooperatives to exactly the Government rate of 5½ mills. If that action had been taken prior to the time when the contract was awarded or prior to the time when the contractor was notified to proceed with the work under the contract, there would really have been no excuse for building the line, because the primary purpose of the line is to get power to the REA cooperatives at the Government rate; and if power could be ob-

tained from the private power company at the same rate, construction of the line would not be justified. However, the Montana Power & Light Co. was about 3 weeks late in obtaining the order permitting it to reduce the rate in the way I have stated. So the contract was let.

We are faced with that situation; and under the circumstances the committee felt that the Bureau of Reclamation was in a little too much of a hurry to let the contract. For that reason, the committee voted to disallow the funds at this time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senator will recall that an effort has been under way for many years to construct this project, so that low-cost Fort Peck power will be available to the farmers in that area, who have been denied this power during all this period of time. In 1947 the Senate appropriated funds for the construction of this line in 1948. At that time the Bureau of Reclamation did not hurry to let the contract—thinking that there might be a possibility of entering into a contract with the private power company. However, nothing happened. The Bureau of Reclamation continued to hold up the contract, and did so until very late in the year. Then, just before work was begun under the contract, Congress eliminated that appropriation.

Then the farmers in that area became despondent about the possibility of getting the project constructed. However, they continued to make efforts to obtain it. They had spent a great deal of money for that purpose, but they could not get any contract for service. They had to build a line at their own expense. That line connected with the Montana power system. Also it was necessary to purchase a steam plant there, to firm up the power. All that was necessary in order to make it possible to provide power to those who live in that area.

So, during all these years they have been struggling to get this project, and now, last year, after a very elaborate debate on the floor of the Senate, we succeeded in getting an appropriation with which to start the project. The project was not started, however, and contracts were not let for it until December of last year, waiting again to see whether anything could be accomplished with reference to making an agreement with the power company. The power company did not offer them any contract, did not offer them any wheeling agreement, and the result was that they finally had to start construction on the project.

The project has now been carried on to almost full completion. I have before me a statement from the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation in which he shows the status of construction at this time. It shows that the Government has already expended \$892,136 and has obligations on the project amounting to \$535,231. So the project cannot be stopped at this point when it is almost finished.

Besides, it will be absolutely necessary to have this project. We cannot tear down the lines now and end the project at this point, because even if the Montana Power Co. could furnish power to

the rural electric cooperatives there at the present time, the time is going to come when they will need more power, and will need stronger, heavier lines to carry that power. Besides there is a pumping project involved in the area which will require considerable power.

Mr. HAYDEN. But the representations made to the Committee on Appropriations were that if this appropriation were denied, the Montana Power Co. would then pay the Government for all materials and the lines, as I understood, and take them over. That is not clear in the RECORD.

Mr. MURRAY. No, and it is not clear anywhere.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well.

Mr. MURRAY. With whom are they going to contract? They have not offered an agreement to the farmers or to the Government.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the point to which I am coming. This money has been allowed by the House, but has not been allowed by the Senate. If that point cannot be cleared up, it seems to me quite evident that the House is going to insist upon the appropriation. On the other hand, if it can be shown that the Government will come out whole without loss in this matter, and that in the meantime the REA cooperatives are receiving the benefit of this very low rate on the power of 5.5 mills, then we might be justified in taking it up. I think the best way to handle the matter is to take it to conference and see what the Montana Power Co. has to say about it at that time.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to ask the Senator whether he does not think that this would be a very mistaken action in view of the emergency which is before the country at the present time; that is, to destroy this line, and to destroy this property? It is almost akin to arson. It would be a criminal destruction of property. We have a line already completed, and the Congress, because of some language picked up from the street or in the lobbies of the Congress, to the effect that the power company is going to compensate the Government for the destruction of this line, proposes to terminate construction and cancel the appropriation. I think it is the most unusual legislative action I have ever heard of.

Mr. HAYDEN. What the committee instructed me, as chairman of the subcommittee, was to inquire first of the Reclamation Service as to the progress on the work at that time. At the time we acted on this item we had that information. I was also instructed to inquire of the Montana Power Co. as to what its attitude would be about taking the property off the hands of the Government, and, while there is no firm commitment at the moment—

Mr. MURRAY. No.

Mr. HAYDEN. We were given to understand that the power company would do that. Before this question is ultimately settled in conference, that will have to be determined.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator said the power company would do that. What is

the agreement it proposes? What does it propose to do?

Mr. HAYDEN. To take over all the materials and to take over the line so far as it has been built, as I understand.

Mr. MURRAY. What does it propose to offer to the rural cooperatives who are involved?

Mr. HAYDEN. A low rate for power.

Mr. MURRAY. A low rate for power?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. But it does not propose to give them the lines which would be needed in order to enable the cooperatives to secure adequate service.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the line is to be built, as the Senator states, of course it will have to be completed either by the Government or by the private power company.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I remember, the evidence shows that 9 of the 11 cooperatives are now being furnished with power as cheaply as they could obtain it if they were to manufacture it themselves. Is not that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is not involved in this item.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is the same identical rate as that at which the Government offers to supply it.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it is all involved in the question, is it not?

Mr. MURRAY. It is not involved in this item, because it is entirely separate and apart from the contracts they may enter into with the power company in other sections of the State. But here is a situation in which the power company has failed to offer a contract during all these years, and does not now offer a contract. No one knows what it proposes to give to the rural cooperatives in the way of adequate service and future low rates.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes; they have the rate fixed by the Montana Power Commission. If any REA cooperative applies to them, and they serve it with power, it shall have the benefit of the rate of 5.5 mills, which is exactly the same as the Government rate.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was my understanding.

Mr. MURRAY. Then that would mean that there would be turned over to the Montana Power Co. a complete monopoly of the power coming from the Fort Peck Dam. At the present time, the Fort Peck Dam is carrying that power down to Great Falls, where the Montana Power Co. takes it. If a contract of that kind is given to the Montana Power Co., it would mean that the Bureau of Reclamation will lose the difference between 2.5 mills for power and 5.5 mills, so that the Government will be losing 3 mills per kilowatt hour, which the Montana Power Co. secured as a result of that situation, and that deprives the project of the opportunity to repay.

Mr. HAYDEN. That matter was not presented to the subcommittee, but it certainly will have to be considered when the bill goes to conference. My suggestion is that this matter be taken to con-

ference, and that those who are interested otherwise can ask the Montana Power Co. to come forward with a clean-cut specific proposition. If it does not have one, then that is one thing. If it has a proposition that will save the Government whole and free of cost, then I think the situation would be different.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator says, which would hold the Government free of any cost whatever. How much money has the Government invested in this project at this time?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Government has about \$800,000 in it now, and the cost will be close to, but under, \$2,000,000.

Mr. HILL. But there has already been expended on this project about \$800,000 of the Government's money; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. And, in addition to that, another \$400,000 to \$500,000 has been obligated.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator mean that that has been contracted for?

Mr. MURRAY. I mean contract obligations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Nebraska let me finish first?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Is there a supplemental contract obligation of \$400,000 to \$500,000, in addition?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The contractor has agreed to build the entire line, and he has been paid for his work as it has proceeded.

Mr. HILL. Then the Government really has an interest in the matter to the extent of \$1,200,000 or \$1,300,000, has it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Does the distinguished Senator from Arizona have any information in writing from anyone in authority connected with the Montana Power Co. as to what the power company will do in this matter?

Mr. HAYDEN. We have a telegram from them. The work was just starting on the line when we had our hearings. The work had been halted by the blizzard. The representation made at that time was that the company would take off the hands of the Government all the material it had. The missing part of the understanding is, What is to be done to compensate the contractor for the profits he otherwise would make? The committee said, "If we can save a million dollars, let us save it."

Mr. HILL. From whom is that representation?

Mr. HAYDEN. From E. J. Corette, vice president of the Montana Power Co.

Mr. HILL. He did not go into the question of what our debt may be to the contractor, did he?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; but he did agree to take off our hands all the material on the ground and to take over the line.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement from the Commissioner of Reclamation with reference to the status of the line, and also an extract from the report of the chief engineer on the status of construction and material contracts.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 14, 1950.

Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KIRWAN: In order that you may be informed as to the present status of construction on the Havre-Shelby line and substations, we are enclosing a statement on the status of funds and construction progress as of June 30, 1950, and estimated progress as of July 31, 1950.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
Commissioner.

Status of construction, expenditures, and obligations, Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations, Fort Peck project, Montana—status of funds

	June 30, 1950 (actual)		July 31, 1950 (estimated)	
	Accrued expenditures	Obligations	Accrued expenditures	Obligations
Havre-Shelby transmission line, Smith Construction Co.	\$311,954	\$138,046	\$398,910	\$200,523
Havre substation, Valley Construction Co.	12,024	27,976	28,024	59,563
Government-furnished materials and equipment	17,281	259,978	260,000	194,145
All other (R/W, design, engineering, and administration, etc.)	184,831	8,199	205,202	11,000
Rudyard substation	-----	-----	-----	23,000
Shelby substation	-----	-----	-----	47,000
Total	526,090	434,199	892,136	535,231

	Progress of June 30, 1950	Estimated progress as of July 31, 1950
TRANSMISSION LINE		
Miles of poles hauled and distributed	18	65
Miles of structures framed	12	58
Miles of holes dug	10	58
Miles of structures erected	3	55
HAVRE SUBSTATION		
Grading	(1)	(1)
Structure excavation	(2)	(1)
Backfill	0	(3)
Concrete placement	(4)	(3)
Rudyard and Shelby substations	0	(6)

- 1 Complete.
2 90 percent complete.
3 50 percent complete.
4 30 percent complete.
5 60 percent complete.
6 Construction contracts awarded.

If construction is stopped we would have an uncompleted facility incapable of serving any useful function, and of the \$1,427,367 expended or obligated as of July 31, 1950, the Government would suffer a direct loss of approximately \$600,000, since the \$200,000 expended for right-of-way, design, engineering, and administration, and approximately \$400,000, consisting of contractors' profits, construction costs, termination costs, and super-

vision and legal expenditures could never be recovered. This assumes a salvage value of approximately \$800,000 for material and equipment, which is questionable, since some of it is special equipment and might have only a nominal salvage value, in which case the direct loss to the Government could run as high as a million dollars.

In addition, if the Havre-Shelby Line is not completed and placed in service by the Government, the Fort Peck project will lose a principal outlet for firm power. This may well result in requiring the project to sell firm power which has a value of 5.5 mills per kilowatt-hour at a rate for dump energy, or 2.5 mills, a loss of 3 mills. After the load has been built up over a period of 10 years it will result in an estimated annual loss of almost \$250,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a telegram sent by direction of the subcommittee to Mr. J. E. Corette, vice president of the Montana Power Co., and his reply thereto.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 29, 1950.

Mr. J. E. CORETTE,
Vice President, Montana Power Co.,
Butte, Mont.:

Members of Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations have asked me to submit to you following information relative to Havre-Shelby line obtained from Reclamation Bureau: (1) Due to favorable bids under estimate, total estimated cost has been reduced from \$2,860,000 to \$1,912,000; (2) estimated contract expenditures as of June 30, 1950, for materials are \$202,000 and for progress payments on 23 supply contracts and 2 construction contracts are \$295,000; (3) in addition to above contract expenditures an additional amount of approximately \$155,000 has been expended for engineering, right-of-way, and administration; (4) in addition contractor has on hand approximately \$115,000 of supplies for which certified invoices have not as yet been submitted to Reclamation Bureau; (5) therefore, total actual expenditures and contractors' earnings as of June 30, 1950, plus material on hand by contractor amount to \$767,000; (6) status of work is reported as follows: 4 miles of poles hauled to site; 1 1/2 miles of holes dug; 2 miles of structures framed, and erection was started on June 26, 1950, and on Havre substation grading is completed; structure excavation is 75 percent completed; and concrete work is 13 percent completed. Subcommittee would like to have your comments on above factual statement and what the Montana Power Co. would be willing to do under present circumstances. Subcommittee would also like to have a statement from you as to present status of the negotiations with the Interior Department for a wheeling contract and how near you are to an agreement on same. Please wire reply at once as subcommittee meets again tomorrow, Friday.

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Interior Department Appropriations Subcommittee.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., June 30, 1950.
Senator CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Have no source of information to check items on (1) to (5), inclusive, of your telegram.

Item (6) appears accurate but this is very little work toward completion of 100 miles of lines; in addition, excavation, grading, and foundations are only a small part of

the cost of a substation and this work has just been started.

Important facts are that Bureau let all contract for Havre-Shelby line and substations after money was appropriated by Senate with the very clear understanding and statement that no money should be spent if arrangement could be made with Montana Power Co. to serve REA's involved at Bureau of Reclamation rate.

At hearing before your committee on April 20, Mr. McPhail was told by you personally and by other committee members that money was appropriated for this line with such understanding. Our information is that "go ahead" order was not given to contractor on Havre-Shelby line until approximately April 22.

In addition, on April 12, Montana Public Service Commission approved a Montana Power Co. rate for power company rate for power to Marias, Hill, and all other REA's on our system, which is identical to Bureau's rate, thereby eliminating any possibility of any saving to the REA's or anyone else by building the Havre-Shelby line.

The facts clearly indicate to us that Bureau has not acted in good faith with you or with the Senate but has deliberately created a situation to make it difficult for your committee to rescind the appropriation made last year for this line.

This has been done in spite of the fact that no benefits could result from building of this line.

Our company is still willing to purchase at your cost all materials which have been acquired for this line.

As to the Wheeling contracts, we have a contract with Bonneville and supply all REA's in far western Montana under it. Bureau refused to make with us a contract similar to the Bonneville contract and we could not agree on a rate to be paid for Wheeling because Bureau insisted on paying only 1 mill per kilowatt-hour even though Wheeling distance was approximately 150 miles instead of 50 miles as in North Dakota contracts in which the 1-mill rate was established.

In view of this deadlock we reduced our rate to the Bureau rate, thereby accomplishing every benefit that could result from a Wheeling contract plus saving the Bureau all expense that would necessarily result from its serving these customers. We understand from discussion last week between Mr. McPhail and our counsel, Mr. Glover, that Bureau agrees that Wheeling agreement to REA's is now unnecessary as they already have power at Bureau rate.

Only negotiations pending with the Bureau regarding Wheeling are from Canyon Ferry to Crow Creek Irrigation pumping plant and for use of our two 100,000-volt lines between Canyon Ferry and Great Falls to interconnect Canyon Ferry plant and Bureau's Fort Peck line. We believe these negotiations will result in satisfactory agreements to both parties.

As we see the situation every additional dollar spent on Havre-Shelby line will be wasted as there are no benefits to be accomplished, and sensible thing would be for Bureau to cancel all contracts and reduce expenses to a minimum. Undoubtedly every contract has a provision that it is subject to appropriations by Congress.

Am sending this telegram from Great Falls but will be in my office in Butte all day Friday and would be pleased to answer any further inquiries.

We certainly hope that you will rescind last year's appropriation for Havre-Shelby line, thereby carrying out the intention clearly expressed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last fall and saving as much money as possible.

Respectfully,

THE MONTANA POWER CO.,
J. E. CORETTE, Jr., Vice President.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I am a member of the subcommittee. I should like to ask if it is not correct that the total cost of the Havre-Shelby line was approximately \$2,000,000, or was it a little more than that amount?

Mr. HAYDEN. It was originally estimated to be \$2,880,000, but it was reduced, by a favorable bid, to \$1,912,000.

Mr. GURNEY. It was very close to \$2,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. The information received from the Bureau, as I remember, was to the effect that along with materials and expected profits there was an obligation of approximately \$800,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. Materials on hand, which the Montana Power Co. agreed to buy at the cost to the Government, would amount to approximately \$500,000. Therefore there is a possible net loss to the Government of between \$200,000 and \$300,000. That, I believe, was the understanding of the committee on which it based its decision not to build the line, inasmuch as there would be no lowered cost to the cooperative below the 5½-mills rate at which the Montana Power Co. agreed to furnish current. That is the same rate, of course, the cooperative would pay if it received the Bureau power. Therefore, as I see it at this time, when we need money and materials, we can save the expenditure of the money and save the use of the materials, because the Montana Power Co. is already connected with the Havre-Shelby cooperative, as I understand. We have before us an expense of \$300,000 instead of a total of \$1,900,000. That was the background for the subcommittee's making the recommendation to the full committee and to the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, some of the farmers in the western section of North Dakota are very much interested because they are expecting to get power. But a letter from the Commissioner indicates that the figures quoted a moment ago by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] are not accurate. Here is what is going to happen in case construction is stopped, according to Mr. Straus:

If construction is stopped, we would have an uncompleted facility incapable of serving any useful function, and of the \$1,427,367 expended or obligated as of July 31, 1950, the Government would suffer a direct loss of approximately \$600,000, since the \$200,000 expended for right-of-way, design, engineering, and administration and approximately \$400,000 consisting of contractors' profits, construction costs, termination costs, and supervision and legal expenditures could never be recovered. This assumes a salvage value of approximately \$800,000 for material and equipment, which is questionable since some of it is special equipment and might have only a nominal salvage value, in which case the direct loss to the Government could run as high as a million dollars.

In addition, if the Havre-Shelby line is not completed and placed in service by the

Government, the Fort Peck project will lose a principal outlet for firm power. This may result in requiring the project to sell firm power which has a value of 5.5 mills per kilowatt-hour at a rate for dump energy, or 2.5 mills, a loss of 3 mills. After the load has been built up over a period of 10 years, it will result in an estimated annual loss of almost \$250,000.

That, Mr. President, is apparently the whole story. So it is much more serious than we have been led to assume. I am delighted to know that the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is leading this fight because hundreds of thousands of farmers are interested in the question of whether they are going to get cheap power or whether the Montana Power Co. is going to have a monopoly. It seems to me that the stopping of this line is entirely wrong.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. If anyone will read the telegram which the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee sent to Mr. J. E. Corette, vice president of the Montana Power Co., under date of June 29, 1950, and the telegram of Mr. Corette in reply, he will see that the Montana Power Co. certainly very skillfully evaded any direct answer to the chairman's telegram, and did not at any place in the telegram say that the Montana Power Co. would hold the Government free of all costs and expenses which had gone into the line. If the power company is willing to do anything, it has certainly kept it a deep, dark secret up to this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee acted on the information available to it at the time. I am quite sure that when the bill goes to conference we shall have to have more information from both the Reclamation Service and the Montana Power Co., and the conferees can then decide what to do about it. For that reason I should prefer that the bill remain as it is when it is taken to conference.

Mr. MURRAY. When the conference meets, the conferees will not be able to hold any hearings or get any facts developed with reference to the situation with regard to the expense of completing the line. They will not be able to know what the company will do.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is mistaken. The custom is to act on these matters and get the very latest available information. I can assure the Senator that we shall have accurate information as to exactly what the situation is when the matter is taken up in conference, and we shall also have, if it is possible to obtain it, definite information from the Montana Power Co. as to how much it is willing to pay.

Mr. MURRAY. Will the conferees have information from the farmers interested in this matter? Will they know what the farmers' position is with reference to the ability of the Montana Power Co. to furnish them with adequate power?

I understand they claim that the present line of the Montana Power Co. is totally insufficient to carry the load. Besides, there is a pumping project in that

district which will require great quantities of electric power because it involves a hundred thousand acres of land.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I understand, the transmission line will be finished within 30 days. The poles will be in the ground and the wire will be on the poles.

Mr. MURRAY. It is a question of whether we will turn it over to the Montana Power Co., and give them a monopoly of the power.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand that, but we have appropriated the money with the understanding that if they would reduce rates and render the service, it would not be necessary to build the line. The money would not have been obtained on any other basis. That is how we proceeded in the case of the Southwest Power Administration. We took \$6,000,000 out of the bill. We made the same arrangement elsewhere. The interval between the time when the contract was let and the power company reduced its rate complicates this case somewhat, and therefore is not exactly like the other cases. Nevertheless, the money would not have been appropriated by Congress if we had not believed the circumstances to be as stated; and so, the committee said, "If the company will do it, we can save the Government some money."

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the contention of rural electric cooperatives in this field, who have been claiming for a long time that because they could not get adequate service over the company's line, they were compelled to build a line themselves to the Montana Power Co. line in order to hook onto it. In addition to that, as I said a little while ago, they had to buy a steam plant, because available power was insufficient.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. ECTON. The Marias Cooperative built their lines several years ago, and they have those lines. Is that not correct?

Mr. MURRAY. They have built their lines. The Marias Cooperative have their own system.

Mr. ECTON. They have their own system.

Mr. MURRAY. They had it originally, and they want to take advantage of their right to have access to Fort Peck power. I think they are entitled to it. They are preferred customers for that power, and they ought to be permitted to use it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The subcommittee was in an embarrassing position. One Senator from Montana was urging us to allow the appropriation, while the other Senator was suggesting that it be disallowed. A situation like that is always embarrassing. I have in my hand the latest information from the Commissioner of Reclamation with respect to the status of this line, and I should like to put it in the hands of the junior Senator from Montana with the request that he send it to the Montana Power Co., and ask them to come back with a very definite offer as to what they will do in the light of the representations now made by

the Bureau of Reclamation. We acted on information which was a month or 6 weeks old. If we could know definitely in conference what the power company proposes to do, and could see how much it would cost the United States, one way or another, the conferees could consider the matter with some degree of intelligence. If not, I do not see that the Senate conferees can do anything but recede. On the other hand, if the Montana Power Co. can come in with a clear-cut proposition to show that the Treasury of the United States is not going to lose anything, I think the Senate conferees ought to stand by what has been done.

Mr. GURNEY. I think the proposal would be a very fine solution of this problem. Personally, I want to see the cooperatives get adequate power at the Government rate of 5½ mills. I do not want to appropriate any Federal money at this time, especially for duplicating lines. I want to be sure that the Government's interests are preserved. If we have a proposal from the Bureau setting forth the status of the contract at this time, and the Montana Power Co. will agree to buy the material, or make some other agreement, and it appears to the conferees that it is a reasonable solution of this problem, I think that is the best we could do. The matter could be very well handled in conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that is the best we can do. Would the distinguished Senator from Montana be willing to do that?

Mr. ECTON. I did not hear the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have here the latest information issued by the Bureau of Reclamation, dated July 11 and July 14, as to the status of this transmission line, showing how far it has gone, what it has cost, and what the estimates on it are. The conferees would like to know what the Montana Power Co. proposes to do at this time under the circumstances.

Mr. ECTON. The information I have from the Montana Power Co. officials, which I think the distinguished Senator from Arizona has, is that the company is perfectly willing to take from the Government at cost all the material which is now on the job, so the Government will not lose any of the cost in that respect. What the liability to the contractor would be I am not prepared to say.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am asking if I give the Senator these letters will he transmit them to the Montana Power Co. with the understanding that by the time the bill comes to conference we will have a statement from them?

Mr. ECTON. I am willing to cooperate. However, I would suggest, since the Senator from Arizona has been handling the matter, that he do it, and that the information be sent directly to him.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall do it that way.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to continue with this discussion. In connection with the point which arises with reference to the sufficiency of the present transmission lines of the Montana Power Co., I wish to call attention to the fact that farmers

in this area expect to have a power failure this winter. They wrote a letter to the local power manager of the Bureau of Reclamation at Great Falls, asking for the right to lease this unfinished line so that they may be able to get more power for their cooperatives, I should like to have the letter inserted in the RECORD. In it the Marias Cooperative, writing to the Bureau of Reclamation manager at Great Falls, says:

I have discussed with you our desire to temporarily lease the use of your Havre-Shelby transmission line on the section from Chester to Shelby, Mont., to relieve our power shortage for this coming winter's load; as it is my understanding that when the contracts were let on the Havre-Shelby transmission line that the construction of the line would be completed by October 1, of this year. We have made extensive inquiries for the rental of transformers which we will transform from 69,000 volts to either 7200/12000/400Y or to 34,500, which we prefer; provided, we can find transformers of capacity sufficient to serve our additional power requirements.

The letter continues to show the insufficiency of the present transmission line. The Montana Power Co. does not offer any agreement to increase those lines. Therefore, it seems to me that the construction of the Havre-Shelby line is absolutely essential. It seems to me it would be a criminal act to destroy the line after it has been practically finished.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARIAS RIVER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
Shelby, Mont., July 12, 1950.

MR. CHESTER BRAZIL,
Power Manager, Reclamation Bureau,
Great Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. BRAZIL: I have discussed with you our desire to temporarily lease the use of your Havre-Shelby transmission line on the section from Chester to Shelby, Mont., to relieve our power shortage for this coming winter's load; as it is my understanding that when the contracts were let on the Havre-Shelby transmission line that the construction of the line would be completed by October 1, of this year. We have made extensive inquiries for the rental of transformers which we will transform from 69,000 volts to either 7200/12000/400Y or to 34,500, which we prefer; provided, we can find transformers of capacity sufficient to serve our additional power requirements.

We had a peak load of approximately 4,200 kilowatts last year; and even with our plant generating at full capacity, we were unable to hold a satisfactory voltage regulation on this peak load; and therefore, we anticipate a great deal more trouble this coming winter than we had the last winter.

Please bear in mind, that we have a transmission line from Conrad to Shelby and purchase power from the Montana Power Co. to supplement our generating capacity, and operate our plant in parallel with the power company's plants.

We anticipate a normal peak of 5,200 kilowatts this December, which will be increased by another 200 kilowatts; provided our allocations are completed to serve areas that we anticipate construction on this fall.

We will be urgently in need of power for next winter's use, in addition to what we can now generate and expect to receive from the Montana Power Co. over the present transmission line hook-up; and I would appreciate your immediate advice as to what we can expect relative to the completion of the Havre-Shelby line and the possibility of leasing it temporarily to relieve our power

situation, or that the Bureau of Reclamation furnish us with an additional 2,000 kilowatts of supplemental power delivered to Shelby over that portion of the Havre-Shelby transmission line at our substation which would be located in the vicinity of the proposed Bureau substation.

Your immediate advice on these matters will be greatly appreciated, as the time is drawing near when action will be necessary.

Very truly yours,

R. O. McPHILLIPS,
Manager.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. ECTON. I wonder if the Senator knows that the Montana Power Co. has offered to double their voltage on the line so that everyone will be able to have sufficient power. Is the Senator familiar with that?

Mr. MURRAY. I have been familiar with the proposals which the Montana Power Co. has been making over the years. For the last 5 or 6 years we have failed to get any satisfactory agreement from them which would enable the cooperatives to get the power which they need.

In addition to that, as I said a little while ago, we will need this transmission line more than ever as a result of the Marias pumping project, which undertakes to irrigate 100,000 acres of the valuable land in that area.

Mr. President, this is a most unusual and arbitrary action and will, if approved, result in denying the farmers of the section of Montana involved an adequate and efficient program of rural electrification at reasonable cost. In addition, it will result in a tremendous loss to the Government because this line is already nearing completion and the funds which we appropriated last year have already been paid out or almost completely obligated and cannot now be recaptured.

Furthermore, the meaning and net effect of this procedure will be to turn over to the Montana Power Co. a monopoly of the power generated at the Fort Peck Government Project and repudiate the program of the Bureau of Reclamation in furnishing power to REA's at low rates for rural electrification.

There are three cooperatives involved in that program. It is in a very rich agricultural section of the State of Montana, and the successful development of this area is entirely dependent upon an adequate supply of firm power at a reasonably low cost.

There is also in this area as I have stated a potential irrigation pumping development on the Marias project that could be served by the Havre-Shelby line. This development of over 100,000 acres of good irrigable land can be placed under water by the proper location of irrigation pumping plants. It is estimated that the annual energy required for such purpose may reach a total of over 4,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. Without the Havre-Shelby line it would be necessary for the Marias pumping project to secure its power from the Montana Power Co. at a higher rate than this power could be obtained from the Fort Peck project.

Of course, the agreement which the Montana Power Co. is now offering, of 5.5 mills for the power they propose to sell to cooperatives, does not apply to the pumping project. That would have to be a separate contract, and the farmers there would have to pay an excessive price for the power, which would practically render the project unfeasible.

Mr. President, I should like to refer to some other background history of this controversy. This struggle on the part of the REA's in Montana to secure low-cost power, which they had been guaranteed by Congress, has been going on for many years. During all that time we have made efforts to make agreements with the power company, but they have never taken any interest in these rural cooperatives until just recently.

At the outset of this effort of the farmers to get power on their farms, the Montana Power Co. displayed no interest whatsoever in serving these cooperatives or in providing adequate transmission facilities for such purpose. The company simply stood by with their control of the power from the Fort Peck Government project and undertook to block the development of these cooperatives. It was not until the Bureau of Reclamation proposed construction of the Havre-Shelby line that the company suddenly became interested. That was back in 1947. I have already described the situation then. The Congress appropriated funds in 1947 to build this line. If the Bureau of Reclamation had proceeded expeditiously, they could have completed the transmission line at that time. I remember some of the farmers who came here testifying about that—and I think the Senator from Arizona will recall it. They said some of the officials of the Bureau of Reclamation should have been shot for their failure to proceed with the construction of the line. It seems that some people are going to criticize the Bureau of Reclamation this time because they have proceeded. At any rate, the farmers were getting no power.

The Congress, finally taking cognizance of all these factors, back in 1947 appropriated funds for the fiscal year 1948 to provide for initiating construction of this line and substations. A large percentage of the line was then surveyed and staked out, designs and specifications prepared, and invitations for bids published during the fiscal year 1948. During all this time the Montana Power Co. offered no satisfactory program to serve these cooperatives, but continued to oppose the program in every way possible and maintained a powerful lobby in Washington for that purpose.

Just prior to awarding the contract for construction the Congress, because of this pressure of the power interests, rescinded its 1948 fiscal year appropriation. This action of the Congress was a severe shock to the REA's. It left the people of the Havre-Shelby area totally dependent upon an inadequate, makeshift, and completely unsatisfactory system consisting of low-voltage transmission lines owned by the Montana Power Co. and supplemented by a line belonging to the REA's and a steam-generating plant at Shelby which the REA's were compelled to pur-

chase in order to provide some semblance of service, although clearly inadequate.

After the action of Congress rescinding the 1948 appropriations for this line the REA cooperatives were deeply concerned as to their future expansion and development. They had already expended large sums of money and were despondent over the future, but continued the struggle. It was clearly shown at the hearings before the committee that the REA development in the Havre-Shelby area depended entirely upon the construction of the Havre-Shelby line.

On the basis of these well-established facts, developed in extensive hearings, the Congress last year, after a very elaborate debate, appropriated funds for the construction of the Havre-Shelby line for the fiscal year 1950. At no time during the Senate debate last year on the appropriations for the fiscal year 1950 did the Montana Power Co. offer adequate service under a proper agreement for these REA's. Never a thing; they just stood by, hoping they could beat them. They were successful before the committee in knocking out all the appropriations for transmission lines in Montana, but when it came to the floor of the Senate they were defeated. They did not even then try to enter into any agreement with the rural cooperatives in Montana.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. It was the fine and able efforts of the senior Senator from Montana on this floor that got the money for that line, of course.

Mr. MURRAY. Assisted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and many other Senators, who recognize the merits of the program. It seemed utterly ridiculous that the Government should build the Fort Peck Dam and have all this power available to these preferred customers, and then that they should be shut out of the power by the action of the Montana Power Co., which undertakes to get a monopoly of the power from that project. I think it is utterly indefensible.

During all the months intervening since the fiscal year 1950 appropriations were made, there was no effort to provide a wheeling agreement or adequate transmission facilities to serve this area. The Montana Power Co. having offered no wheeling agreement, the Bureau of Reclamation in good faith and under instructions from the Congress awarded a contract on December 28, 1949, for materials and construction of the line.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, will my colleague yield at that point?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. ECTON. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the Montana Power Co. had a contract signed by nine REA cooperatives in that area who were willing to take the company's power, but the REA here in Washington refused to approve it?

Mr. MURRAY. That does not relate to this section of the State of Montana at all; that is an entirely different situation.

Mr. ECTON. I should be pleased if the Senator would tell me to what section of Montana he refers.

Mr. MURRAY. I am referring to the section of Montana which will receive service from the Havre-Shelby line, in the northern section of the State, where these three very large cooperatives which have spent a great deal of money trying to get power during the past 6 of 7 years are located. I am referring to that area, where they should have access to the power from Fort Peck, but they have been denied it all these years by the maneuverings of the Montana Power Co. and their failure to give them a fair and decent contract.

Mr. ECTON. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that the two cooperatives involved have been offered the same rate as the others, namely, 5.5 mills, the same as the Government rate?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; but that means that the Bureau of Reclamation will have to turn over to the Montana Power Co. a monopoly of power from Fort Peck, and lose 3 mills per kilowatt on all the power hereafter which comes from that project, which will amount, as the Senator from North Dakota showed a little while ago, to a quarter of a million dollars a year.

The power company continued, all during the winter and spring, to refuse to enter into any deal with these cooperatives, and after failing to block the movement in the House, the power company officials then rushed back to Montana and went before the State railroad commission, which regulates the rates for utilities.

They appeared one day and submitted these revised rates, and the railroad commission acted on it the very same day, and put the rates in operation. This, however, did not occur until long after the contract was let for construction of the Havre-Shelby line and long after it was in course of construction. In view of that action by the commission it would seem to me that later on, after a few years, they will be able to go to the Montana Railroad Commission and get the commission to revise the rates, to raise the rates they may charge the farmers. That is something which can readily be expected, because they naturally have power and influence in the State with reference to the regulatory body, and I am satisfied that the company will receive such increase if it asks for it.

I believe this action before the Montana Commission is significant in that there is a possibility that the company, once the Government is deprived of the right to serve these REA's, may make representations at a later time to the commission that its rates should be raised. It seems reasonable to assume that it might be successful in accomplishing this even without holding public hearings. That is very significant as far as the REA cooperatives are concerned since, in view of the manner in which this rate reduction was handled, there is grave doubt as to the future. But, Mr. President, this rate reduction was not accompanied by any agreement to pro-

vide transmission facilities to carry full service to the area.

Now it is claimed that the power company will compensate the Bureau for the losses sustained if construction on this line is discontinued. Who is going to determine this? What is the compensation going to be? And who is going to reimburse the farmers who will be compelled by the power company's action to spend thousands of dollars more than would be necessary if the Havre-Shelby line were completed? It seems to me that is something which has not been properly adjusted by the conference committee. There ought to be some way of weighing the company's proposals and determining whether they are sufficient actually to compensate the Government for the total losses it will suffer.

If the company had made an offer of an agreement after the action of the Congress last year and could offer complete service to the REA's, it would have been a different story. But they waited until the last minute, when the line is nearly completed. So now the Government stands to take a heavy loss if the proposed action is carried into effect. We would not have been here last year fighting for this appropriation if the Montana Power Co. had at that time offered the rate which they are now proposing to offer. It seems to me the point I make to the effect that it results in giving a monopoly to the Montana Power Co. is something which should be taken into consideration by the conference committee. I think that the power company, by its neglect and delay in presenting any proposal until after the line had been partly constructed, has waived any right to depend on any so-called understanding, and the committee is released from obligation under the alleged understanding arrived at in the conference last year.

I regret exceedingly to see this struggle between the power interests of my State and the people again resurrected. Last year we thought that the fight had been finished and that we would now begin to witness a long period of progress and cooperation in the development of rural electrification in Montana. I think the power company is making a grave mistake in again reopening this bitter feud. There is not enough at stake to justify the power company in seeking to deprive the farmers of northern Montana of the right to have this transmission line and have access to a full supply of power from the Fort Peck project.

The power company knows that it is not adequately equipped through its present transmission lines to furnish the Havre-Shelby area with sufficient power to fulfill all requirements. The power company stands to profit enormously as a result of its control of the public power generated at Fort Peck, which the taxpayers of our State have helped to bring into existence. The power company has also been greatly benefited by the development of the Hungry Horse power project in Montana, which they tried to obstruct for years, and will now witness a great expansion of its business.

The company is expanding its business tremendously and is going to make huge profits. Already its stock has jumped on the stock exchanges because of the enormous expansion of business which will result to the company because of the fight we made in Congress for the Hungry Horse Dam and the other developments in our State. The company fought us in connection with the transmission line from Kerr Dam to Anaconda claiming that it was not necessary. They fought us for several years and tried to block the development of the Hungry Horse project. Finally Congress took action with respect to the project. After that the company came here last year and admitted that the Kerr-Anaconda power line was necessary. The company is going to benefit from it because it carries power from the Hungry Horse Dam to the Montana power centers where they are going to obtain a huge amount of that power. It seems to me that the power company should be satisfied with the tremendous growth and profits it stands to make through its expanding operations under this power development program, and not waste its time trying to crush the little group of farmers who seek to get the meager benefits of low-cost power on their farms, to which they are entitled under the national policy.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Montana will remember that at the very time the Hungry Horse Dam project came before us for consideration for the first time, when former Senator Wheeler and the distinguished senior Senator from Montana appeared and asked for the initial appropriation of a million or a million and a half dollars to make a study of the project, even then the power companies protested and opposed the request.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. And now after the project has been completed the company takes advantage of it.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. Undoubtedly the Hungry Horse Dam should have been constructed long before it was. It should have been constructed before the last war. By reason of the failure to construct the dam big floods occurred in the Lower Columbia. The dam helps to hold back those waters, and contributes greatly to flood control in the Columbia Basin. So it seems the Congress acted unwisely in delaying that project, as it did several years ago.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact the construction of the dam changed the entire situation around Kalispell, Mont., did it not?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. It has changed the entire situation in the whole State of Montana as well as in the Dakotas. In that section of the country we were losing population. Just before the project was begun we had fewer people

in Montana than there were in Montana 30 or 40 years before.

The population had greatly dwindled because we had no balanced economy. All we had was an agricultural economy. After the young people had gone through school and graduated from college, they were obliged to leave the State and go to other sections. As a result of this development, however, people are coming into Montana seeking to obtain the power created by the project, to use it for industrial purposes.

Yesterday I had a conversation with a man who represents a concern which wants to construct an aluminum production plant in Montana. Mr. Raver, of the Bonneville Power Authority, has been negotiating with him. That is one illustration of what is occurring. Hundreds of similar illustrations could be given. Such construction will develop Montana's internal economy. Montana is the third largest State in size in the Union. It could maintain a population of many hundreds of thousands more than it has now. Instead of the population increasing in Montana, it has been dwindling.

Another factor that I believe is of major importance to the Senate is the possible losses that will be incurred by the Government as a result of failing to appropriate funds to complete the Havre-Shelby line. We are not assured that the company will stand all the costs as a result of stopping construction, although company officials have indicated their willingness to reimburse the Government for materials involved. Expenditures by the Bureau of Reclamation, as of June 30, 1950, are \$526,090. Obligations, as of July 1, 1950, will total \$828,522. The estimated expenditures by July 31 will be \$892,000 and the estimated obligations, \$535,000. As of July 10, 10.5 miles of structures have been erected and 17.5 miles of structures framed. By July 31 it is estimated that 55 miles, or over one-half of the structures, will be erected and 58 miles of structures framed.

Should the Bureau of Reclamation now be required to terminate the construction contract and dispose of the material, it would stand to lose approximately \$200,000 for designs, surveys, engineering and administration, and right-of-way acquisitions. Termination of the contracts would probably result in a loss to the Government of from \$400,000 to \$800,000 for settling the claims which, no doubt, the contractors for materials and construction will seek for such termination. The amount of the loss is contingent upon final determination of the disposal or use of materials and the resulting salvage value. The direct and immediate loss to the Government would as a minimum be \$600,000 and may reach as much as a million dollars.

What will be the status of the structures already in place? Salvage would be costly. If the company offers to take it over, it will be an admission that the line is required in spite of testimony to the contrary. The Congress will also have to decide the question of disposal. We cannot abandon these works by

merely saying, "Stop—no more work is to be done."

Mr. President, this is a tragic matter. I am confident that the conference committee which will handle this bill will not be jockeyed into this muddle of confusion which was concocted by some smart lawyers and lobbyists. No, Mr. President, this so-called offer of the company to assume the loss caused by the termination of construction of this line is not worth a penny. Such an arrangement would be contrary to public policy. It seems to me that some sort of deception must have been perpetrated on the committee to induce it to peremptorily terminate the construction of this vitally necessary line which will not cost the Government a single dollar.

In view of the present emergency confronting the country, Congress must act in this matter with caution. We can not afford to see this property and the labor which has been expended on it recklessly wasted. There can be no doubt but that the Havre-Shelby line is necessary to carry the load required to serve that area. If it was not built this year, it would have to be built in a year or two by the Montana Power Co. if it should undertake to fully serve the area.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it not true that the President today, in his emergency message to the Congress, took pains specifically to point out that the limitation of expenditures ought not to be applied to power, and that he named it as such?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct. The Senator from Washington made a statement for the RECORD to that effect this afternoon.

Now to destroy the line after it has been almost completed would be a piece of vandalism hard to understand. It would be a flagrant and criminal destruction of property at a time when the country is facing a great emergency.

I cannot understand why anyone would propose completely to destroy a line which has been constructed and will be available for service within the next month. Certainly that is not the proper thing to do.

Furthermore, this action forced on the farmers of Montana will be the beginning in our State of a perpetual feud which will never subside, and in the long run it will be a very costly performance on the part of the power company and a great injury to the citizens of Montana.

When the power company says it will compensate the Bureau for the loss sustained by the destruction of the line, what does it mean? It means that the taxpayers of the country will be called upon to pay for it—not the Montana Power Co. Any funds paid out by the Montana Power Co. to compensate for the destruction of the line, if the courts would permit such a fraud on the Government, would be a deductible item in the company's income-tax reports; and, therefore, the taxpayers of the country would be paying for the loss that would

be sustained. Also, Mr. President, the consumers will suffer, because, of course, higher rates will be charged.

If the action of the committee is reversed, the farmers of Montana, who will be the purchasers of the power supplied, will pay every nickel of the costs of the line, and the Government will not lose one cent. At the same time, the Montana Power Co. will not lose anything, either. As a result of the great power development in Montana, it stands to make fabulous profits. This seems evident from the way in which the price of its stocks and securities is jumping up in Wall Street, as I mentioned a few minutes ago.

A further matter to consider is the fact that if the Havre-Shelby line were not completed, and the Government were compelled to sell all its Fort Peck power to the Montana Power Co. at the dump rate of 2.5 mills, the Government would lose annually over a quarter of a million dollars. Without the Havre-Shelby line, it would be deprived of a profit of 3 mills on every kilowatt of power it would be able to sell to the REA's over that line, all of which would go to pay for the cost of the Fort Peck Project and transmission lines and provide for other reclamation projects.

Who will profit by such arrangement? The Montana Power Co. will get the differential between the dump rate and the firm rate for merely providing transmission service to the cooperatives' load centers. It is hard to believe that the Senate would ever condone such a staggering loss to the Federal Treasury in order to provide a profit to private interests.

I might add that, should the company be in the position of being the sole source of supply to the cooperatives, there would be no assurance that the company would provide capacity in its facilities to meet the load requirements, even though it has recently raised the voltage of certain sections of its line. I make this point since I have been informed that the Hill County Cooperative has discussed with the Bureau of Reclamation the possibility of temporarily using the Havre-Shelby line before the substations are complete, to assist in meeting its peak loads this winter, which cannot be provided for by the facilities of the Montana Power Co.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if the Havre-Shelby line is not completed, and if the Government is required to sell whatever facilities it has completed, the private power company will have a monopoly, as I have previously stated on several occasions.

In addition, if the private power company is the sole source of supply of electricity, there is no assurance that it will not raise its rates at a later period of time.

Mr. President, I realize how difficult it is to thrash this matter out on the floor with only a few Senators present. It requires the most careful attention. It seems to me that this matter could be handled more effectively in the conference committee, as has been suggested by the distinguished Senator from Ari-

zona, who is handling this portion of the appropriations bill. I understand that it is the purpose of the Senator from Arizona to have this matter fully considered by the conference committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is my desire; and I am quite sure that when we reach the conference we shall have definite information down to date from both the Reclamation Service and the Montana Power & Light Co. in regard to this situation.

Mr. MURRAY. I am glad to know that the Senator from Arizona agrees with me about this matter. This is a most unusual situation. In view of all that the able Senator from Arizona has said, and in view of the facts developed in the RECORD here today, this matter should be given the most thorough and careful consideration by the conferees on this bill, with the result that the Congress will be prevented from making a serious blunder, costly to the Government, and at the same time will protect the farmers of Montana from a grave injustice by the destruction of this line after it has been almost completed.

Mr. President, the other item which is affected by this matter is the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls transmission line.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me state briefly what the committee has done in that regard:

The committee concurs with the House in omitting the foregoing transmission lines and substations from the bill.

In addition, the committee recommends that \$365,000 included in the 1951 budget estimate and allowed by the House for the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls 115-kilovolt transmission line and substations be deleted. The committee expects the Reclamation Bureau and the Montana Power Co. to negotiate, giving appropriate weight to the distances involved, a wheeling agreement for the disposal of Canyon Ferry power. If the facts show next year that the company has not acted in good faith, the committee will be willing to recommend appropriations for the construction of these facilities. The Montana Power Co. has given assurances that it will build the Canyon Ferry-East Helena section of the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls line and will include the right to use this line in the agreement being negotiated with the Reclamation Bureau for the use of the company's two existing 100,000-volt lines between Great Falls and East Helena.

Again that is a matter which we shall take to conference. It is involved in the total amount to which this item relates.

I can assure the Senator from Montana that if a proper wheeling agreement of that kind is not made, he will not have to make any argument with me.

On the other hand, if one is made, and if it is made in a manner which is satisfactory to the Bureau of Reclamation—and from what I could learn from the Chief Engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation, the negotiations are now in progress, and those in the Bureau believe they will be fully satisfied with the agreement—then I understand that the Senator from Montana himself will be satisfied.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. If the transmission line is not carried through as

proposed in connection with the appropriations, there should be a wheeling agreement which will prevent the Montana Power Co. from having a monopoly of the power from the Canyon Ferry project.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is distinctly understood by everyone, and we shall do our best to find out about it.

I hope that at the time when we take up this item in the conference, we can dispose of both of these matters in that way. If it can be handled in the way it was handled in the case of the Southwestern Power Administration and between the Montana Power Co. and the Bonneville Power Administration in reference to power from Hungry Horse Dam, and it can be handled in a way that is fair to both the company and the Government, I hope that will be done.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. I should like to point out that the action of the Senate committee in eliminating funds for initiating construction of the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls transmission line and substations will have a serious effect on the Canyon Ferry unit of the Missouri Basin project. This unit includes the Canyon Ferry Dam and power plant of 50,000 milowatts capacity, capable of producing over one-quarter billion kilowatt-hours of salable energy annually.

Senators no doubt will recall the action taken by the Congress several years ago when a restrictive provision barring the installation of generating facilities at Canyon Ferry power plant was contained in the Appropriation Act. It was pointed out last year that this would have a serious effect on the repayment ability of this unit, which should be a heavy contributor toward the repayment of the Missouri River Basin development. The Congress removed this restriction last year after it realized the serious implications involved in eliminating the power-generating facilities.

The elimination of the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls transmission line is of equally serious import. This line is the outlet for power to be produced at Canyon Ferry power plant and will interconnect with the Fort Peck project system at Great Falls, Mont. Should the committee's action be sustained, and the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls line be eliminated from the program of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Montana Power Co. then will be placed in the position of being the only customer or outlet for power to be produced at the Canyon Ferry power plant—unless, as the Senator from Arizona has pointed out, a satisfactory wheeling agreement is reached.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is thoroughly understood by all concerned, I assure the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, with the understanding that this entire matter is going to be considered by the conferees, it seems to me it is not necessary for me to go much further into this question.

If the company is not willing to lease a portion of its facilities to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to utilize these facilities to integrate its operations with the Fort Peck system and thus provide an outlet for the power there produced, it is obvious that the Government will

realize a serious loss in revenue. Under the proposal of the committee, the Montana Power Co. will construct a segment of line from its East Helena substation to the Canyon Ferry bus bar. This will place the company in a position to monopolize the entire output of the project. Should the company refuse to lease its facilities at a reasonable cost, the only alternative would be to sell the entire output to the company or deliver power over its system under a wheeling agreement. The wheeling agreement would be entirely unsatisfactory, since it would not permit the free integration of energy with the Fort Peck project system, and the annual cost of wheeling one-quarter of a billion kilowatt-hours would be prohibitive unless such costs were merely nominal or were equivalent to a license for the full use of its line capacity.

The other alternative is even more serious. As stated previously, the Montana Power Co. has with the Bonneville Power Administration a firm power contract whereby the company will receive 50,000 kilowatts, delivered at Anaconda, at an average rate of approximately 2.5 mills. The rate for firm power from the Missouri Basin project is 5.5 mills per kilowatt-hour, or a differential of 3 mills per kilowatt-hour between the Bonneville rate and the Missouri Basin rate. The company, being in a position to monopolize the output, would be in a good position to demand an equivalent rate for Canyon Ferry power. If the company should take such a position—and it appears quite certain that it will—the total anticipated revenue from the Canyon Ferry project would be approximately \$600,000 annually. The operating costs and provision for replacement would require approximately \$190,000 annually, leaving a net of \$410,000 annually available for interest and amortization.

Let us analyze the situation further. The tentative allocation of cost to be repaid from power revenues for the Canyon Ferry unit is approximately \$18,200,000. The interest alone for 1 year on this amount at 3 percent would be \$546,000, leaving a net loss of \$136,000 annually to the project, without considering repayment of the original investment. By not approving funds for the construction of the necessary transmission facilities to provide an outlet for power, the Congress manifestly places the Government in such a position that it cannot seek the best arrangement for disposing of Canyon Ferry power at the established Missouri Basin rate.

If such action is sustained by the Congress, it will in effect, be placing the Bureau of Reclamation in such a position that it cannot carry out the provisions of reclamation law requiring repayment under stipulated conditions. Here, again, Congress, by refusing to appropriate a relatively small amount of money to provide these necessary facilities, will be placing the Government in a position to continually lose, year after year, part of the interest on its original investment, and also will deny it any means of returning the investment itself. I think it would be proper to characterize

this as a fraud on the United States Government. It is certainly contrary to the national policy and the intent of Congress that the expenditure of public funds should be made for the sole and exclusive profit of an individual corporation. This is especially true when the returns from such investments as reclamation projects are for the development of the West. The most widespread benefit and use of the projects' products, both irrigation and power, are a part of that national policy.

Upon careful consideration of this matter, the conclusion is inevitable that the funds should be restored for the construction of the necessary facilities to provide an outlet for Canyon Ferry power in order to place the Bureau in the best position to bargain with the Montana Power Co. for the most satisfactory arrangements to dispose of Canyon Ferry power in keeping with reclamation law.

Mr. President, I think this matter cannot be fully and effectively handled on the floor with only a few Senators here. This, again, is a matter which requires careful study by the conference committee when the measure goes to conference. I should like to ask the able Senator in charge of the measure if he does not agree with me in these observations.

This is a matter which has very serious implications, and I am sure that no one would want to see the Government defrauded or imposed upon as a result of any oversight or neglect or failure to give the questions involved the fullest consideration.

Again I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if it is his intention to have these matters—both the Havre-Shelby problem and the other problem—worked out with proper agreements which will not give the Montana Power Co. the entire advantage and will not destroy the efforts of the farmers to obtain low-cost power on their farms in Montana?

Mr. HAYDEN. That will be our effort, I am sure.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point, to permit me to insert in the RECORD some matters in connection with this item?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEPPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I had promised to yield for a moment to the Senator's colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], to permit him to discuss a matter relating to this portion of the bill.

Therefore, I now yield to the junior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, in the report of the Committee on Appropriations on the general appropriation bill, 1951, the following appears on page 150:

JAMESTOWN UNIT, MISSOURI-SOURIS DIVISION,
MONTANA-SOUTH DAKOTA

The 1951 budget estimate for this project under phase B (planning) is \$105,000. In view of the recent devastating floods in this area, the committee recommends that construction work on the Jamestown project be started at the earliest possible date. The committee, therefore, has approved the

transfer of this project from phase B to phase A (construction) and recommends that the appropriation be increased from the House allowance of \$105,000 to a total of \$750,000.

Mr. President, I should like to make a statement to the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with Interior Department appropriations and I wish to ask whether he agrees with it:

In order that the record may be clear as to the intent of the Senate, it is my understanding that the Bureau of Reclamation is to proceed at the earliest possible date to construct the Jamestown Dam for flood protection and, because of the urgency of providing this protection for life and property in the city of Jamestown, the Secretary of the Interior should make appropriate allocations of the costs to flood control and other nonreimbursable purposes. The costs of space in the reservoir are to be allocated to irrigation and municipal water supply, to be reimbursable under contracts to be negotiated; but construction of the flood-control features shall not await the completion of these contracts.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, my answer to the question is yes, because the committee held very careful and extensive hearings on this question. The situation is desperate, and requires prompt action; and the only manner in which it can be properly handled is by means of the action proposed by the Senate committee.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this time?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say that I join my colleague in regard to the Jamestown Dam.

In addition, I have received telegrams and letters relative to the Havre-Shelby line. I should like to read those communications into the RECORD, if the Senator from Arizona will permit me to do so at this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. The following telegram has come to me from Medicine Lake, Mont., under date of July 7:

MEDICINE LAKE, MONT., July 7, 1950.
WILLIAM LANGER,
North Dakota United States Senator:

At special meeting July 6, 1950, board of trustees passed resolution to the effect that funds be allowed for completion of Havre-Shelby Bureau of Reclamation transmission line. Board definitely against Montana Power Co. buying Bureau line. Transmission lines are vital link in serving REA Co-ops. Montana Power always been hostile. Urge your support of funds to complete Havre-Shelby transmission line. Urge Montana Power Co. be stopped from buying Havre-Shelby line and retarding progress of REA Co-ops. Montana Power would like to control power source and in position to dictate to REA Co-ops.

SHERIDAN COUNTY ELECTRIC CO-OP, INC.

I have also received the following letter:

HUNTLEY, MONT., July 5, 1950.
HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I sincerely hope the Appropriations Committee approves suffi-

cient funds for the completion of the Havre-Shelby (Mont.) transmission line. This, and other like projects, must remain in public ownership if our REA cooperatives are to get power at lowest possible cost.

Very respectfully,

PLATO PICKENS.

In addition, I have received the following telegram:

INVERNESS, MONT., July 3, 1950.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Government control and ownership of the Havre-Shelby transmission line is necessary for the existence of our electric co-op. We ask your support to obtain additional funds to complete the line.

Mr. and Mrs. EMIL STROVIK.

Mr. and Mrs. BERNARD STROVIK.

Mr. and Mrs. HOWARD HALL.

I also have a letter from Pendroy, Mont., dated July 7, which reads as follows:

PENDROY, MONT., July 7, 1950.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am insisting that sufficient funds be appropriated for completion of the Havre-Shelby project of the REA.

I think everything should be done to keep REA throughout the Nation every home in the United States of America should have the benefit of electricity and how else will they get it, unless there is a REA. The big companies never worried about farm homes until REA came along.

I want to say, Mr. President, that that is true. At the time I was governor of my own State I could not even get a little line built to the farm home in which my sister lived. It took 7 years to get it, and the price was the great sum of \$1,300, merely for putting in five posts and the wire. If a sister of the governor of the State could not get electrical service, Senators can imagine what chance the average farmer has of getting it. The situation there is disgraceful. The letter continues:

They never put electricity in the farm homes that their lines passed by. So see that the REA has sufficient funds to continue their good work.

That is in connection with the Havre-Shelby project.

I have a telegram from Havre, Mont., reading as follows:

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge sufficient appropriations to complete Havre-Shelby transmission lines.

COTTONWOOD FARMERS UNION,
LOCAL 145,

H. J. HANSEN, Legislative Chairman.

I have another letter, from Circle, Mont., dated July 5, 1950, reading as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am sending you my protest against the Montana Power Co. owning our electrical transmission lines. I fully endorse and ask our representatives to help forward the Havre-Shelby and public transmission lines.

My neighbors and fellow citizens of this part of the State are of the same opinion.

Trusting you will give your fullest cooperation in this project, I am

Yours respectfully,

WILLIAM GASS.

I have another letter, Mr. President, also from Montana, from the Park County Trades and Labor Council. Liv-

ington, Mont., under date of July 3, 1950. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR: The action of the Senate Appropriations Committee in failing to provide funds for completion of Havre-Shelby, Mont., transmission lines project; and the Montana Power Co. offering to buy up the Government's obligations was a terrific shock to all members of our council.

Every one of you Senators remember how the private power companies insisted upon the Government allowing them to build dams, handle the transmission lines; and that they would provide the power necessary, for operation of all plants in the United States.

You well remember, that if the Government had heeded their requests we would have lost the last war, as there was and still is a shortage of cheap power; not alone in the Western States; but in the Middle West and New England States.

Instead of curtailing Government dams and power transmission lines, our council feel that we may be on the verge of World War III and the Government should immediately hasten the construction of more power dams and transmission lines; so that, if war does come, we will not be unprepared.

Therefore the council in regular meeting July 3, instructed me to request your assistance upon the floor of the Senate to see that ample funds are provided for completion of the Havre-Shelby transmission lines; but that you do everything within your power to speed up the construction of all construction work on all dams and transmission lines.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. PRIEST,
Secretary, Park County Trades and
Labor Council.

This trades and labor council is made up of the affiliated unions of bakers, barbers, bartenders, boilermakers, carpenters, clerks, retail culinary workers, electricians, firefighters, firemen and oilers, hodcarriers, building and general laborers, lathers, laundry workers, machinists, musicians, painters, operative engineers, plasterers and cement finishers, plumbers, sheet metal workers, State, county and municipal employees, and teamsters. Cooperating, not affiliated: Blacksmiths, carmen, clerks, railway conductors, railway engineers, locomotive firemen and enginemen, letter carriers, trainmen, railway, and typographical.

Mr. President, I have another telegram which is from the Mayor of the city of Havre, Mont., dated July 5, which reads as follows:

HAVRE, MONT., July 5, 1950.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Request you establish funds for the Bureau of Reclamation to complete and operate the Havre-Shelby transmission lines. This line necessary to progress of north central Montana and bureau operation necessary in order to insure low rate of rural electric co-operative and other public bodies who need low cost power. Please keep faith with the people of Montana who need low-cost power for development of this area.

HARRY SODERBERG,
Mayor, City of Havre, Mont.

Mr. President, I took up with the Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, every one of these communications. I have here a letter dated July 13, 1950, which I desire to read into the RECORD. It is signed by the Acting Commissioner, and reads as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Reference is made to your letter of July 10, advising that

the board of trustees, Sheridan County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Medicine Lake, Mont., has passed a resolution urging that funds be allowed for completion of the Havre-Shelby Bureau of Reclamation transmission line.

I call this particularly to the attention of the members of this committee:

As of July 10, 1950, 10½ miles of this transmission line had been completed and practically all material required for its construction has been delivered on the site. The contractor's schedule calls for completion on September 6, 1950.

Mr. President, that is a matter of but 6 weeks from now. In 6 weeks it is going to be done, if it is not stopped by the Congress. The letter continues:

However, it is with deep regret that I inform you that the Senate Appropriations Committee has not only failed to provide funds for fiscal year 1951 for the completion of this line but also has stipulated that any money not obligated out of 1950 appropriation be returned to the Treasury.

This action by the Senate Appropriations Committee, if sustained by the Congress, would prohibit the completion of the Havre-Shelby Transmission Line by the Bureau of Reclamation and would be a very serious blow to the cooperatives who are relying on the completion of this line to meet their power requirements.

He says, Mr. President, that it would be a very serious blow. Then he goes on to say:

Furthermore, if the Bureau of Reclamation cannot complete these facilities it will result in a direct loss to the Government of from \$600,000 to \$1,000,000 as a result of having to terminate construction and material contracts already in force. In addition, if the Havre-Shelby line is not constructed by the Government the Fort Peck project will lose a principal outlet for firm power. This may well result in requiring the project to sell firm power which has a value of 5.5 mills per kilowatt-hour at a rate for dump energy, or 2.5 mills, a loss of 3 mills. After the load has been built up over a period of 10 years, it will result in an estimated annual loss of almost \$250,000.

If construction is permitted to proceed—

For which my distinguished friend from Montana has so eloquently argued—

If construction is permitted to proceed repayment of the costs of these facilities are assured.

I say to my friend from Montana, how are we saving one single penny? It is said that we are saving a million dollars when, as a matter of fact, the Bureau of Reclamation says:

If construction is permitted to proceed repayment of the costs of these facilities are assured. The original repayment studies indicated pay-out with an investment of \$2,800,000, which has now been reduced to \$1,995,000, as a result of very favorable bids. The Government's investment will be amply protected under these circumstances.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH MARKWELL,
Acting Commissioner.

Mr. President, I submit that here is a project which will be completed by September 6, approximately 6 weeks. Certainly Congress ought to be jealous of the fact that by previous action it has authorized its construction. It has led thousands of farmers to believe that REA would control the transmission line. We have spent millions of dollars to build the Fort Peck project, and certainly

every taxpayer in the country, whether he lives in Montana or in some other State, ought to be anxious to see to it that no single outfit, such as the Montana Power Co. or any other, should have a monopoly on that power. Certainly after the Government has spent all this money to build the dam, we should spend more money to build a transmission line to get the power to the farmers, because that, in essence, is the entire REA program.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a group of telegrams which I have received from persons in Montana. The first telegram is from the Governor of Montana, which reads as follows:

HELENA, MONT., July 14, 1950.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I sincerely hope you are successful in your fight for the restoration of the Shelby-Havre transmission line before the United States Senate. I was keenly disappointed that the Appropriations Committee eliminated this line because it is of vital necessity to the people of this State. We need this line if Montana is to prosper and I feel so deeply about it that I made a State radio address the day before yesterday urging the people to wire you urging that the Senate restore the appropriations for the line. The response which I have received because of the radio address has been most gratifying and I assume that you have received many telegrams of the same nature. Best wishes for your success in this most worthy endeavor.

Regards.

JOHN W. BONNER,
Governor of Montana.

Mr. President, I ask that the other telegrams which I hand to the official reporter may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT FALLS, MONT., July 12, 1950.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,

Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to use all your influence to secure funds for completion of Havre-Shelby and Canyon Ferry transmission lines. This plea comes from more than 300 farm families and REA patrons meeting in Great Falls tonight whose welfare is at stake. We demand an end to the exorbitant power rates now levied by a private power company that takes Government power from Fort Peck at a low rate and sells to our rural electric cooperatives. Give us a chance to live decently with low-cost power and lights on our farms.

CASCADE COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
FRED NICHOLSON, Jr., Secretary.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., July 15, 1950.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,

Washington, D. C.:

Saving the Havre-Shelby and Canyon Ferry Government power transmission lines is vitally important to thousands of farm families in northern and central Montana who are dependent on rural electric cooperatives for their power and lights. These Montana people need low-cost power to enable them to stay on their farms and live decently. They also need low-cost power to make their cooperatives pay out. As taxpayers they are entitled to access to Government energy available at Fort Peck and Canyon Ferry on an equal basis with other power users, and that

means freedom from exorbitant middleman charges by private power companies. The Havre-Shelby transmission line is a self-liquidating project designed to bring cheap Fort Peck power to the people in northern Montana. Destroying that Government power line will put the people in the area at the mercy of the Montana Power Co. in the years ahead. The announced reduction in rates by the company carries retarding conditions that more than offset the announced improvement in costs and forecloses on further advantages for the people now demonstrated by the Bonneville Power Administration and TVA. The Canyon Ferry line will firm up farm power in central Montana and bring the same benefits for patrons of rural electric co-ops as the Havre-Shelby line. Furthermore, land improvement through irrigation will be considerably increased through more low-cost power.

Irrigation planned in the Helena Valley, Crow Creek, and Chestnut Valley will be well-nigh eliminated if Government sale and distribution of power from Canyon Ferry is stopped. Irrigation phases of the project are feasible only through the revenue possible from sale of Government power and a schedule of low power rates for pumping water: The one to make the whole project pay out and the other to make it possible for farmers to operate irrigation pumping stations without going bankrupt. Congress contemplates no additional appropriation for irrigation, we are told, and there is little hope for such action in the foreseeable future. The charge that more Government power lines means duplication of lines is not a fair nor accurate argument because present distribution facilities are not able to deliver firm power to all customers, and the power demands in Montana are increasing every year. There is need for much more Government generation and distribution of hydroelectric energy in the State, and even a considerable increase in Government power facilities would still leave ample opportunity for existing private power companies.

Besides blocking the low-cost power program in Montana, the efforts of the Montana Power Co. against the Government transmission lines, if successful, will seriously impede further irrigation developments.

Great numbers of Montana farm people are depending on your able leadership and the efforts of your coworkers to restore the funds for the Havre-Shelby and Canyon Ferry lines.

LEONARD KENFIELD,

Editor, Montana Farmers Union News.

HELENA, MONT., July 7, 1950.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Urge that nothing be put in the way of construction and completion of the Havre-Shelby transmission line because it is of vital importance to the people of this State. Its abandonment would be a serious blow to the prosperity of Montana and the future growth of Montana.

JOHN W. BONNER, Governor.

BUTTE, MONT., July 13, 1950.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,

Washington, D. C.:

Rocky Mountain Sportsmen's Association, being fully cognizant of what completion and operation of Havre-Shelby lines as a public-power project means in ensuring a large and stable supply of inexpensive power for Montana industry and consumers alike, urges that necessary appropriations for this project be restored by the United States Senate. Havre-Shelby, Canyon Ferry, Hungry Horse, and other public-power projects, when completed and in operation, will prove Montana's greatest attraction to out-of-State industries. In providing low-cost power for their operations. This in turn

means thousands of new jobs for Montana workers, a greatly expanded market for the products of Montana farmers, and little-business men, and likewise a greatly broadened tax base so vitally needed for successful operation of Montana schools, city, county, and State governments.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN SPORTSMEN'S
ASSOCIATION,
JOHN STANTON, President.

CORVALLIS, MONT., July 13, 1950.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Urge no eliminating of funds appropriated for Havre-Shelby transmission line. This line necessary to serve electric energy in the State of Montana for developments.

PAUL BRISSONNEAUD.

CHINOOK, MONT., July 13, 1950.

Senator JAMES MURRAY,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Request that you use all possible means to keep the Havre-Shelby transmission line from falling into the hands of private utility interests. Be sure that funds to complete this line are added to the budget. Do not let these utilities take this line as it will mean a tremendous loss to the taxpayers whose money is invested in the Fort Peck Dam and who stand to gain by the sale of Fort Peck power at 5.5 mills to REA instead of 2.5 mills to the Montana Power Co. We ranchers and farmers served by REA lines realize that without public power we would never have the advantage of electricity we now have. Do not let private interests rob those of us who do not yet have electric service. We know this is a difficult battle but you have our endless support.

Tom Ness, D. L. Murphy, John Scott, Harold A. Haive, Author Dahl, Edward Dahl, R. D. Doughton, Rudolph Block, Arthur W. Campbell, A. E. Cole, Thos. Staff, Ole Eklong, Jas. Spencer, H. A. Marsh, Leo Gist, Geo. Vandeven, Arthur C. Jacobsen, Jess Conrad, Charles Pancretz, John Redekap, Chas. Greenburg.

HELENA, MONT., July 12, 1950.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,

United States Senate:

We, the undersigned, respectfully request that sufficient appropriations be made to complete the Havre-Shelby power-transmission line, and that the Federal Government operate this power line permanently in the interests of the people of Montana.

Marian Covington, Gussie Chapman, John E. Sasek, Harry Norton, Francis Small, Elizabeth Hawks, Ruby Lee, Joseph Casey, Mr. and Mrs. E. W. Pruttis, Lucy T. McLemore, C. C. Covington, Caroline Christian.

HELENA, MONT., July 12, 1950.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,

Senate Office Building:

Appropriation for Havre-Shelby transmission line as a public project last year gave new hope to REA cooperatives and farmers of Montana. It must not be allowed to be abandoned as it approaches completion. Do everything possible to have the appropriation for construction of this vital project restored.

LEE METCALIF.

SHELBY, MONT., June 30, 1950.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This cooperative has been advised that the Montana Power Co. is offering to buy and is trying to secure control of the Havre-Shelby 115-kilovolt transmission line and facilities now under

construction by the Bureau of Reclamation. The contractor expects to have this line completed by October 1 of this year. The members of this cooperative are strongly opposed to any action that would take control of this line from the Reclamation Bureau and place it in the control of the Montana Power Co. or any private utility. According to sworn testimony of Montana Power Co. officials in previous hearings before your committee, the Havre-Shelby transmission line is entirely unfeasible and is an indefensible waste to taxpayers money. Now we are informed the same Montana Power Co. offers to buy out the contractor, the Reclamation Bureau and the United States Government itself insofar as the aforesaid line is concerned. The complete reversal of power company statements and action at this time amounts to an admission that it was wrong in its previous testimony, and establishes beyond question that the Havre-Shelby line will, upon construction, become a very valuable asset and a key to open up the resources of the area in eastern Montana, and will be the means of giving the people of this area a plentiful supply of low-cost electric energy. In view of the value and importance of this transmission line and its facilities, it becomes apparent that it would be an indefensible act to turn it over to any private utility. In an address given by Regional Director Vernon last fall in Havre, the statement was made that this line will pay for itself and return to the people of the United States a surplus of many millions of dollars. This plain fact explains the desire of the Montana Power Co. to secure control of the line. The membership of this cooperative strongly urges the Congress to continue in force appropriations already made for this line as it is critically needed in this area.

Respectfully yours,
E. J. BYRNE,
Vice President, Marias River Electric
Cooperative.

SHELBY, MONT., June 30, 1950.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,

Washington, D. C.:

This cooperative has been advised that the Montana Power Co. is offering to buy and is trying to secure control of the Havre-Shelby 115-kilovolt transmission line and facilities now under construction by the Bureau of Reclamation. The contractor expects to have this line completed by October 1 of this year. The members of this cooperative are strongly opposed to any action that would take control of this line from the Reclamation Bureau and place it in the control of the Montana Power Co. or any private utility. According to sworn testimony of Montana Power Co. officials in previous hearings before your committee, the Havre-Shelby transmission line is entirely unfeasible and is an indefensible waste of taxpayers' money. Now we are informed the same Montana Power Co. offers to buy out the contractor, the Reclamation Bureau, and the United States Government itself insofar as the aforesaid line is concerned. The complete reversal of power company's statements and action at this time amounts to an admission that it was wrong in its previous testimony, and establishes beyond question that the Havre-Shelby line will, upon construction, become a very valuable asset and a key to open up the resources of the area in eastern Montana, and will be the means of giving the people of this area a plentiful supply of low-cost electric energy. In view of the value and importance of this transmission line and its facilities, it becomes apparent that it would be an indefensible act to turn it over to any private utility. In an address given by Regional Director Vernon last fall in Havre, the statement was made that this line will pay for itself and return to the people of the United

States a surplus of many millions of dollars. This plain fact explains the desire of the Montana Power Co. to secure control of the line. The membership of this cooperative strongly urges the Congress to continue in force appropriations already made for this line as it is critically needed in this area.

Respectfully yours,

DON HELLINGER,
President, Marias River
Electric Cooperative.

HAVRE, MONT., July 11, 1950.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Bureau of Reclamation contractor on Havre-Shelby line personally informed me today that construction is proceeding and by end of July 53 miles of poles will be erected, 58 miles of poles framed, 63 miles of poles hauled. Also wire stringing will start soon, not later than August 1. All material on the job for this 99-mile line. Line will be complete about September 15, 1950. All persons contacted on our REA project by letter. Everyone urges that this line be completed, owned, and operated by Bureau of Reclamation, not Montana Power. Labor unions, farmers' unions, REA cooperatives, and other persons interested in this line urgently request that the appropriations requested by the Bureau for completion of this line be granted. Request you carry the fight as far as necessary. The people of Montana want this line to remain as the key to the development of Montana's resources and for military defense if the need be.

HAROLD C. EBAUGH,
Manager, Hill County
Electric Co-op, Inc.

KALISPELL, MONT., July 12, 1950.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

The board of trustees of the Flathead Electric Cooperative Inc. urge appropriation of necessary additional funds for completion of the Havre-Shelby transmission line. We respectfully call your attention to the necessity of this line. Even Montana Power Co. now admits this when they believe transmission line within their control. This evidence alone is enough to condemn these people and their plans to own or control this and other transmission lines in the State of Montana that are needed for the development of Montana through abundant low-cost power. We ask construction of this line in order that wholesale power may be made equally available to the cooperatives as it is to the Montana Power Co.

Let this point be definite and clear once and for all. The cooperatives unlike Montana Power Co. do not want monopoly of power. They only demand an equal right to the power resources of the Nation which in this case is only possible through the construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line. This is not a gift if Montana Power can pay out here cooperatives will do equally well.

Our people, as citizens of Montana and the United States have this right of development and use through the facilities of our Government when necessary. Will you grant them this right?

Respectfully,

CHAS. A. GREEN,
President, Flathead Electric Cooperative, Inc.

HELENA, MONT., July 12, 1950.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Western Montana council for CVA vigorously opposes abandonment of Havre-Shelby transmission line. The line is a vital link in providing service for northern Montana

ranches and towns and tends to prevent complete monopoly control of power resources of the State. Sincerely hope congressional action will not stop the completion of the line which is already under construction.

LEIF ERICKSON.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have another large batch of telegrams which I shall not ask to have printed in the RECORD, but I should like to have the names of the senders of the telegrams printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the names of the senders of the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hazel D. Pilgeram, secretary and treasurer, Armington Farmers Union, Belt, Mont.
A. L. Nicholls, Ulm, Mont.
Robert E. Brown, Butte, Mont.
Mr. and Mrs. Ralph E. Salisbury, Flowerre, Mont.
Ralph E. Clark, Shaw, Mont.
Mr. and Mrs. B. F. Cooper, Simms, Mont.
Missoula Electric Cooperative, Inc., Missoula, Mont.
Representative Walter Laas, Chester, Mont.
Liberty County Times, Chester, Mont.
Mary M. Condon, State superintendent of public instruction, Helena, Mont.
Darby O'Brien, Chester, Mont.
Charles C. Smith, president, Mussellshehl County Farmers Union, Roundup, Mont.
J. M. Glass, chairman of Farmers Union Local, Lewistown, Mont.
Don W. Chapman, Montana Farmers Union, Great Falls, Mont.
Claude M. Johnson, Stevensville, Mont.
Joe Hackett, Stevensville, Mont.
Sheridan County Farmers Union, Irvin V. Peterson, Plentywood, Mont.
R. J. Lewis, county chairman, Fergus County Farmers Union, Lewistown, Mont.
Representative Robert S. Cotton, Glasgow, Mont.
Richard Shipman, president, Montana MVA Association, Lewistown, Mont.
Cecil O. Burdick, Brady, Mont., chairman, Pondera Legislative Committee Farmers Union.
Pat C. Sullivan, secretary, Plumbers State Association, Butte, Mont.
Eddie J. Williams, secretary; Aaron R. Shull, assistant secretary, Montana Transmission Electric Cooperative, Inc., Lewistown, Mont.
Ted Skornogoski, legislative chairman, Daniels County Farmers Union, Scooby, Mont.
Charles A. Banderob, legislative chairman, Huntley Project Local, Huntley, Mont.
Fred C. Kuehne, Big Fork, Mont.
Mrs. Andrew Dahl, public relations director, Sheridan County Co-op., Inc., Plentywood, Mont.
J. Harry Wilson, Stanford, Mont.
William H. Sennett, manager, Park Electric Co-op, Livingston, Mont.
Andrew Dahl, State senator, Sheridan County, Plentywood, Mont.
Claude Hookham, president of Emigrant Farmers Union, Livingston, Mont.
Henry Marken, chairman, Swan River Farm Union, Bigfork, Mont.
Mr. and Mrs. Charles Mills, Inverness, Mont.
Bruce L. Packer, Inverness, Mont.
Mr. and Mrs. Edgar Lincoln, Rudyard, Mont.
Martha Packer, Havre, Mont.
Berger Johnson, Joplin, Mont.
Kenneth Bangs, Inverness, Mont.
Ben Shand, Cartersville Local Farmers Union, Cartersville, Mont.
F. J. Brietbach, legislative chairman, McCone County Farmers Union, Circle, Mont.
Mr. and Mrs. Emil Storvik, Mr. and Mrs. Bernhard Strovick, Mr. and Mrs. Howard Hall, Inverness, Mont.

Harry Soderberg, mayor, city of Havre, Mont., Havre, Mont.
Ole Wee Larslan, North Valley County, Glasgow, Mont.
State Senator David F. James, Joplin, Mont.
Devon Farmers Union, Devon, Mont.
John Evanko, junior secretary, Cascade County Trades and Labor Assembly, Great Falls, Mont.
F. L. Schnebly, president, Harold Thielman, secretary, Farmers Union, Local No. 181, Chester, Mont.
Ralph F. Cook, Belt, Mont.
Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Haltz, Floweree, Mont.
Bertha P. Maki, Great Falls, Mont.
Lee Roy Smith, Mrs. Audrey Smith, Harold Hardinger, Hazel G. Hardinger, Belt, Mont.
Harvey Talvi, secretary-treasurer, Willow Belt Farmers Union, Great Falls, Mont.
Leland S. Davis, Vaughn, Mont.
Harvey Talvi, Belt, Mont.
John Geikkila, Belt, Mont.
E. W. Chapman, president, Montana Farmers Union, Great Falls, Mont.
W. H. Oldenberg, manager, Lincoln Electric Cooperative, Eureka, Mont.
Ed Cozad, secretary-treasurer, Missoula County Central Trades & Labor Council, Missoula, Mont.
Mr. and Mrs. F. B. Potts, Missoula, Mont.
Mineral County Democratic Club, Superior, Mont.
Edwin Buck, Sr., Corvallis, Mont.
E. K. Babcock, Great Falls, Mont.
Lester Rutledge, Sandy, Mont.
Harmon E. Dickey, chairman, Buffalo Rapids Local Farmers' Union, Glendiv, Mont.
Anton B. Smale, chairman, Legislative Committee, Local No. 72, East Helena, Mont.
Robert C. Weller, secretary, Montana District Council, Lumber and Sawmill Workers' Union, Kalispell, Mont.
Arnold H. Olson, attorney general, Helena, Mont.
Ernest Salvas, president, Deer Lodge Miners Union, Local No. 834, IUMM&SW, Butte, Mont.
Hugh Adair, Helena, Mont.
John W. Swackhamer, Missoula, Mont.
Leo C. Graybill, speaker, Truman G. Bradford, mayor, Great Falls, Mont.
Resner Blikken, president, Montana State Rural Electric Co-op Association, Opheim, Mont.
Wesley W. Wertz, chairman, Democratic County Committee, Helena, Mont.
A. S. Lattin, secretary, Local No. 39, Fairfield, Mont.
Northern Electric Co-op, Inc.
William Mason, executive board member, District, No. 1, International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, Butte, Mont.
Shelby Chamber of Commerce, Fred Pfannsmith.
Miles Romney, Glen Varner, Curtis C. Cook, Gilbert Jellinek, Hamilton, Mont.
Grant Flange, Galata, Mont.
Union Elevator Co., Galata, Mont.
Peder Underdal, Galata, Mont.
Oli C. Brevik, Devon, Mont.
E. L. Nordberg, Whitehall, Mont.
Charles M. Curfman, Devon, Mont.
Henry Halverson, Devon, Mont.
Louis Kanning, Devon, Mont.
Peder Tuvdet, Devon, Mont.
Ote Simmerstad, Devon, Mont.
Raymond Zelenka, Devon, Mont.
Fred Finger, Devon, Mont.
A. L. Arsen, Devon, Mont.
Darwin Snuffer, Devon, Mont.
John Englund, Devon, Mont.
J. M. Larsen, Devon, Mont.
Nils I. Fredrickson, Devon, Mont.
Elmer C. Chilbers, Devon, Mont.
Quinten Larsen, Devon, Mont.
Bradford Skinner, Devon, Mont.
Clara G. Prestbye, secretary, Kalispell Farmers' Union, Local No. 153, Kalispell, Mont.
Edward Fenske, Whitefish, Mont.

Florence Slethaug, legislative chairman, Swan River Farmers' Union Local, Creston, Mont.

J. H. White, Devon, Mont.

Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Adamson, Devon, Mont.

Mrs. Gordon Twedt, secretary, Black Coulee Farmers' Union, Rudyard, Mont.

Emmers Berg, Berg Motors, Chester, Mont.

Hanson Electric, Cliff Hanson, Chester, Mont.

William Rambo, Hingham, Mont.

Erland L. Olson, Alberton, Mont.

Frank J. Lochdutton, Great Falls, Mont.

N. J. Dougherty, secretary-treasurer, Montana Farmers' Union, Jamestown, N. Dak.

Vigilante Electric Cooperatives, Dillon, Mont.

Riley W. Childress, Galata, Mont.

Flora E. Wright, Silver Star, Mont.

Ole Sanvik, Kalispell, Mont.

L. J. Schaefer, Chester, Mont.

John Swank, Chester, Mont.

Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Sathre, Mr. and Mrs. Guy Nelson, Havre, Mont.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I think we have all received hundreds of telegrams with reference to this item in the bill. I wonder if the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and my colleague from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would like to hear a telegram which I received from Livingston, Mont. The Senator from North Dakota mentioned a long list of persons and read a very long telegram. I also have a telegram from Livingston, Mont, which I think will explain why so many telegrams were sent with reference to this particular line. The telegram is dated July 12, 1950, and reads as follows:

LIVINGSTON, MONT., July 12, 1950.

HON. ZALES N. ECTON,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Impelled by MVA and western council of CVA broadcasts am wiring you urging that you continue to back action of Appropriations Committee and the standing taken by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers as well as CIO in cutting appropriations for Havre-Shelby line and Canyon Ferry-Great Falls line, which would only be duplicating existing lines at expense of taxpayers and throwing Government into competition with free enterprise. Labor eagerly watching this in Montana.

WILBUR M. RANEY,

Business Manager,

Local Union No. 341, IBEW.

Mr. President, that explains why there has been an avalanche of telegrams sent here to Senators representing other States, with reference to this line.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. For what purpose?

Mr. MALONE. For a statement.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Nevada to make a statement without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

IMPORTANCE OF REORGANIZATION IN WINNING THE WAR

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, we are committed to the Korean war, and we shall all make any sacrifice to win that war. That does not, however, take one iota from the stigma of the stupidity on

the part of our officials who made it necessary for us to get into this predicament.

The President has asked for \$10,-000,000,000 as a starter. We will ask the taxpayers for that amount, but no one is naive enough to believe it is the final cost. We still have no definite foreign policy. We will, I hope, scrutinize very carefully any blanket authority since he has shown little judgment in past performances in such matters.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada in an address delivered on this floor on March 4-5, 1948, said:

PEACE AND SAFETY OF THE UNITED STATES

1. The peace and safety of this Nation is seriously threatened, through the complete absence of a definite foreign policy, telling our own people and the nations of the world what we consider will threaten our ultimate peace and safety, and the complete absence of a military organization spearheaded by an air corps to enforce our pronouncement.

2. The basic subject of foreign policy has never been discussed with the American people, through two world wars, and now the Marshall plan is in the same category. The basic subject at issue (as it was in 1823 when the Monroe Doctrine was established to protect South America and the Western Hemisphere from encroachment from the European empire-minded nations) is what areas—and naming the nations in the European and Middle East countries, including Asia and the South Seas—is it necessary for us to currently protect for our own ultimate safety? Until this decision is made no plan to make it effective can be intelligently discussed.

I challenge the State Department to name the nations of the 46 member countries of the United Nations Organization, whose integrity we must currently protect for our own ultimate safety, to tell the world and the American people the truth, so that any empire-minded nations may be apprised of our intentions and thus avoid what could well develop into a third devastating world war, and that our own people may prepare for their own defense, through rebuilding our military organization spearheaded by an air corps that could keep any other nation on the ground in the event of war.

HUNGRY PEOPLE—COMMUNISM—REHABILITATION OF INDUSTRY

3. It is impossible to consider the feeding of hungry people—the stopping of communism—and the rehabilitation of industry as one subject. We only confuse ourselves.

As a result we mix our emotions with the facts and become unwilling victims of the greatest propaganda machine ever established in Washington; let us take them one at a time:

(a) Feeding emergency hungry people of Europe or of any other area is a matter of charity and must be so considered apart from other considerations. The Congress of the United States has appropriated nearly \$1,500,-000,000 during the last 12 months for that purpose alone, and has appropriated \$24,000,-000,000 and handed it to the nations of the world without hope of repayment since the close of World War II in 1945.

The December 1946 appropriation of \$597,-000,000 is expected to last into March of this year; and the Congress is ready to consider further reasonable gifts for food, until Europe completes its third crop, to the extent that our own resources will withstand the impact without further inflation.

(b) Stopping communism through protecting the integrity of the nations of the world that we decide, after full discussion and study, we must currently protect for our own ultimate safety, is a matter of our own

integrity and frankness with our own citizens—and with the nations of the world.

If we should decide, after full consideration of our experience through two world wars—and our improved methods of defense and offense—that a threat to the integrity of any member nation of the United Nations Organization, by any other nation would constitute a threat to our ultimate safety—then President Monroe's exact words could be utilized in announcing an extension of the established Monroe Doctrine, leaving out any reference to the Western Hemisphere, and say, in effect, to the world and to the American people that:

"We owe it therefore to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system, as dangerous to our peace and safety."

We should then build at once a military force, spearheaded by an Air Corps that would bear silent evidence to all concerned that we were ready and able to enforce the extended doctrine, just as we have enforced the original Monroe Doctrine covering the Western Hemisphere for more than 125 years, and which kept us out of a major war for more than 75 years.

The Congressional Air Policy Board has recommended a long-range military plane purchase program, which would provide a 35,000-plane striking force costing \$16,800,-000,000 over a 5-year program. The President's Air Policy Board's recent report closely parallels this document.

The Armed Services Committees of Congress should immediately check these reports and if found correct recommend their adoption and the appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress of the United States for the entire 5-year program.

Congress could apply the Marshall plan 4-year funds of \$17,000,000,000 to the \$16,-800,000,000 5-year plane purchase program and have approximately enough left to continue the necessary European nations' feeding program until they raise a third crop and to furnish the necessary funds to the RFC or the World Bank for the rehabilitation of the European nations' industry under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation rules, as applied to American citizens.

(c) The rehabilitation of the industries of the 16 Marshall plan European countries, entirely separate from feeding hungry people, can then be accomplished as a purely business transaction in the same manner as such industrial plants were financed in this country by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation during depression and World War II years.

A reasonable amount of money, say \$1,-000,000,000, could be appropriated and made available to the RFC or to the World Bank for that specific purpose, simply providing that the RFC rules and regulations be applied to any foreign-business loans.

Their rules provide for an investigation of the feasibility of such an industry by an experienced investigator in the respective field, with an estimate of cost, together with a list of the needed machinery and supplies. They further provide for a lien or mortgage to be taken on such equipment—the stock or shares of the existing organization to be hypothecated as additional security for such loan, and then the signature of the applicant is required.

It will prove a pleasant surprise to both the Congress and to the State Department the relatively small amount of funds that the European nations will require for industrial plant refinancing, if such loans must be secured on a business basis.

4. The entire thesis and point of my argument is that the feeding of hungry people, whether located in this or any other nation—the international policy of protecting the

othy Thompson, which appeared in the Evening Star on July 17. It says in part:

President Truman has decisively committed himself and ourselves to something undecided. We are not, he says, at war. But Americans in Korea may reasonably wish to know when shooting is not shooting, and when war is not war.

And perhaps the President, whose international acrobatics are astounding, may be able to tell us the objective of this shooting that is not war.

The aim, we are told, is to deter aggressors and reestablish the status quo. Since United Nations exhortation has failed to deter, we are now out to destroy—just what ultimate forces is not clear.

Yet we are committed in principle to the unification of Korea. Our object is merely to prove (by force of arms) that unification may not be accomplished by force of arms.

I submit that the nightmare world in which we live is the direct result of fighting a world war for no comprehensible objective. Some of these leaders today are the same persons who got us into this mess and who now ask us to trust them not to get us into another.

By another of his remarkable somersaults, the President has reversed his recent opinion and decided to defend Formosa. But he has forbidden the Chinese Nationalists in Formosa to continue fighting Chinese Communists on the mainland. Thus communism in Korea is apparently sinful, but communism in China is legitimate.

As a direct result, according to what I have just read into the RECORD, the President's order stopping the nationalist government from attacking shipping on the Communist China coast has cleared the way for England's shipping to continue carrying war supplies into the Communist China area, which are immediately available to North Korea to be used against American troops.

I quote again from the column of Miss Thompson:

It would really be a brilliant Russian move to order the North Korean armies to return to the thirty-eighth parallel in exchange for moving Red China into the Security Council—relinquishing the invasion of South Korea for another invasion of New York.

STRATEGY OF RUSSIANS—ADMIT COMMUNIST CHINA TO UNITED NATIONS

Mr. President, that is exactly what the junior Senator from Nevada thinks they are doing. In other words, the note to Mr. Nehru, of India, simply says that before they would discuss ending the war in Korea, we must admit Communist China to the United Nations.

We have in a grandiose manner refused to do that, which I think is highly proper, but at the same time and out of the same mouth comes the statement from the Secretary of State that we will not oppose the Communists becoming members of the United Nations and displacing Nationalist China.

That opens the way for us to recognize Communist China, by the same excuse, through the back door, a little later.

ACHESON COMMITTED US TO RECOGNIZE RED CHINA

Mr. President, I wish to repeat what I said on the Senate floor in September of last year, 1949, when England, Canada, and the United States were meeting here in their great conference. The confer-

ence to divert public attention from the most important debate in a century—extending the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. It is my humble opinion that at that moment we agreed to recognize Communist China and follow England and India into that recognition.

Mr. President, the State Department has not given up this idea of recognizing Communist China. It simply does not tell the American people the truth. It does things through the back door which it does not openly deny, and puts out tons of propaganda every day, camouflaging its actions.

STUPID HANDLING OF EVENTS LEADING TO THE KOREAN MENACE

Mr. President, the stupid handling of the Korean situation, culminating in the North Korean thrust, is but another instance proving the unfitness of Mr. Acheson for his high position. His administration has been wholly unsatisfactory and should be renovated from top to bottom.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I yielded a while ago to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] under a unanimous-consent agreement that I not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Montana that he was not then in the chair, and did not know of the arrangement.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what is the situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The arrangement was that the Senator from Montana would yield to the Senator from Nevada without losing his right to the floor.

QUESTIONS ON THE KOREAN CRISIS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me for a brief statement and a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that the Senator will not lose the floor?

Mr. ECTON. I yield with that understanding, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Montana yields to the Senator from New Jersey, without losing the floor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, confronted as we are with a war crisis in the Far East and perhaps disaster elsewhere in the world, as emphasized by the President's message of today, it is incumbent upon all of us to do a little soul-searching to ascertain the truth in respect to both the causes and effects of our dilemma.

I hold before me a brief article entitled "Korea" in which eight very pertinent questions are asked, and because I think it would serve a good purpose for every Member of the Senate to read these questions and endeavor to find the answers, I ask unanimous consent that this article be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREA

Why did Intelligence fail? If it did not fail, why were we not ready?

Why a handful of untrained youngsters on the front line?

Why are our tanks inferior to the Russian?

Why are we using our old-style recoilless weapon and bazooka?

Why do we not have a good supply of heavy artillery?

Why the lack of combat planes of the right type, both old and new style?

Why are we without unit task forces of landing craft and surface ships?

Why did we not have a completely equipped, balanced fighting force in Japan ready for instant use?

The American people after two generations of failure can no longer accept military incompetence in the field of preparation and readiness. The disgrace of Korea following the submarine disasters and fiascos of the First World War, the submarines again in the Second World War, Pearl Harbor, Bataan, Corregidor, is more than the public can bear. We have spent untold billions during the recent war and since—far more than would have been necessary to have had a relatively small number of highly trained men with the world's latest and most effective weapons ready for instant use anywhere.

These questions must be answered.

Mr. HENRICKSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana for his courtesy.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3809) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949.

The message also announce that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7477) providing for the conveyance to the town of Nahant, Mass., of the Fort Belknap Military Reservation.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I believe all of us who are Members of the Senate and work on committees usually look over very carefully the reports on all bills submitted to the committees from the various departments of the Government. I know I do, and I know the other members of committees on which I am placed do the same. We hardly ever pass a bill in the Senate without having received a favorable report from one of the governmental departments concerned. It seems to me that when the Congress passes a bill, and specific instructions respecting the bill appear in the committee report and in the debates in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the department concerned should read the report of the committees and the debates in Congress before it proceeds to act.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for mapping out and defining a power policy which seemed to be fair and which seemed to be workable a year ago. The instructions in the report and as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were explicit when the appropriation measure was passed by Congress a year ago.

Had the Bureau of Reclamation looked over the report and read the colloquys which took place between Senators on the floor of the Senate before they let the contract, we would not be here debating this question this afternoon. From all appearances the Bureau of Reclamation was a little overanxious to proceed, enter into a contract and get things moving irrespective of the instructions specifically set forth in the report and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a year ago which were set aside.

Mr. President, I should like to relate in chronological order a few of the things that happened in respect to the Havre-Shelby line. Before I proceed further let me say that if I thought one single farmer in Montana would be deprived of obtaining electricity on his farm by virtue of discontinuing this line at this time, I certainly would vote against the committee's proposal. But I am thoroughly convinced that no farmer in Montana is going to be deprived of electricity by curtailing this line at this time, and that the farmers are going to receive electricity just as cheaply, whether the line is built or whether it is not. I hope to be able to prove that in a few minutes.

I have always been interested in REA. I have done everything I could to assure the farmers of the Nation that they would have electricity on their farms as soon as it was possible for them to get it. I have worked diligently during the last 3 years to get the rates lowered to the REA co-ops in the State of Montana. That objective has now been attained. I certainly would not want to deprive any farm or any farmer from receiving that service at the lowest possible rate.

It will be recalled, Mr. President, that on May 26, 1948, the House committee report on the Interior Department bill for the fiscal year 1949 disallowed a request for the \$1,035,000 for construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations, and further rescinded a carry-over of funds of \$560,197 which had been appropriated the previous year for the line. Congress in passing the Interior Department's appropriation bill sustained that position.

Then on March 28, 1949, the House committee disallowed \$1,300,000 requested for initiating construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line, and initiating construction of the Havre-Shelby and Rudyard substations.

On July 13, 1949, the Senate Appropriations Committee reported the Interior Department appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1950, and in that bill the \$1,300,000 disallowed by the House was not restored.

We must remember, Mr. President, that there was no appropriation by the House last year for this line. When it was considered by the Appropriations

Committee of the Senate that committee still turned it down. But it was put in the bill on the Senate floor a year ago, with instructions which were placed in the RECORD by the distinguished and able Senator from Arizona that it was to be used as a bargaining power primarily between the Reclamation Bureau and the power companies for wheeling agreements to get service to REA's and to the farmers at the lowest possible figure.

After the House refused to place the item in the bill last year, after the Senate Appropriations Committee refused to consider it, it was added to the bill on the floor of the Senate and the conference committee agreed to it.

On August 25, 1949, when the bill was before the Senate for consideration, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] on the floor of the Senate stated:

I suggest to them that the Senate disagree to the Senate amendment (regarding the Anderson Ranch Dam—Mountain Home transmission line in Idaho), with the understanding that the Bureau of Reclamation will do as we have instructed it to do, both with respect to Southwestern Power Administration and Montana Power, that is, seek to enter into negotiations with the Idaho Power Co. with respect to the transmission of this power.

Mr. President, what the Senator from Arizona intended and what the Senate voted at that particular time is as plain as the nose on one's face.

The bill was passed on October 12, 1949, after the Senate had restored funds for the Havre-Shelby transmission line, with the understanding that the funds would not be used if a wheeling contract could be arranged for transmission of power to the REA cooperatives in that area. This question is important, because I believe it was stated here in the Senate this afternoon that the power company did not offer to make wheeling agreements. According to my understanding, however, on October 13, 1949, the Montana Power Co. notified the Bureau of Reclamation that the company was willing to negotiate a wheeling agreement to serve the REA cooperatives in the Havre-Shelby area.

On November 1, 1949, the Bureau of Reclamation announced a call for bids on the Havre-Shelby transmission line. Many persons in that area did not even know that negotiations were going on, until they saw the announcement in the newspaper.

On November 15, the Bureau of Reclamation announced a call for bids on substations at Havre, Shelby, and Rudyard.

On December 6, 1949, the Bureau of Reclamation received bids on the Havre-Shelby transmission line.

So, Mr. President, we see that on August 25 the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] made his statement, and on October 13 the company offered to negotiate for wheeling agreements, and on December 6 the Bureau of Reclamation received bids for the line.

On December 30, the Bureau of Reclamation approved a contract for construction of the Havre-Shelby line.

On February 20, 1950, representatives of the Montana Power Co. and the Bureau of Reclamation conferred in Butte, regarding negotiations for a

wheeling agreement. I understand that at that meeting the Havre-Shelby line was discussed.

Sometime in March, the Bureau of Reclamation received bids for a substation near Havre.

On March 18, 1950, the Montana Power Co. executed with the Bonneville Power Administration a contract under which the company will purchase up to 50,000 kilowatts of power from the Hungry Horse Dam, and under which the company will serve REA electric cooperatives in western Montana for the Bonneville Power Administration.

The Bonneville Power Administration read the instructions and the statement of the congressional intent. The Bonneville Power Administration was not in a big hurry to build the line merely because it had the money with which to build it. On the contrary, the Bonneville Power Administration negotiated and entered into an agreement with the Montana Power Co., as was intended by the Senate when the appropriation bill containing provision for these lines was passed.

On March 20, 1950, representatives of the Montana Power Co. and the Bureau of Reclamation held a meeting at Billings, Mont., regarding negotiations for a wheeling agreement. That was on March 20, after bids for the line had been received.

On March 22, the contractor was directed by the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with construction of the Havre-Shelby line as soon as conditions permit.

It was plainly evident then that there would be no possibility of entering into a wheeling agreement. Just 20 days elapsed—including 3 Sundays—between March 22 and April 12, when the Montana Power Co. adopted a new rate of schedule for service to REA cooperatives in Montana, east of the Continental Divide. When that was done, it became unnecessary to enter with the Bureau of Reclamation into a wheeling agreement to give the service at the lowest possible rate to the REA cooperatives and to the farmers in northern Montana. The schedule reduced the average rate to 5½ mills per kilowatt-hour, which is identical with the rate of the Bureau of Reclamation for Missouri Basin power.

Mr. President, I am not defending the Montana Power Co. A company which can negotiate a satisfactory agreement with the Bonneville Power Administration, and a company which has reduced its rate to such an extent that it is equal to the Government rate, I submit does not need any defense; it has put up its own defense.

However, perhaps the public power trust needs a little condemnation when a private company which pays taxes, builds its own lines, and gives a satisfactorily low rate to its customers.

Mr. President, we have heard talk about monopoly and about the possibility that the company will have a monopoly of power. We become unduly excited about the possibility that a power company will obtain a monopoly. In my State, for instance, we have a public service commission, composed of three members who are elected directly by the

people of the State. That commission passes on the public utility rates, and sees to it that the people receive a just deal. If the people do not like what the commission does, all the people have to do is to change the membership of the commission at the next election—as is done in our representative government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the able Senator from Montana yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. ECTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not sometimes true that the so-called public utilities commissions are controlled by the power companies which they are supposed to regulate, so that those regulated actually become the regulators?

Mr. ECTON. Inasmuch as the members of the commission are elected, I do not see how they are controlled in the way the Senator has suggested, any more than any other elected officials are controlled. If the argument of the Senator were to hold, then it might be said that the Members of Congress are controlled because they are elected by the people.

Mr. President, there are three members of the public utilities commission. They are elected by the people. Certainly the people have a chance to catch up with them at some time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. For what length of time are the members of the Montana Public Utilities Commission elected?

Mr. ECTON. They are elected for a term of 6 years. However, they alternate in service; every 2 years the term of one member of the commission expires, and an election for that position on the commission must be held.

Mr. LANGER. So if the people did not like what one of the commissioners did, 2 years later the people would have a chance to elect someone else; and at the end of 6 years thereafter the people would have had a chance to elect an entirely new commission. So it would be 8 years before the people could change the entire membership of the commission, in view of the fact that at 2-year intervals an election is held to fill one or another of the positions on the commission.

Mr. ECTON. Of course, Mr. President, if the members of the commission were appointed, there might be some excuse for a charge that the members of the Commission are controlled by the companies they are supposed to regulate. However, when the people elect the members of the commission directly, there is no excuse for such a charge.

All three members of the Montana Public Utilities Commission are Democrats, and I do not think anyone controls them.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator think they should be condemned ipso facto because they are Democrats?

Mr. ECTON. No. I think they are good Democrats.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Montana for

the tribute he has paid to the Democratic Party in his State.

Mr. ECTON. I wish to say to the Senator that I was a member of the Montana legislature for many years, and I always got along very well with the upright and honorable Democrats.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me inquire whether they were formerly Republicans, and later became Democrats.

Mr. ECTON. Some of them may have flopped over, away back sometime. I do not know, and I cannot vouch for that.

So on April 12, the Montana Power Co. adopted a new rate schedule for the service to REA co-ops in Montana, east of the Continental Divide. As I stated, this schedule reduced the rate to the identical rate charged by the Bureau of Reclamation for the Missouri Basin power accounts. So no one in that vicinity can gain anything by buying Government power. It is impossible to get it any cheaper than the price at which it can be bought directly from the private company. I admit that some of the people think they prefer to deal with the Government. They prefer to get their electricity from the Government line rather than from a private line. Such an attitude, perhaps, may be compared to that of an individual who wanted to go to San Francisco, but would not get on a train because the Government did not own it. There would be just as much sense in that. In other words, if a person needs something and can get it just as cheaply from a private company, why demand that the Government own it instead of someone else?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ECTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Twice the distinguished Senator has stated that it would be possible to get a rate of 5.5 mills.

Mr. ECTON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator not know that in the Missouri Basin the Montana and the Dakota utility companies buy all the power they furnish, at that rate, but that at the place where they sell electricity, where there is no REA line, they get 2 for 1? I want to ask the Senator whether that is not true in the State of Montana, the same as it is in North Dakota.

Mr. ECTON. No, not under the Bureau of Reclamation, not in the Missouri Basin, and not in the case of the Montana Power Co.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ECTON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. It is true in the Missouri Basin, in North Dakota.

Mr. ECTON. But it is not true in Montana.

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator certain of that?

Mr. ECTON. Yes. I have the contract here, if the Senator would be interested in it. The Montana Power Co. takes only the excess electricity from Fort Peck, which the Government does not use to supply its preferred customers. The power company purchases it at a certain rate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. If the Montana utilities companies get their power from Fort Peck, they have to get it over a line which is 200 miles long, and yet, for every single kilowatt hour furnished them, the price could be doubled somewhere else, could it not? They keep track of the number of kilowatt-hours. I cannot believe that the situation in Montana is any different from what it is in North Dakota.

Mr. ECTON. I might give the Senator an idea of what the Montana contract provided. There has been a contract since July 1, 1943, under which the Montana Power Co. buys from the Fort Peck project all the power which is available, after supplying firm requirements of the Fort Peck project, and that can be used by the company itself, or by any other companies with which it is interconnected.

Mr. LANGER. What does the power company pay for it?

Mr. ECTON. I do not know what is paid for it, but that makes no difference.

Mr. LANGER. At what price does the power company sell it?

Mr. ECTON. In the last 5 years, I may say to the Senator, the company has paid the Government \$1,814,670 for this power, and the amount of the payments has risen steadily from year to year. In 1945 the Government received \$219,951; in 1946, \$229,462; in 1947, \$321,283; in 1948, \$472,254; and in 1949, \$571,720. So the Senator will see that in a period of 5 years it has more than doubled.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Of course that was due to the fact that REA was extended in those localities and used more power.

Mr. ECTON. Let me say that the Senator is talking about a Government power line, which pays no taxes to the State, county, or city in which it operates. The Montana Power Co., last year, distributed through 40 counties of the State of Montana \$2,044,087.89 in property taxes. That was a part of the \$6,140,823 which was its total tax bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator does not want to tell the Senate, does he, that the \$2,000,000-plus which was paid in taxes was not added to the bill of the consumers?

Mr. ECTON. I may say to the Senator that when it is known that the State of Montana has as low a rate as any of the other 17 western reclamation States, I do not think we need worry about how much the companies make.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I return to my question whether it is not true that, in some other places where there is no competition, the private companies make good this so-called cheap rate—and it is a cheap rate—by charging two for one?

Mr. ECTON. In the suit of clothes which the Senator is wearing, a great many taxes are tied up. Does the Senator advocate that the Government should

make his clothes, so that he would not have to pay taxes?

Mr. LANGER. Oh, no.

Mr. ECTON. The proposition is the same.

Mr. LANGER. There is no analogy.

Mr. ECTON. Oh, yes, there is. It is the same thing. The private-business enterprise pays taxes. When the Government goes into business, it operates tax-free. My point is that, if the State and counties of Montana had to lose \$2,044,087, and the National Government had to lose the difference between that sum and \$6,140,000, the Senator's taxes and mine would be that much higher.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the Government has built the dam at Fort Peck at its own expense?

Mr. ECTON. Yes. That is all right; I do not object.

Mr. LANGER. Why should the Montana Power Co. or any other power company buy that power, getting it from a dam built by the people, and sell it at a profit to farmers and others who pay taxes?

Mr. ECTON. I do not know whether it is sold at a profit. If the Government does not make a profit at 5.5 mills, I do not see how it can be argued that the company makes a profit.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator maintain that, if the Government pays \$100,000,000 to build a dam, it would not be appropriate for the Government to spend an additional \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 to build a transmission line for the purpose of delivering the power to the farmer at cost?

Mr. ECTON. No, the Government is getting entirely out of its sphere and beyond its prerogative. I believe the Government should do only those things which individuals or private companies are not able to do. Let the Government build the dams, and then let private companies distribute the power and give the service, and pay the taxes. We must have taxes from some source.

Mr. LANGER. If I correctly understand the Senator, he believes in the people furnishing the money to create the power, but when it comes to distributing the power, we should let private concerns distribute it at a profit.

Mr. ECTON. Why not? If we find they are making too much money, let us tax them further. If we do not get taxes from them, where are we to get them? Are we merely to appropriate the money? Is that the way to get them?

Mr. LANGER. I submit that when the Government builds a dam and creates power and the farmers and businessmen pay the entire cost of the project, they certainly should get the power distributed to them at cost.

Mr. ECTON. They are getting it distributed to them at cost. It costs the Government 5½ mills now, and the power is going to be distributed at the rate of 5½ mills by a private company which will build its own line. Why pay for a Government line?

Mr. LANGER. How much does the Montana Power Co. pay the Government to get the power at Fort Peck?

Mr. ECTON. Since it is not firm power, I imagine it gets the power for approximately 2½ mills.

Mr. LANGER. They charge the farmers twice as much as they pay for it at Fort Peck.

Mr. ECTON. No. They do not get firm power; they get surplus power. They get the extra power which the Government does not need at Fort Peck.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Could not the Government give the surplus power directly to the farmers at the rate of 2½ mills per kilowatt?

Mr. ECTON. I do not know. Maybe we shall reach the point where we will give it to them for nothing.

I shall not take much more of the time of the Senate, Mr. President—

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is amazing to someone from New England to hear the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Montana arguing over whether 5½-mill power is too high. If they lived in New England or in the State of New York, where the minimum price is at least twice 5½ mills, they might better realize the value of competition in the power industry.

Mr. ECTON. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Whether the power comes from public or private sources, both Senators are very fortunate to be even able to talk about 5½-mill power.

Mr. ECTON. I think so, too, because I know many people have to pay 20 cents and other people complain about 5½ mills. What do they want? Shall we hand it to them on a silver platter?

On April 20, 1950, J. E. Corette, Jr., testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations, explaining the 5.5-mill rate available to REA cooperatives, pointing out that capacity has been doubled on company transmission lines serving the Hill County REA and reiterating the company offer to double capacity to the Marias REA.

This should eliminate any argument that the cooperatives cannot have all the electricity they want.

Up to April 20, the same date on which Mr. Corette, vice president of the Montana Power Co., appeared before the committee, I understand no work had been done on the Havre-Shelby line, except that some of the right-of-way had been purchased and some easements had been filed.

During Mr. Corette's testimony before the Senate subcommittee H. F. McPhail, of the Bureau of Reclamation, stated the situation. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] asked:

What is the status of that line?

Mr. McPhail replied:

The status of that line is that the contract has been let. The contractor has been ac-

cumulating his materials. * * * The actual notice to proceed was not given until the weather conditions had approached a condition where the contractor could actually get to work in the field.

On May 19, 1950, Harold E. Aldrich, acting manager of the Bureau of Reclamation, upper Missouri district, announced that the Smith Construction Co. had started work on the Havre-Shelby line in April and that it expected to complete its part of the work by September 6.

Aldrich said contracts for substations at Shelby and Rudyard were still to be awarded and that bids were expected in July.

So, Mr. President, every effort was made to shove this contract along and get it underway, even after it was known that the rate had been reduced to the Government rate and there was a possibility of serving the cooperatives at the lowest possible rate the Government could offer. The Senate's policy that no money should be spent for Federal transmission lines if arrangements could be made to get the power to the people was reaffirmed last April during the hearings.

On April 20 Mr. Corette, vice president of the Montana Power Co., stated:

Money was appropriated for the Havre-Shelby line last year. We thought it was with the definite understanding in light of your statement, Senator HAYDEN, that it would not be spent if a wheeling agreement could be made and these REA's could be supplied at the Bureau of Reclamation rate.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] replied:

That was my understanding.

Mr. Corette then said:

But in December we read in the paper that a contract had been let for the transmission lines and we now read that a contract has been let for some of the substations.

The Senator from Arizona asked Mr. McPhail, of the Bureau of Reclamation, this question:

What is the necessity for the Havre-Shelby line under these circumstances?

Mr. McPhail replied:

Unquestionably, the necessity would be reduced to some extent. However, I don't know what the reaction of the REA's that are directly affected may be. We have heard no word from them since this rate announcement. So I have not had any idea as to what the local reaction might be.

Mr. President, that is from the Senate subcommittee hearings, part I, page 1416.

Mr. President, I again submit that if the Bureau of Reclamation had read the report and what took place on the floor of the Senate as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD all this confusion might have been eliminated.

Up to this time the Montana Power Co. has offered to take all the materials which have been placed in the project off the hands of the Government at cost, so the Government will not lose any money.

Mr. President, I have a few telegrams which I have received from labor unions. There are many labor unions in Montana which have been much concerned over the building of this particular line. As

early as last December they read in the newspapers that the Bureau was contemplating letting the contract, and after the contract has been let I received communications from labor unions in Montana protesting the letting of the contract on the ground that it was unfair to organized labor in the State.

I ask unanimous consent to insert these telegrams in the RECORD. They come from labor unions in Montana. I ask that they be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ECTON. In that connection I ask unanimous consent that the policy as set forth by D. W. Tracy, international president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. ECTON. Also, Mr. President, I ask that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a news release issued by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, dated May 25, 1950, in substantiation of the statement made by their president, Mr. Tracy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona for his untiring efforts to live up to the policy which was clearly stated last year on the floor of the Senate. I believe that the recommendations of the Senate committee should be sustained.

EXHIBIT 1

GREAT FALLS, July 12, 1950.

Hon. Z. N. ECTON,
Washington, D. C.:

Local 122, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, vigorously protest the allotment of any funds for the construction of the Havre-Shelby power line.

R. C. STANICH,
Secretary.

LEWISTOWN, MONT., July 12, 1950.

Senator ZALES ECTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We feel that the Havre-Shelby area is now adequately served by the Montana Power Co. We urge you to oppose restoration of funds for construction of the Havre-Shelby electric power transmission line. Stand behind Senate appropriation committee decision.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL NO. 552,
By A. D. EDWARDS.

MISSOULA, MONT., July 12, 1950.

Senator ZALES ECTON,
Washington, D. C.:

The Montana State Council of Electrical Workers composed of the 17 Montana IBEW unions have instructed this office to vigorously protest any appropriation of funds for the construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line under the present circumstances. The contract has been let to the Smith High-Line Construction Co., of Tennessee, notoriously unfair to organized or

unorganized labor. His methods of operation are to the utter detriment of Montana labor; that this contractor has no intention of hiring Montana labor is shown by the thirty-odd Negroes imported from Tennessee that are at present at the site of the job. This has forced our electricians to seek employment outside of the State of Montana in Idaho and Washington where conditions like those in Montana are not tolerated. We are aware of the Davis-Bacon Act but due to the fact that classifications are not included in this act the contractor will not hire our skilled craftsmen.

The Montana State Council of Electrical Workers has no desire to impede progress but if Government power projects are to be built and maintained on cheap and unfair labor as proposed in this case of what benefit is this to the workmen of Montana; the present Montana utilities use Montana labor; pay a fair living wage, and sign and maintain the provisions of work to the mutual benefit of utilities and Montana labor.

If you are friends of organized labor you will do all in your power to prevent this appropriation and help your Montana citizens maintain their standard of living.

MONTANA STATE COUNCIL OF
ELECTRICAL WORKERS,
GEORGE W. SCOTT,
Secretary-Treasurer.

HAVRE, MONT., July 13, 1950.

Hon. ZALES N. ECTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We don't need duplication of power lines. Public power advocates are throwing away the taxpayers' money. Support the Senate Appropriation Committee's decision to refuse funds for the Havre-Shelby line.

H. EARL CLACK Co.,
L. B. WIGMORE, Sales Manager.

HAVRE, MONT., July 13, 1950.

Hon. ZALES N. ECTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please use your influence and position to see that funds for unneeded transmission lines such as the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls and the Havre-Shelby line be denied.

RUNKEL BROS.

EXHIBIT 2

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
ELECTRICAL WORKERS,
Washington, D. C., March 27, 1950.

Mr. WILLIAM C. WISE,
Acting Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WISE: I am hereby entering an urgent protest on behalf of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL) against the latest developments in the anti-union policy of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL) which represents more than 75 percent of the unionized workers in the electric light and power industry, both private and public, has been shocked and surprised at the antilabor actions of the Rural Electrification Administration. These actions are all the more grievous because they strike at organized labor which participated in the effort to bring the Rural Electrification Administration into existence. Labor was a staunch supporter of the proposal to establish the Rural Electrification Administration because it believed that the Administration as originally set up would function in the public interest. We now find that the Rural Electrification Administration has taken such a narrow and backward view of its responsibilities and duties that it is bringing serious harm to the im-

portant section of the public interest represented by labor.

On December 17, 1949, an international representative of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL) wrote the Montana State Water Conservation Board a letter setting forth the facts that the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL) had entered into bona fide collective bargaining agreements with seven Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives in Montana and such agreements included a clause guaranteeing that work let by contract would be performed under International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL) union conditions. The international representative of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL) suggested to the Montana State Water Conservation Board that it would be in the interest of preventing confusion if the proper authorities would notify contractors that the cooperatives are under union agreement when the invitation to bid is sent out. This letter was forwarded by the State water conservation board to the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington for comment. On March 6, 1950, you, as Acting Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, replied to the State Water Conservation Board of Montana and forwarded a copy of your letter to me in my capacity of international president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL).

Your letter pays lip service to the maintenance of a policy of good labor relations and concedes the legality of the union clause in REA cooperatives bargaining agreements. You then go on to throw the entire weight of the administrative discretion of the Rural Electrification Administration against the actual operation of the union clause. You say:

"While, as I stated, it is satisfactory to the REA for its borrowers to include any legal provision in the construction contract relating to labor problems, it should be pointed out that any provision in a contract which has the effect of preventing free competitive bidding may well result in a cost of construction to the borrower which will make it impossible for us to approve the award of the bid, due to the effect of high cost upon the feasibility of our loan. We, of course, have to scrutinize all awards most carefully to make certain that the cost of construction will not be so excessive as to endanger the repayment of a loan. This is especially true in areas in which the Montana borrowers operate, where the consumer density is low, and all possible savings have to be effected in order to make the project feasible from a financial standpoint. It should be pointed out that we cannot approve awards of a bid in the event that the number of bidders is so low as to not constitute true competitive bidding. The possibility of this danger always exists whenever any kind of restrictive provisions are inserted in the construction contract."

The REA policy, as stated in your letter, is in complete contradiction of the policy of promoting and advancing labor standards through union agreements. Your emphasis on the matter of "high cost" as a reason for opposing labor standards established by union agreements and in favoring lower wages paid by nonunion contractors, is a throw-back to the days of the "sweat shop" employer who justified his position on the ground that he sold his products to the consumer at a cost lower than the cost of legitimate union employers. The REA is not advancing sound public policy when it seeks to develop a financial record for itself at the expense of the men and women whose work is essential to the bringing of electricity to the farms.

I am in complete accord with all efforts to secure a sound and economic expenditure of Government funds which are drawn from

the taxes paid by all parts of the population, including labor. I would respectfully recommend, however, that the REA would do better, if it were to begin to apply itself to the task of increasing efficiency in the management of cooperatives and reducing its own high administrative expenses rather than to continue its present policy of destroying union conditions of labor. In this connection, I have noted with interest the report of the House Committee on Appropriations in explanation of the appropriation bill for the several branches of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951. (81st Cong. 2nd Sess. Report No. 17973, p. 140). The Committee approved a total of \$8,150,000 for the administrative expenses of the Rural Electrification Administration during 1951. No criticism was offered in the report with respect to wages paid to the working men and women who perform useful services for the cooperatives and their members. The committee, however, did criticize the Rural Electrification Administration and its officers for exorbitant fee paid for engineering and legal work. The committee stated as follows:

"In the opinion of the committee (House Appropriations Committee), [fees paid for engineering and legal work in connection with the larger loans are too high]. It is believed that such fees should not be established strictly on a percentage basis but maximum limits should be fixed which would in the cases pointed out to the committee [reduce the fees paid substantially. These costs are passed on to the consumer.]" (Matter in brackets supplied.) (A reference is made on p. 1036 of the Hearings of the House Committee on Appropriations to an appendix including information requested on the above subject by the committee. The note in the hearings states that the appendix may be found at the end of the hearings but it appears that the appendix is not available.)

It is apparently a fact that the concern voiced in your letter on the effect of union conditions on costs has not registered itself with equal force in keeping down the excessive fees for engineering and legal work, which have been criticized by the congressional Committee.

Insofar as your statement on "free competitive bidding" is concerned, I wish to point out there is no Federal statutory requirement for such bidding on the part of such cooperatives since the cooperatives are not agencies of the Federal Government. The cooperatives have the legal power to enter into the agreements which they have made for union conditions on contract work and I believe they should be applauded and not discouraged from entering into such agreements by a Government which is committed to a policy of collective bargaining.

Your letter is written in banking terms. The Rural Electrification Administration, however, is not a banking program. If it were, there would be no need for Federal action in this field. Private money could be secured for development of the cooperatives. The specially favorable terms of interest and amortization provided in the Rural Electrification Administration Act have been adopted by the Congress because it is deemed wise from the standpoint of the public interest to give assistance to the worthy cause of bringing electricity to the farms. It ill behooves the Government officers engaged in the administration of this public policy program to close their eyes to this fact and refuse to give consideration to the needs of labor for proper labor standards. Your letter is a far cry from the policy of the Rural Electrification Administration as stated in its memorandum of understanding with the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL) entered into August 4, 1941, which provides that "The REA agrees to promulgate a list of labor stand-

ards embodying the spirit and letter of this general policy [and assumes the obligation of winning REA cooperatives to the acceptance of these labor standards]."

I have commented fully on the status of this understanding and the failure of the Government to implement its general statement of policy in a letter of February 2, 1950 to a State fact finding board of Minnesota, copy of which was transmitted to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. Today we find the REA, in the case of the Montana cooperatives, not only refusing to assume its obligation of winning REA cooperatives to the acceptance of labor standards but, on the contrary, doing its utmost within the limits of its power to win such cooperatives away from those labor standards which the REA cooperatives themselves are willing to adopt pursuant to collective bargaining agreements with the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL).

The time has come to look through slogans and fine words to the actual facts. The union clause which is the subject of your letter of March 6, 1950, is not unusual. It is not a special favor the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL) is seeking to secure from the REA cooperatives—it is a standard clause in our agreements with private companies in the electric light and power industry.

We do not run into the complicated considerations set forth in your letter in securing such clauses in our agreement with private companies nor in securing the good faith application of the clause. Labor is getting a fair deal from these private companies but we cannot secure equal treatment from the Rural Electrification Administration. This is an alarming fact which must become known to organized labor and all others concerned with the problem.

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL) has patiently tried to secure relief from the antilabor policies of the Rural Electrification Administration by conferences and communications. I have become convinced that the condition cannot be corrected through such means. I am, therefore, releasing this letter for public information so that all fair-minded people may judge for themselves whether the labor policies of the Rural Electrification Administration are in the public interest.

Sincerely,

D. W. TRACY,
International President.

EXHIBIT 3

THE SENATOR REPORTS, BY SENATOR ARTHUR V. WATKINS

(Radio broadcast over Utah stations,
July 17)

ANNOUNCER. This is your Washington reporter bringing you The Senator Reports, a program featuring Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS. These programs are transcribed in Washington and are brought to you as a public service by this radio station. And now, Senator WATKINS.

Senator WATKINS. Hello everybody.

I want to make a few every report on the Korean crisis and my connection with the events that transpired. I think the people of Utah are entitled to know the truth about my actions in this very important matter, and particularly since the press has presented what I consider a very unfair and garbled account of what happened in the Senate the day the President announced that he had ordered the Air Force and the Navy to support South Koreans. I shall also make some additional comments on the situation as of the time this transcription was made.

I have with me today my executive secretary, Mr. James McKinney. He will aid in presenting this program.

Imagine yourself seated in the Senate of the United States on June 27. The Senate has barely begun its session. Senator Lucas, Democrat, of Illinois, the majority leader, has just been read the historic statement made by the President. The news of the President's action had just been made public outside of the Senate, and the news hadn't yet reached us. Mr. LUCAS was presenting it.

From here on, Mr. McKinney and I will reenact a part of what took place between me and Senator LUCAS as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27. Mr. McKinney will impersonate Mr. LUCAS. Previously I had asked a number of questions for information and then came the following colloquy:

"Senator WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?"

"Senator LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

"Senator WATKINS. Mr. President, I came into the Chamber late. Was the document referred to by the Senator from Illinois a message to the Congress?"

"Senator LUCAS. No, it is a statement by the President that was given to the conference this morning, and also to the press of the country. No doubt every newspaper in the United States has it on the front pages now. The commentators have it. I am sorry that the statement was not passed around. I brought one copy from the White House. Perhaps it would have been much better if I had brought a number so that every Senator could have had a copy of it on his desk.

"Senator WATKINS. Will the Senator yield further so I may make an observation?"

"Senator LUCAS. Certainly.

"Senator WATKINS. Mr. President, I have asked a number of questions with respect to this matter, and particularly with reference to the power of the President to order our Air Force and our sea force to back up the southern Koreans against the northern Koreans. In spite of the fact that the distinguished majority leader has said that that power is pursuant to the power granted to the United Nations to require a defense of nations which are subject to aggression, it seems to me that the action taken is a step which in effect is war.

"Senator LUCAS. Just a moment.

"Senator WATKINS. Will the Senator permit me to finish?"

"Senator LUCAS. Yes.

"Senator WATKINS. It is in effect war or a step leading to war. It may be that that is the very thing we ought to do. I am not one of those who have been taken into the confidence of the President and the Defense Department of the Government, so I do not know the facts. But it seems to me that this should have been called to the attention of the entire Congress. The Congress is now in session, and unless there is power in the United Nations to order our forces into an action of this kind which may result in a major world clash, then I think we should have been informed by the President direct by a message to the Congress. As I recall, we were told time and again when we were considering the Atlantic Pact that nothing would take us into war under that pact without the action by the Congress. The President could not do it.

"Senator LUCAS. Let me say—

"Senator WATKINS. Just a moment, please. Now, according to the action taken, by the mere order and the request of the United Nations, our troops can be sent into a fighting war without the Congress saying "Yes" or "No". That is the observation I wished to make.

"Senator LUCAS. In reply to the Senator from Utah, I should like to read from the statement by the President again:

"The Security Council of the United Nations called upon the invading troops to

cease hostilities and to withdraw to the thirty-eighth parallel."

"The Senator from Utah will not deny that they had the right to do that under the United Nations treaty?"

"Senator WATKINS. I think that is true."

"Senator LUCAS. I continue to read:

"This they have not done, but on the contrary have pressed the attack. The Security Council called upon all members of the United Nations to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution."

"After we have become a member of the United Nations in good faith and the United Nations Security Council by a unanimous vote made that sort of a request, what would the Senator from Utah do if he were President of the United States?"

"Senator WATKINS. I would have sent a message to the Congress of the United States setting forth the facts and asking for the authority to go ahead and do whatever was necessary to protect the situation."

From that colloquy has gone out press reports that I was highly critical of the President's program to aid the Koreans.

Well, you have heard the exact words which were used. I find no criticism either direct or implied of the general proposition of aiding the Koreans. What I said had to do with the way that help was brought into being and it could not be considered in any way a full expression of my views.

May I say I have a firm conviction in the wisdom of the constitutional provision that only Congress can declare war and send our Armed Forces into battle.

Remember, this was all done on the spur of the moment—nothing was prearranged—at least on my part.

I have made no recent public statement on the Korean situation except the one above referred to and the one I made in last week's radio report to Utah.

But I am on record on several occasions on the subject of help for Korea and on what should be done to contain and stop Communist Russia.

To get to that record, let's return to scenes in the United States Senate: The first time April 22, 1947—the occasion, the debate on the first Greek-Turkey loan, otherwise known as the Truman Doctrine, a measure which I supported.

As a freshman Senator, I was making my maiden speech in the Senate.

Here are some quotes.

"Mr. President, in my campaign last year for election as Senator from the State of Utah, I pledged my full support of the United Nations to give it every opportunity to succeed in its purposes. This I should like to do now. I favor the resolution introduced by the senior Senator from Virginia, Mr. BYRD, and his accompanying speech in which he proposed in substance that this entire matter be referred to the United Nations, that the United States and Russia lay all of the facts before that body; that we have a showdown between Russia and the democracies; that in the event Russia will not agree to a policy which will prevent war, we oust her from the United Nations."

Later in the same speech delivered more than 3 years ago in April, 1947, I said:

"Mr. President, I am voting for this bill with the belief and the hope that this is only the first step; that we shall now come back to the first principles as set forth in the Atlantic Charter not only in Greece and Turkey but in China; that we will reverse the action we took in that nation recently when we decided not to take sides as between the Nationalists and the Communists, but decided to get out; that we will redeem our promise made to the Koreans that they shall have their independence * * *

that we lay all the facts on the table before the United Nations."

When I made that statement in 1947 the nationalists were still in full control of China, but were waging a bitter war against the Communists.

Military experts have said that a vigorous support of Nationalist China by us at that stage could have saved China. I demand that we help her.

South Korea was threatened, although not in immediate danger. I urged that we protect her independence. I did that because of our commitments at Cairo even though I thought we were unwise to make that commitment because of the heavy burden we were assuming.

Again I quote from the 1947 speech:

"By taking this stand, Mr. President, I sincerely believe we can stop the present ideological war and prevent a shooting war of world war III. Halfway measures, in my opinion, will not do. We must go the full distance. This is a case which requires the boldest of action. By any other methods I believe we court disaster, and I say this notwithstanding the fact that we have the atom bomb."

"Mr. President, unless we act promptly and resolutely and with firmness we are in grave danger of losing our friends among other nations. The passage of this bill (Greek-Turkey loan) will be but the first step. From here on, no matter what the cost in money may be—and I believe it will be less if we act firmly—we must proceed to do everything in our power to win the war we are now waging to bring about a just and lasting peace."

I claim no special wisdom in what I said in 1947. I dislike to take an "I-told-you-so" speech and wouldn't do so now had not my record been challenged.

Have events justified my 1947 demand for the boldest of action? Have halfway measures been sufficient?

Have we courted disaster?

The muse of history has written the unhappy and tragic record since that time of one disaster after another.

Following the Greek-Turkey loan, Russia's answer was to take Hungary and Czechoslovakia behind the iron curtain.

As a counter-measure we were forced to adopt the Marshall Plan which when its course has run will have cost the United States approximately 18 billions of dollars.

Then came the Berlin blockade. More hundreds of millions were spent, and Russia can repeat the performance any time she wishes.

Then China, with her great manpower, was lost to the free nations of the world.

American and English traitors gave Russia the atom bomb secrets and now that nation holds that lethal weapon as a threat to the security of the rest of the world.

One disaster after another, and the end is not yet.

On September 22, 1949, I repeated in the United States Senate parts of my speech of 1947 and reaffirmed my stand.

On Sunday, September 27, 1949, a few days after the President's announcement that Russia had the atom bomb, I made a radio speech in Washington in which I declared:

"The United Nations Assembly is now in session; our opportunity is before us for a show-down. We can frankly state our case, what we expect and what we are willing to do. We can invite Russia to tell us what her needs are, what she wants, and what she thinks she is entitled to, and then as a Christian Nation, and with the help of other Christian nations, and in the spirit of true Christianity, we should be able to help her get what she really needs and what she is equitably entitled to. There is a chance we may succeed."

"And as a consideration we can insist upon disarmament. We can require cooperation backed with guaranties. If Russia and her satellites in this show-down are not willing to cooperate, are not willing to agree to disarmament, then we can decide whether to go on with our present policy or to take advantage of the strength that is ours before Russia and her allies can reach the same stage of preparation. Still other policies may suggest themselves."

That speech was made part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 25, 1949.

And now Korea! It should be clear that it is no longer a police action, but a full-blown war even though it isn't global at the present time. It is the duty of every loyal American to back to the limit our Armed Forces who are fighting and dying in the hills and rice paddies of Korea.

How we got into the war is important for future guidance, but it is not as important now as the absolute necessity of doing everything we can to win the victory in our present fight. In the end we shall win; we cannot afford to lose.

In Washington and throughout the country today there is deep resentment that after Congress appropriated some \$60,000,000,000 for defense purposes since 1945, there is a deplorable lack of preparation. It makes us wonder if we shall be ready for world war III when it comes.

There are many who are now questioning the timing of our fight to restore the independence of South Korea.

Many feel that we had no right to send our GIs into battle, as one soldier described it, "With one hand tied behind his back." The President's decision to send our troops into Korea when they weren't prepared is causing a reappraisal of the whole situation.

Military authorities here say it will take many months to drive the Communists out of South Korea. They say there are many bad days ahead for us.

Press dispatches quote Senator LODGE of Massachusetts as demanding an investigation as to the fitness of Secretary of Defense JOHNSON to hold his job.

Washington seems to be in the dark as to future policies.

Official Washington, in administration circles, is seething with recriminations over the Korea debacle.

Here are some of the pointed questions that are being asked in Washington with increasing emphasis:

When we have driven the Communists back to the thirty-eighth parallel, then what? Do we continue to occupy South Korea? Well, will we dare let it go?

What happens if and when Communist China attacks us?

Will we pour munitions and men into China, that historic sinkhole of lost armies?

What will we do in other countries where Russia's satellites become aggressors against the smaller nations? Will we repeat the Korean policy over again?

Should we now call for a show-down with Russia?

Next week I hope to discuss some of these questions and the latest war developments. Until then, good-by.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I wish merely to say that I am wholly familiar with the facts developed with reference to this particular matter, and I join the chairman of the subcommittee in urging the Senate to approve the action reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 247, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

REDUCTION IN NONDEFENSE SPENDING— STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me dealing with reductions in nondefense spending.

There being no objection, Mr. BYRD's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

I will support the President in all necessary appropriations for the military. I will support reasonable and practical measures to control inflation.

I am very much disappointed that the newspapers today report that the President has requested the majority leader, Mr. LUCAS, to oppose reductions in nondefense expenditures. The President should realize that financial preparedness and the ability to pay are the source of all preparedness. With colossal new expenditures facing us, we cannot preserve our solvency unless we reduce in every possible way nondefense spending.

In 1948 we expended more than \$6,000,000,000 for domestic-civilian expenditures, exclusive of the military, of interest on the debt, veterans' expenses, and foreign aid. The President now recommends about \$12,000,000,000 for domestic, nondefense spending. This represents an increase of about 100 percent within this period.

I hope the President will reconsider his decision and cooperate with the Congress in reducing nondefense spending.

The President says he will ask for \$10,000,000,000 of additional military appropriations. It is significant that he used the term "appropriations" instead of authorizations. This means he expects actually to spend \$10,000,000,000 additional in this fiscal year. If this is done the total expenditures will approximate \$52,000,000,000 and, of course, further requests may be made, as the President has indicated.

The highest estimate of income under the present revenue system, and allowing for increased prosperity, is about \$40,000,000,000 for this fiscal year. This leaves a deficit of \$12,000,000,000 without further requests.

If we continue to add such sums to a public debt now approaching \$260,000,000,000, it will not be long until we go over the precipice of financial disaster.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on July 17 considerable discussion took place on the floor of the Senate between the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] pertaining to the language in the committee report on the general appropriation bill with reference to the Rural Electrification Administration. The language in the report which was discussed is as follows:

The committee believes that no loan should be made for construction of such facilities unless in areas where private power companies cannot or will not furnish adequate power at reasonable rates and within a reasonable time.

I have had a large number of calls in reference to this particular committee language. Also I have received a number of telegrams and other communications from persons in the farm areas in the State of Minnesota who are very much concerned over the application of

this language as it would pertain to the rulings and decisions of the Administrator of REA. Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to state on record my position on this issue, and also wish to incorporate into the RECORD some of the telegrams and messages which I have received from persons and organizations in my own State.

The public law pertaining to REA has already been interpreted by precedent, tradition, and experience. I do not believe that the language of the committee's report should in any way be controlling. It may be a statement on the part of the members of the Committee on Appropriations, but it does not represent, at least up to this date, the considered judgment of the Congress of the United States. The public law pertaining to REA was passed by the Congress. It had been considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It has been debated at length for many years. The objectives of REA legislation are clear and unmistakable. Any attempt in any way to thwart the efforts of the REA cooperative development should be strongly resisted and protested. I urge the conference committee on this bill to make it unmistakably clear that the Congress has no desire to impair the development of REA generation or transmission. I take that position and shall continue to maintain it.

Mr. President, for example, I have a telegram from the president of the Border Counties Power Corp., Warroad, Minn. This is one of the fine cooperatives in our State. To quote just a few passages from the telegram, I should like to read the following:

Language in Senate report on general appropriations bill for 1951 could be very detrimental to Rural Electrification Administration especially to generating and transmission cooperatives, and could impose restrictions on authority of REA Administrator which would be damaging to entire program.

Toward the end of the telegram appears the following:

In our opinion this is very loose language and we urge that you work against this proposed change.

Mr. President, I ask that the telegram be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WARROAD, MINN., July 14, 1950.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senator from Minnesota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Language in Senate report on general appropriations bill for 1951 could be very detrimental to Rural Electrification Administration especially to generating and transmission cooperatives, and could impose restrictions on authority of REA Administrator which would be damaging to entire program. We object to the following proposed language. "The committee believes that no loan should be made for construction of such facilities unless in areas where private power companies cannot or will not furnish adequate power at reasonable rates and within a reasonable time." In our opinion this is very loose language and we urge that you work against this proposed change.

NORMAN CLEMENTSON,
President, Border Counties Power Corp., Inc.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also have a telegram from Mr. E. L. Smith, president, and A. E. Lee, secretary, Western Minnesota Power Cooperative. I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENSON, MINN., July 16, 1950.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We seriously object to portion of Senate Appropriations Committee report on H. R. 7786, whereby they recommend restrictions of REA loans for construction of generation-transmission facilities. Can see no justification either moral or economic for strengthening position of private power companies and weakening position of farmers cooperative in power supply matter. Please do everything possible to exclude any language from omnibus appropriations bill that will restrict generation-transmission loans to cooperative or weaken Administration's authority to make such loans.

E. L. SMITH, President,
A. E. LEE, Secretary,

Western Minnesota Power Cooperative.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have a telegram from the directors of the Carlton County Cooperative Power Association, signed by C. W. Maki, secretary, which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOOSE LAKE, MINN., July 17, 1950.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.:

We request you do everything within your power to remove restrictive language in Senate Committee report on the appropriations bill for 1951 that might be interpreted to restrict or stop granting of generation or transmission loans.

C. W. MAKI,
Secretary, Board of Directors, Carlton County Co-op Power Association.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have a similar message from the Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light and Power Association, of Montevideo, Minn. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTVIDEO, MINN., July 17, 1950.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:

May we have your support for the generating an dtransmission bill giving the REA administrator authority to make such loans.

MINNESOTA VALLEY COOPERATIVE LIGHT
AND POWER ASSOCIATION.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have a telegram from the president of the Minnkota Power Cooperative, from Grand Forks, N. Dak., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., July 14, 1950.

Senator HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.:

Language in the Senate report on general appropriations bill for 1951 regarding con-

struction of REA generating facilities should be clarified so as not to hinder program. Will you please do what you can to avoid the inclusion of any unnecessary provision which might hinder or hamstring the Administrator.

VICTOR M. EDMAN,
President, Minnesota Power Cooperative.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have a telegram from Roy E. Wiseth, president of the Minnesota Farmers Union, which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLMAR, MINN., July 3, 1950.
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We must have public transmission lines to safeguard Government investments in REA cooperatives. Urge you to oppose appropriation cuts for transmission lines.

ROY E. WISETH,
President, Minnesota Farmers Union.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have a letter from Mr. Victor Hanson, manager, Agra Lite Cooperative, Benson, Minn. I wish to read two paragraphs of the letter, because I think it is quite pertinent:

From sad experience we know what the private power monopolists mean when they talk about adequate power supplies and reasonable rates. We have found that they actually mean inadequate supplies and unreasonable rates.

We cannot think of a single good reason why the farmers of America, through their REA cooperatives, should be further hampered by legislation in their long battle to obtain electric power in adequate supply, and at cost of production. They have developed their own loads, and have every right to serve those loads if they wish to do so. To deny them that right, by whatever means that may be used, would be rank injustice.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRA LITE COOPERATIVE,
Benson, Minn., July 17, 1950.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The attempt to restrict use of REA loan funds for development of generation-transmission facilities as proposed in the Senate committee's report on the appropriations bill for 1951 is of vital concern to our cooperative.

From sad experience we know what the private power monopolists mean when they talk about adequate power supplies and reasonable rates. We have found that they actually mean inadequate supplies and unreasonable rates.

We can not think of a single good reason why the farmers of America, through their REA cooperatives, should be further hampered by legislation in their long battle to obtain electric power in adequate supply, and at cost of production. They have developed their own loads, and have every right to serve those loads if they wish to do so. To deny them that right, by whatever means that may be used, would be rank injustice.

Please use your influence and vote in the Senate to defeat the present attempt to hamstring the REA GT program.

Sincerely yours,
VICTOR HANSON, Manager.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that a recent survey of power development in this country indicates that the Federal power projects have in no way thwarted or injured the development of private power facilities. In fact, the tempo at present is one of increase in private power facilities as compared to public power. A tremendous investment of money is going into this field. It is a lucrative investment. I think proper tribute should be paid to the private companies who make power available at proper and reasonable rates. I do feel, however, that the facts today set aside all these spurious and propaganda charges that somehow or other the activities of the Federal Government are threatening the private investment field and private activity within the field of generation of electric power and its transmission.

The facts are crystal clear that nothing like that has happened. In fact, private companies are expanding their kilowatt-hour capacity at an ever-increasing rate. The Government is engaged in power projects in areas where private facilities are not available, or where power is not adequately available. Finally, no matter how much power we develop we shall always have too little. Let us make it quite clear, as we mobilize the Nation for national defense that this is no time to say that we are developing too much power or spending too much in public funds for it. Recently, I heard the Secretary of the Interior testify before the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. He said that in 1939 we had a 40-percent power reserve. In 1950 we have a 15-percent power reserve. We have had a loss of power reserve of 25 percent in a period of a little more than 10 years, and at a time when we are looking forward to a great national defense program. The President's message is before us. In it he asks for increased production and asks our country to turn out unprecedented quantities of materials in order to maintain our domestic, civilian, and international commitments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, an article entitled "Private Utilities Step Out Ahead," printed in the June 30, 1950, issue of United States News and World Reports.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE UTILITIES STEP OUT AHEAD—SPENDING \$3 FOR PLANT TO EVERY PUBLIC DOLLAR

Federal power projects, growing fast, still lag far behind private producers. Expansion programs are booming.

Private firms are outspending Government 3 to 1 in the race to keep up with electric-power demand. They still furnish most of the juice for industry.

Final decision in issue of private versus public power is not in sight. But private companies, now, are holding their own.

Private utilities, once the scapegoats of the New Deal, are in the midst of a vast program of expansion. Private power, as a result, is at least holding its own in the continuing struggle with public power for a market that is expanding by leaps and bounds.

The flow of money from Federal, State, and local governments into power development and distribution is breaking all records. Yet the flow of private capital into the power industry is running far ahead of investment of Government capital. The ratio is about 3 to 1, with \$3 of private capital going into modernization and expansion for each Government dollar.

A demand that appears insatiable lies back of the booming expansion of power resources. That demand, on basis of conclusions reached both by private utility managers and by Government planners, is expected to double electric-power requirements during the 10 years ahead. In the contest to gain and hold this market, the private utilities are maintaining their position relative to governments, after losing—relatively—during the 1930's.

Expansion records show what is happening.

In generating capacity, privately owned utility companies are making much larger increases than publicly owned systems. The chart on page 37 tells this story. Private utilities' generating capacity in 1951 is to reach 61,000,000 kilowatts, on basis of present plans. That will be 20,700,000 more kilowatts than these companies had in 1945, or a 50 percent increase in capacity.

Public power agencies, in contrast, will add only 5,200,000 kilowatts of new capacity by 1951, in their postwar building program. This means that during the early postwar period, at least, the share of United States electric power in Government hands is remaining the same, instead of increasing as in prior years. In 1920, Government systems controlled 5 percent of the power supply. By 1940, they had 14 percent. By 1945, their share was up to 20 percent, but it has not increased since then.

Spending totals, for new plant and equipment, also point up the trends in power development. Spending figures are illustrated by the chart on this page. It shows private companies' investment of about \$8,050,000,000 in new generators, transmission lines, other facilities in the 1945-50 period. Federal expenditures by unofficial estimate, amount to about \$1,597,000,000 in this same period. Cities, States, other power units invested around \$1,500,000,000 during these years.

In other words, electric-power companies are building new plants, putting up lines about three times as fast as all the city, State and Federal agencies combined. That is the national, over-all picture, and it is encouraging to advocates of private power. The situation and future outlook are entirely different in some areas. This shows up from a closer look at power programs around the country.

Northern United States, from Illinois to the Atlantic, is the scene of the greatest building activity in power. Industrial States of this region are demanding and getting about \$1,000,000,000 worth of new facilities a year. Around half of the dollars are being spent in five North Central States—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin. About a third of the money goes into increased power for New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania; the remainder to New England plants.

Private utility companies account for nearly all the expansion. Federal activity is at a minimum in this area.

Major work centers on steam plants, using coal and oil for fuel. These modern plants are marvels of engineering. They are changing old ideas about practical limits on size

of steam units. Some newer ones rival the immense hydroelectric projects of the West.

An example is the new plant opened at Sunbury, Pa., by the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. It is one of the largest coal-fired power plants in the world. First units will have 250,000 kilowatts' capacity when completed. The plant can be enlarged later to 550,000 kilowatts, half the total for Hoover Dam. This hints at the scale of things in the power industry that private companies are creating.

The South also is getting enormous new blocks of power from private-utility building programs. Outside the TVA region, private companies provide virtually all the electric energy. They are spending in the neighborhood of \$350,000,000 this year in the South Atlantic States, along the coast from Delaware to Florida, and in Kentucky, Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee. One item in this year's schedules: Around 5,000 miles of new transmission lines.

Federal activities are growing in this region, however. TVA construction expenditures in 1950 are at a record level. TVA gets 85 percent of its power from hydroelectric plants now. Two additional steam plants are under way, and, by 1953, around 30 percent of TVA power will be supplied by steam.

A new Federal agency, the Southeast Power Administration, is setting up shop in the South, also. It will sell the power generated at Federal dams that are built outside TVA's domain. Now, SEPA has only two projects going, with 72,000 kilowatts capacity. Plans are under way for other projects that will bring SEPA capacity to 3,000,000 kilowatts. Interior Department estimates that SEPA will be marketing one-tenth of all the power produced in Southeastern United States within a few years.

West of the Mississippi, utility-company expansion goes forward in every area except Nebraska, the one State where all power has been taken over by public agencies. Private investment will approach \$250,000,000 this year in six North Central States—North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, and Missouri. Much of the money will go for additions to steam power plants.

Farther South, in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Texas, utilities are spending about the same amount, building 4,500 miles of transmission lines plus substations and power generators. Here federally financed co-ops are setting up very extensive networks of transmission lines that will compete with private companies.

Far western utilities carry on a larger building program than is generally realized. In 1950 they are spending more than \$300,000,000 in Washington, Oregon and California. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., in California, is doing more construction than any other utility company in the Nation. It has spent more than half a billion dollars, provided 850,000 kilowatts of capacity since 1944. In 1950 and 1951, this one company will spend another \$300,000,000 and add 450,000 kilowatts to the West's power supply.

Washington and Oregon utilities are active, too, though most of the power there eventually is to be produced in Federal projects on the Columbia River.

Power supplies, as a result of these vast expansion efforts, improved markedly during 1949. The Nation's reserve margin—percentage of power available above peak loads—moved up from 6.6 percent at the end of 1948 to 14.2 percent at the end of 1949. That is considered adequate, except in isolated regions where power can't be borrowed quickly from neighboring sources in emergencies.

Threat of power shortages in most parts of the country is removed, in consequence, for the first time in many years. A prolonged drought can cause troubles where water power is the main source. In most places, business and residential customers

need not fear brownouts or other restrictions this year. The Pacific Northwest still rations industries, but that is the only area of shortage.

Rises in demand are phenomenal. Residential use averaged 897 kilowatt hours in 1939, was up to 1,655 in 1949. Industrial load rose 22 percent in the last 3 years; farm load, 91 percent.

There isn't any end in sight. Just a few of the things forcing electricity's use upward are frozen-food lockers, clothes dryers, television sets, electric bed coverings, air conditioners, air cleaners, automatic soft-drink dispensers, electric stairways, thousands of new power-driven machine tools, and electrical implements on farms.

Forecasts agree on a need for at least 120,000,000 kilowatts capacity by 1961. This means doubling the size of the generating plant—building 60,000,000 kilowatts of new capacity—in the next decade. The issue is how much of this vast new industry will be built and controlled by private companies, how much by Government groups. The private utilities feel they have made some gains on their competitors, but they know the struggle for leadership is only starting.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This is a time when we ought to recognize that no matter what we do, it will not be enough, and surely Congress should not be guilty of "too little and too late." So I surely support the program for the project developed along the lines suggested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate at an appropriate time reconsider the action by which it approved committee amendments on the following pages and lines: Page 188, line 6; page 195, line 1; page 197, line 14; page 208, line 20; page 212, line 6; page 223, line 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois moves that the Senate reconsider its action on certain amendments enumerated by him. The motion will be entered.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 247, in line 5, after the word "which", to strike out "\$22,897,700" and insert "\$25,135,700".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 247, in line 6, after the word "fund", to insert "and in addition thereto the Commissioner of Reclamation is hereby authorized to incur obligations and enter into contracts for additional work, materials, and equipment in an amount not exceeding \$3,000,000 for power transmission lines and substations in the fiscal year 1951;"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 247, in line 19, after the word "fund", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That \$1,000,000 of the funds provided in this paragraph for the construction of transmission lines in South Dakota shall be available only for connecting the load centers of Armour with Watertown via Sioux Falls, and of Midland with Rapid City, and of Winner with Randall Dam.

And to insert:

Provided further, That \$3,000,000 of the funds provided in this paragraph plus \$3,000,000 contract authority shall be available for construction of transmission lines and substations in South Dakota, to include a transmission loop from Fort Randall through

the load centers of Armour, Huron, Aberdeen, Andover, Watertown, Brookings, Sioux Falls, and Gavins Point to Fort Randall, and lines from Fort Randall to Winner and from Rapid City to Midland.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, some Senators wanted to speak on some of these amendments, and did not know that we were to continue the session. If we are to continue longer, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask the Senator to withhold the suggestion. I am going to change signals in the middle of the stream.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I withhold the suggestion.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States withdrawing the nomination of Luella M. Thompson, to be postmaster at Darwin, Calif., which was ordered to lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Reports of committees are in order. If there be no reports, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hawthorne Arey to be member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, for a term of 5 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the opening of my remarks, I ask consent that the nominations to the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be considered en bloc.

The Export-Import Bank nominations considered en bloc are as follows: Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska; Herbert E. Gaston, of New York; Clarence E. Gauss, of Connecticut; Lynn U. Stambaugh, of North Dakota; to be members of the Board of Directors for term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1955.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to report that this afternoon the junior Senator from Oregon met with the Committee on Banking and Currency, in accordance with the understanding which was reached in the Senate last night, in respect to the relationship of these nominations to certain loaning policies of the Export-Import Bank which the junior Senator from Oregon wished to discuss with the committee.

I desire to say that the junior Senator from Oregon received from the mem-

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my resolution is a Senate resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not a joint resolution, and the Chair cannot entertain it at this moment.

Are there any concurrent resolutions?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution. It comes under the order of concurrent and other resolutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 312), as follows:

Resolved, That the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations made pursuant to Senate Resolution 231 (relating to an investigation of disloyalty among employees of the Government) be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with the following instructions:

(1) The Committee on Foreign Relations shall conduct a full and complete investigation in accordance with the provisions of Senate Resolution 231; or

(2) In the event said committee decides by a majority vote that a continuation by said committee of such investigation is not in the public interest, the committee shall recommend to the Senate the establishment of a trained bipartisan commission, wholly independent of the Executive, to conduct a full, complete, and relentless search into the whole subject of foreign penetration of the Department of State and other agencies of the Government in accordance with the provisions of said Senate Resolution 231.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What time is it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is 1 minute of 2 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I make a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be over under the rule.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XIX

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, time ran out for submitting resolutions. I ask unanimous consent to send to the desk a resolution which amends rule XIX of the Senate, and I ask for its appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received, and the Chair will refer it to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 313) submitted by Mr. WHERRY was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to debate) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"7. (a) No Senator shall, in any proceedings conducted by any committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, directly or indirectly by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

"(b) If any Senator shall transgress the provisions of subsection (a) of this section in any committee proceedings, the chairman of the committee shall, or any member of the committee may, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall suspend and shall not proceed without leave of the committee, which if granted shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate.

"(c) If a Senator be called to order for words spoken in committee proceedings, upon demand of the Senator or of any member of the committee, the exceptionable words shall be taken down in writing and shall be read for the information of the committee.

"8. It shall not be in order for any committee of the Senate to file any report whether pertaining to a bill, joint resolution, concurrent resolution, resolution, or otherwise, which contains, directly or indirectly, any language which imputes to any Senator any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator."

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 247, in line 19, after the word "fund", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That \$1,000,000 of the funds provided in this paragraph for the construction of transmission lines in South Dakota shall be available only for connecting the load centers of Armour with Watertown via Sioux Falls, and of Midland with Rapid City, and of Winner and Randall Dam.

And to insert:

Provided further, That \$3,000,000 of the funds provided in this paragraph plus \$3,000,000 contract authority shall be available for construction of transmission lines and substations in South Dakota, to include a transmission loop from Fort Randall through the load centers of Armour, Huron, Aberdeen, Andover, Watertown, Brookings, Sioux Falls, and Gavins Point to Fort Randall, and lines from Fort Randall to Winner and from Rapid City to Midland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 248, after line 24, to insert:

Such amount of the \$1,300,000 appropriated in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation", "General fund, construction", "Fort Peck project, Montana", for the Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior not to be required for termination of work on these facilities and the meeting of obligations heretofore incurred against said appropriation for such facilities shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General administrative expenses," on page 250, line 5, after the word "Reclamation", to strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert "\$7,400,000."

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to address myself briefly to the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Because of misunderstandings with regard to this whole subject, I should like to make a statement with respect to my understanding of it. On Monday last, at about the hour of 4 o'clock, I was asked to comment on the report of the subcommittee. I had never heard of it. I immediately communicated with the office of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I was told that they did not know anything about it either, but that a report was to be submitted, probably in a day or two. I asked that as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations I be permitted to have a copy of the report, and one was obtained for me. I also asked that copies of it be sent to every other member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. The Chair insists that Senators and others who desire to converse leave the Chamber. Disorder in the Senate grows more and more noticeable with every week and every month. The Chair insists on order in the Chamber. The rule applies also to the occupants of the galleries.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I made the request so that when we came to consider the report we would know what it was all about. The report came to me at about 5 or 6 o'clock that evening. I had a dinner engagement and could not examine the report in detail. I was summoned to a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations the following morning to consider the report. When we arrived the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], presented a report of what he said was the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations to which had been committed the investigation of the charges of disloyalty in the State Department. Let me emphasize that any findings of the subcommittee were to be reported to the full committee for action by that committee. It was brought out in the discussion that the report was submitted by the three majority members of the subcommittee, that one member of the subcommittee did not even know the report was being considered, and that another member of the subcommittee had been asked to file his own report, which he did, but without being given access to the report filed by the majority. My experience has been that when I served as a member of a subcommittee and a majority of a subcommittee was prepared to submit a report, a meeting of the entire subcommittee was held, in which all members participated. If the minority

members cannot agree with the draft report of the majority members they are given the privilege of filing minority reports. Apparently in this case the draft of the majority report of the subcommittee was not submitted to the other members of the subcommittee.

Therefore I raise the question whether it was officially a report of the subcommittee, because no meeting was held for the purpose of approving or rejecting it. It was submitted by three members of the subcommittee without the other members of the subcommittee participating in its preparation, although one member of the subcommittee had filed a report of his own without, as I understand, having participated in the discussion of the pros and cons, which took place among the majority members of the subcommittee. The report came to the Committee on Foreign Relations in that form.

In the full committee the action that was asked to be taken was that the report of the subcommittee be accepted, that it be reported to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the subcommittee be discharged. Objection was made to dealing with the matter in that way because the point was raised that there were different questions involved and that they should be voted on separately. According to my recollection the language of one motion was to the effect that the Committee on Foreign Relations receive the report of the subcommittee, and that the subcommittee be discharged. We debated that motion briefly, and by unanimous vote the report was received and the subcommittee was discharged with the distinct understanding that the receiving of the report of the subcommittee simply meant its being received for our information, and that we took no action one way or another with respect to it.

I raised the point that I had not had the opportunity to read the report, and therefore I could not pass on it one way or another. I said I did not feel we were in a position to deal with it. Other members of the committee said that they had not read the report. Therefore at no time was this report submitted to us for action. As I have said, after the report had been received by the committee and the subcommittee was discharged—and we had all voted for it, because we thought it was the proper disposition of the matter—it was moved that the Committee on Foreign Relations transmit to the Senate through the chairman, or someone designated by him, the report of the subcommittee without comment one way or another. I voted for that with the distinct understanding that it was simply carrying out the wishes of the subcommittee chairman that the matter be transmitted to the Senate as a subcommittee report for such use as the Senate might see fit to make of it.

I distinctly understood that it was not a report of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I doubt that anyone except the chairman of the subcommittee had read the report. I do not know that anyone else ever had a chance to read

it. There was no discussion of its merits. The entire discussion was on procedure, and on the procedural question it was distinctly understood that we were merely having the report sent to the Senate by the chairman of the full committee, or someone designated by him. He very properly designated the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who had been chairman of the subcommittee. I recollect very clearly that what was to be submitted to the Senate was the subcommittee report without comment. I want to make it clear, Mr. President, that it was to be the subcommittee report without comment, because there seems to be some misunderstanding as to what the committee did. Certainly I would not have voted "yea" on that motion if in doing so it meant that the committee was accepting the report and sending it to the Senate as the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations. While there was some discussion of whether we would debate the merits of the report and approve it or disapprove it we agreed that no one knew enough about it to discuss the merits. Consequently no vote was taken to approve or disapprove the report.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] simply stated that he wanted to submit his report, to have it received by the committee, and to have the subcommittee discharged. After that we could do anything we wanted to do with respect to it. Following that a member of the subcommittee made the motion that the report be transmitted to the Senate through the chairman of the subcommittee, but only as a subcommittee report without comment. It is clear in my mind that it meant we were not passing on it, but simply sending it to the Senate without comment, because we had all agreed that we did not have time to read it or pass comment on it.

I want to make my position clear, because those are the facts as I remember them. If any other member of the committee wishes to take issue with me, he may do so, but I thought that I must make this statement. I do so because it was perfectly clear that no position was taken one way or the other by the committee. We were simply transmitting to the Senate the report of the subcommittee. The form of the document as submitted is the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations pursuant to this resolution with a deletion of some language that reflected on the minority members of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I have made this statement for the benefit of the Senate. I now yield the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, did the Chair recognize me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Chair had recognized me, I believe.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not know; I am just inquiring.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The Chair may state that he did say to the Senator from Wyoming that he would recog-

nize him for the purpose of attending to a matter relating to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the filing of a report, or something of the kind, by the Senator from Wyoming. I merely desire to make the situation clear. I believe I have the floor. If the Senator wishes to have me yield for the purpose of permitting him to put something in the RECORD from the committee, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I can wait, but I thought I heard the Chair recognize the Senator from Wyoming, and I was about to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Iowa, but stated to him that the Chair had previously told the Senator from Wyoming he would recognize him. The Chair did not see the Senator from Wyoming on the floor at the time the Senator from Iowa rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall not take the time now.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not want the Senator from Wyoming to think I refused to yield to him. I shall be glad to do so if he desires.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to make some comment on the pending business.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall be very brief, because my time is limited this afternoon.

Mr. President, with regard to the discussion which has proceeded about the so-called report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations in connection with Senate Resolution 231, I wish to make a few observations at this time, in an attempt to set the RECORD as straight as I know how to do so, and as straight as I can, according to my recollection of the facts.

I was appointed a member of the subcommittee when it was originally created pursuant to Senate Resolution 231, under the Committee on Foreign Relations. The subcommittee was in existence for approximately 5 months, held thirty-some sessions, called only 35 witnesses to investigate the comprehensive field of loyalty of employees, past and present, in the State Department of the United States Government.

What I shall have to say about this report in some detail will be submitted to the Senate, in one way or another, in the near future, but so far as the history of this so-called report is concerned, I desire to make a matter of record and to recite the recent history of this document which now is on the desk of the Secretary of the Senate, and alleged to be a report from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I consider it not to be a report from the Committee on Foreign Relations for several reasons. In the first place, so far as I know—and I should have to ask the Senator from Massachusetts to give his own testimony on this point—there never was a meeting of the subcommittee in connection with this matter to pass on, to accept, or to refuse to accept, this document now called the report of the Committee on

the applications of the States of Louisiana and Texas for rehearing would raise such obstacles to operation and development that the United States would probably be deprived of oil production from these lands at a time when it will be needed in the national interest. At the same time, both the States and the industry, as well as the people of the United States, would suffer.

My resolution in effect makes the Secretary of the Interior a receiver to administer all of the submerged lands except those under inland navigable waters. He will be authorized to receive all rents and royalties under existing leases and to deposit these sums in a special fund in the Treasury pending final solution of the controversy by court action and congressional legislation.

The resolution does not attempt to settle any controversial issue but it does give the Secretary of the Interior authority for a period of 3 years after the entry of a decree in the Louisiana and Texas cases, to grant leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which are not covered by existing State leases.

Failure to enact interim legislation of some kind would precipitate very serious confusion at a time when the country can ill afford it.

Section 1 of the bill provides that any lease of submerged lands issued under the authority of any State prior to December 21, 1948, and which is in force and effect on the date of the resolution may continue to be operated in accordance with the provisions of the State lease. All rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a California lease or such a lease issued by Louisiana or Texas, if the decree sustains the position of the United States, are to be paid to the Secretary of the Interior pending the enactment of legislation by Congress providing for their disposition. This section also gives the Secretary all the powers of supervision and control which are vested in the State under the terms of such leases.

Section 2 authorizes the Secretary to certify that the United States does not claim any proprietary interest in lands or mineral deposits in lands 'beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of any State.'

Section 3 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate an agreement with any State with respect to the operation of leases which may be subject to a controversy as to whether they cover submerged lands of the Continental Shelf or submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters. If the United States is engaged in any litigation involving such lands, the Secretary of the Interior is required to obtain the concurrence of the Attorney General of the United States.

Section 4 authorizes the Secretary to issue leases at competitive bidding but on a flat royalty rate of 12½ percent for 5 years and as long as oil and gas may be produced on submerged lands which are not covered by State leases within the provisions of section 1(a). Receipts under such leases are also to be deposited in a special fund pending future legislation.

Section 5 authorizes the Secretary to issue regulations and section 6 contains the necessary definitions.

I am distributing copies of the resolution to all persons who have indicated an interest in the matter and at an early date I shall call a session of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at which the problem may be discussed.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM FOR MEETING THE KOREAN CRISIS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, at the outset I desire it understood that I am not speaking on the question which has been under discussion this afternoon. I intend to speak on it, probably, tomorrow.

Mr. President, when the Russian equipped and trained Communists from North Korea made their open attack on the Republic of Korea on Sunday, June 25, they opened a new phase in world history. We had known that Soviet communism had its plans for world conquest. But we had hoped that it would limit itself to methods short of open armed aggression. We had hoped that it would respect the principle, established by the United Nations Charter, that there should be no threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. The unprovoked attack on the new Republic of Korea shows that these hopes were vain; it shows that the free world must now gird itself to meet the menace of armed attack at any time, at any place.

The present struggle is not just a struggle between the United Nations and the Communist forces of North Korea. Neither is it yet a struggle between two great powers. It is everlastingly important to keep these things clearly in mind.

We are engaged in the age-old struggle of despotism against freedom. This is a struggle which concerns all of the free world and calls for moral and, to the extent practicable, economic and military support from all who are engaged on the side of freedom. The United Nations has acted promptly, and decisively, to make this clear. Fifty-two nations have concurred in the Security Council finding of aggression and in its appeal to bring that aggression to an end.

While all must help, the heaviest burden and the responsibility of leadership fall upon the United States, not because this is peculiarly our war, but because we have the unique capacity to contribute to a common cause. We have industrial productivity roughly five times that of the Soviet Union. We are the only one of the free nations which possesses great industrial power and which also is free from grave economic dislocations of the Second World War.

Long before the attack on Korea, many of us have felt that world conditions would not permit indefinitely a situation where Russia, in its comparative economic poverty, would continue to manufacture planes and tanks on a scale which far outstripped that of the free world. The unbalance of power, created by this situation, was bound to tempt despots to action, as in Korea.

I believe that the administration can be fairly criticized for not having responded more quickly to these obvious world conditions and for not having provided prevention in time.

This, however, is not the moment for recrimination and for placing blame for past mistakes and present perils.

Yesterday, in his message to the Congress and in his radio address to the American people, the President presented a program of action which, in its broad outlines, is a forceful response to the challenge of Soviet communism and to the aggressive war now being conducted against the United Nations in Korea. It is a program which in principle justifies the general approval of the American people. It points the way by which we

can and must present a united front at home to those who have already struck at indivisible freedom and who are poised to strike again and again unless our action gives them pause.

In many respects the President's program is vague and needs important clarifications before legislative enactment. It is essential to our economic health that the additional expenditures proposed should not precipitate ruinous inflation which in turn, by requiring broad price controls and rigid rationing would necessitate expensive and throttling bureaucratic regimentation of our whole economy. With wisdom, courage, and efficiency on the part of the administration, these additional expenditures can be made without crippling our economy.

There must be frugality in the departments of the Government not directly engaged in the present conflict. Expenditures for our nondefense activities must be cut to the bone. At the same time we must insist on prudent spending by the armed services, which in the past have been too often guilty of waste and extravagance. The critical need for efficiency in every part of our Federal Government is greater today than ever before.

The implementation of the President's program will be thoroughly discussed and debated later when concrete legislation is before us for consideration. At the moment we can rejoice that the administration has awakened at last to the peril which has long stared us in the face. We can rejoice that the administration is demanding action which can provide the basis for national unity. Such unity in itself can be a moral factor of mighty force in the struggle to preserve freedom and to extinguish the present warfare in Korea before it spreads into the awful disaster of a third world war.

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION—PRINTING OF REPORT NO. 2108

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate resolution 314 submitted previously today by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to have printed for its use 4,000 copies of Senate Report No. 2108, a report pursuant to Senate Resolution 231, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a resolution to investigate whether there are employees in the State Department disloyal to the United States, and that an equal number of the supplemental views submitted by Mr. LODGE be also printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I think I understand this perfectly. As I understand, it is

satisfactory to both the Members of the majority and also to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The effect is that we can get about 4,000 copies in this way and save \$600 or \$700, because the reports would be printed anyway. It would be necessary to go to press again to get the additional 4,000 copies of the report. Within the \$1,200 limit it is necessary to take this action.

Mr. WHERRY. This is a simple resolution, which provides for the maximum number of copies to be printed. After these copies are printed, a concurrent resolution would have to be agreed to in order to get additional copies printed?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Will envelopes be printed for each report?

Mr. HAYDEN. Envelopes are not printed for committee reports. The individual views of the Senators from Massachusetts will be printed separately.

Mr. WHERRY. Each Senator may obtain copies of the report and use his own franking privilege?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to submit a unanimous-consent request with reference to the appropriation bill. There are pending to the pending appropriation bill two very important amendments. One involves an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to begin ship-repair work on certain ships designated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a necessary part of any preparedness or war effort.

The other amendment deals with cancer, heart disease, and mental diseases, in the field of health and research grants.

I have conferred with the Senator from New Mexico, and in view of the fact that these two amendments may cause a great deal of discussion, I ask unanimous consent that they be brought up after consideration of the appropriation bill is concluded. I ask that they be considered as the last amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator restate his request? My attention was diverted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that what probably will be the two major amendments on the appropriation bill, one involving \$25,000,000 for ship-repair work, to which 38 Senators are opposed, and the other one, dealing with cancer research, and so on, to which another group of Senators is opposed, be considered last.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, to begin with, the health research item is in chapter V, Labor-Federal Security.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I have conferred with the chairman.

Mr. WHERRY. The ranking minority member is in California and he will

not return until Monday or Tuesday of next week. It was my understanding that it was desired to take it up on Monday, and it certainly should be delayed until Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the Senator will not ask for unanimous consent until I can take the matter up with the Senator from California.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I withdraw the request.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to be heard upon one of the amendments. If I understood the Senator correctly the other amendment which he is offering, and for which he makes the unanimous consent request, has to do with chapter VIII of the general appropriation bill, which covers certain independent offices and executive agencies.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not had an opportunity to examine the Senator's amendment. I am chairman of the subcommittee in charge of that chapter. Apparently it will not come up at least until after the Interior Department chapter has been disposed of. If the Senator from California should return before the Interior Department chapter is finished, then the Labor and Federal Security chapter would have the right-of-way. I therefore ask the Senator to withhold his request until tomorrow, to give me an opportunity to study it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wished the statement to be on record that these amendments will cause a great deal of discussion. I think 30 Senators have signified their opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withdraw his request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I withdraw my request.

ECONOMIC PREPAREDNESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on July 18 I sent a memorandum to the members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. With the memorandum there was a statement which had been prepared by the staff of the joint committee at my request. Because the economic aspect of our international operations is of very great importance I ask unanimous consent that this memorandum, together with a statement of the necessity for preparedness taxation may be printed at length in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC PREPAREDNESS IS ESSENTIAL

Mr. President, we know now that modern war is total war and that the nation that succeeds in modern warfare is the nation with the strongest economy, as well as the greatest military skill.

Success for the United States in the present international dilemma depends upon (1) the awareness of our people of the fact that Soviet Russia is the head and center of a world revolutionary movement which plans by force and deceit to destroy all rival governments; (2) the willingness of the American people to contribute their substance to pay the economic costs as well as the military costs of total warfare.

It has been the policy of the United States, and still is, to establish world peace. To

this end it has contributed through the Marshall plan to the economic rehabilitation of Europe, and through the Truman policy to the containment of communism. By supporting Greece and Turkey and by promoting the union of democratic nations through the North Atlantic Pact and the Western Hemisphere Pact, it has made the free nations of the world more able to resist aggression.

It is evident now that the Soviet Government, through the use of the veto in the United Nations, through the confusion it has sought to create by the activities of Communist Party members everywhere, and through localized acts of aggression, such as those at Trieste and Berlin now ripening into actual aggressive warfare in Korea with Soviet-trained soldiers and Soviet-built machinery, is determined not to permit the world to return to the ways of peace. The United States must continue, through the United Nations, to mobilize the moral forces of the world against these aggressive tactics of Russia, but at the same time must launch an intensified program of military and economic preparedness.

The question which must be answered by all our people is how much we are willing to contribute of our personal economic resources to the winning of this struggle. We cannot hope to make the military effort successful without an all-out economic effort. We know now that the lessons of World War I were not used in preparation for World War II. We cannot afford to make the same mistake again of a soft approach to the hardest problem this Nation has ever faced.

When World War II began, the United States had a national debt of less than \$49,000,000,000; the national debt today is \$257,000,000,000. The debt has reached this proportion because we did not have a pay-as-you-go policy for the war. Only 45 percent of the money costs of that conflict was raised by taxes. The rest of it—55 percent—was postponed to the future through the issuance of bonds. Whatever new expenditures are undertaken now will have to be paid for either through taxes or through another increase in the national debt with consequent inflation. The Kremlin expects this country to take the easy way out, that is, to hold taxes down and to trust that somehow, some time in the future the debt will be paid. Russia is counting on us to bring about our own fiscal collapse by our failure to support necessary military outlays by increased taxes.

Congress is ready now to approve increased military expenditures. Such appropriations should be accompanied by a tax bill which will finance the expense without increasing the debt.

Fortunately, it will be much easier to do this than would at first appear. Military expenditure will increase production; production will increase the income of the people and a portion of this increased income turned into defense channels by a preparedness tax law would make it possible to avoid another increase of the national debt.

Higher taxes would have another beneficial effect. They would constitute an effective substitute for rigid economic controls. In World War II we kept the tax rates lower than they might have been. Rigid controls were therefore necessary, though we were unwilling, in the use of controls, to freeze prices, wages, and profits across the board. Higher taxes now to meet the increased expenditures which everyone believes inevitable will reduce the money available for civilian purchases and will thus operate to divert industrial production from civilian commodities to military commodities. A preparedness tax bill would enable all the people to contribute the buying power necessary to finance the concentrated military production required for the preservation of the free world. For some time to come we

Accordingly, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate Concurrent Resolution 91.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not quite understand how it is that one name has been stricken from the resolution and nine have been added.

Mr. McCARRAN. The House has a right to strike out names and to add others, and when they add others those names come back to the Senate committee for screening.

Mr. WHERRY. That has been done, and the Senator is satisfied with the screening?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection. The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 95) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which were on page 25, strike out line 5, and on page 32, after line 20, to insert:

A-4001725, Bortolotto, Paolo.

A-6357871, Calovich, Mary or Mara Abram alias Mary Car.

A-7284887, Didner, Samuel.

A-7203602, Edguld, Arturo M. or Arturo Maatubank Edguld.

A-7511431, Livanos, Arietta Stavros nee Zafirakis.

A-1931325, Mondillo, Giovanni Battista alias Giuseppe Battista Mondilla or Gio Batta Mondillo.

A-8643089, Tonseth, Johanna Katharina Flood.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the House has amended Senate Concurrent Resolution 95. The amendments strike out the name of an alien in a case which has been withdrawn by the Attorney General, and adds the names of seven additional aliens.

It is recommended by the committee staff and by the committee that the Senate concur in the House amendments. We have screened these additional aliens, and concur in the House amendments. I therefore move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Arizona. The appropriation bill which is now before the Senate, in the items dealing with the Bureau of Reclamation, has abandoned the form which was used in prior years, so that individual projects are not mentioned.

Mr. HAYDEN. That change was made at the suggestion of the House of Repre-

sentatives. What appear in the bill now are lump sums. In order to obtain a break-down of the lump sums, one must examine the House committee report and the Senate committee report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to have the attention of the minority leader, also, please.

Last year when we passed the Interior Department appropriation bill, it contained two legislative limitations upon the expenditure of funds which were appropriated for the Missouri River Basin. The first of these was one upon which the junior Senator from Nebraska and the present speaker agreed with respect to the Glendo unit. That amendment reads as follows, being a provision of the existing appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1950:

Provided further, That in order to promote agreement among the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado and to avoid any possible alteration of existing vested water rights, no part of this or of any prior appropriation shall be used for construction or for further commitment for construction of the Glendo unit or any feature thereof, until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado and approved by Congress: *Provided further*, That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction, nor for further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Montana, or any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress:

Mr. President, the purpose of the two amendments was to provide that since the streams involved are interstate streams, there should be, in the spirit of the existing law, complete agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation, representing the Federal Government, and the States affected, before any expenditure should be made for either of these units.

The definite plan report and the review and the approval required of Congress have not been had in either case. Nevertheless, a reading of these two amendments will show that they refer only to limitations on the appropriations carried in the appropriation bill for 1950 and prior appropriations. In order to make a proper legislative enactment, there should now be an amendment to this bill providing that no part of this appropriation shall be expended for either purpose. But inasmuch as last year's bill required the preparation of a definite plan and report, to be submitted to the States and to be approved by Congress, it will not be necessary.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was about to suggest that, since the Senators from Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado were in perfect accord last year, nothing should be done until the authorities in their several States have had an opportunity to examine and agree to these matters. Obviously the Bureau of Reclamation should spend no money for the units referred to by the Senator from Wyoming, until the States have satisfied themselves. I do not think it is necessary to incorporate such a provision in the bill, because the understanding is perfectly clear. It was expressed here on the floor

that it should be binding on the Reclamation Service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am satisfied that by the legislative recognition of this situation, and in view of the legislative history of the matter, the Bureau of Reclamation will recognize what we are doing, just as the Bureau has always regarded a statement in a report as being a directive to be followed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Obviously, if the directive of last year could not be complied with within the time available, and the States have not had an opportunity to examine into this matter, nothing should be done, on the face of it, until an understanding is arrived at.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think we appreciate the action of the Senator from Wyoming in calling attention to this provision. It apparently is not in the bill. I deeply appreciate the remarks of the chairman, with whom I am in entire agreement. I am also in agreement with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. I hope there will be no objection, since it was done last year. Personally, if there is no objection, I should like to see this language included in the bill. My reason for it is that there has been a great deal of question as to whether a committee report governs in such cases. That question has been raised on the Senate floor and discussed at length in the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill. I appreciate the legislative history which is being made now, upon which there is absolutely complete accord. In view of the fact that all the States went to such length and a compromise was reached, on which they are in total agreement, even though it be legislation on an appropriation bill, since it was included in an appropriation bill once, I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will prepare the amendment and offer it for insertion in the bill. That is the least we can do. If it is thrown out on a point of order, we can do nothing about that, but at least I should prefer to have it in the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I personally believe that is the proper way of accomplishing what is desired. I believe the most expeditious way of handling it then is for me to ask unanimous consent, inasmuch as this is a legislative matter, that a legislative amendment may be added to this bill, providing that no part of the current appropriation may be expended for the purposes set forth, with respect to the Glendo unit and the Moorhead unit in the appropriation bill for 1950.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, what the Senator is now proposing is that we repeat the text of last year's bill, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly.

Mr. WHERRY. Then if any Senator wants to object to it or to debate it, he will have a perfect right to do so.

But certainly I shall not object to such a unanimous-consent proposal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Wyoming proposing to make it a part of the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his request.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My request is for unanimous consent to insert in this bill the complete text of the two amendments which were approved by the Congress last year with respect to the Glendo unit and the Moorhead unit in the Missouri River appropriation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator's offering such an amendment, which is an amendment to perfect the bill? The Chair hears none. Will the Senator send his amendment to the desk to be stated?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the amendment which I propose will be found marked on pages 21 and 22 of the appropriation bill for 1950. I ask that these two amendments be now stated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is the amendment in the exact form of the amendment which was inserted in the bill last year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They will be stated by the clerk precisely as they appear in the present law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That in order to promote agreement among the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and to avoid any possible alteration of existing vested water rights, no part of this or of any prior appropriation shall be used for construction or for further commitment for construction of the Glendo unit, or any feature thereof, until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and approved by Congress: *Provided further*, That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction, nor for further commitments to construction, of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Mont., or any feature thereof, until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on page 152 of the report which was submitted by the Appropriations Committee on the Interior Department appropriation bill, there is a proviso, to which my colleague, the junior Senator from Wyoming, and I have both agreed, which reads as follows:

KEYHOLE DAM, WYO.

The 1951 estimate for this project appears under phase A in the amount of \$3,179,000, which has been allowed by the committee. However, representations have been made to the committee that the water supply on the Belle Fourche River is such that under the Wyoming-South Dakota compact of February 18, 1943, it may be difficult to fill this proposed reservoir. Under the terms of the compact between the two States, there is no limitation upon the number of small reservoirs which may be built in Wyoming. It is the opinion of the committee that a comprehensive study of the future water supply

should be made before construction is undertaken.

Mr. President, this matter has been the subject of a great deal of consideration by the water authorities of the State of Wyoming. I have in my hand a letter from the State engineer, Mr. L. C. Bishop, together with a photostatic copy of a letter which he received from District Engineer Francis M. Bell, of the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, with respect to this matter. There is no question that under the compact between the two States, Wyoming has the right to build these small reservoirs. What the effect may be upon the water supply, I do not pretend to know. Some residents of the State say that there will not be sufficient water. But the State engineer of Wyoming writes me, in this letter, as follows:

The enclosed copy of a letter received recently from Mr. Francis M. Bell, district engineer, United States Geological Survey, Denver, Colo., is self-explanatory. This information from Mr. Bell was at the request of Mr. James Munro, of Sheridan, who represents some of the landowners above Keyhole dam site, and who insists that there will be no water for the reservoir because under the Belle Fourche River compact, all of it will be held back in stock reservoirs. I do not agree with Mr. Munro on this.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the State engineer's letter may be printed as a part of my remarks. I read it, because I want to emphasize the essential nature of the recommendation made in the committee's report, that the Bureau of Reclamation undertake a close scrutiny of this water supply before any construction is initiated.

There being no objection, the letter, with its enclosure, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WYOMING,
STATE ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
Cheyenne, July 5, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senator from Wyoming,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 1 with reference to the water supply for the Keyhole Reservoir.

It is my own opinion based on a review of the report of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the records of the United States Geological Survey and my own knowledge of the water shed above Keyhole Dam site that the average flow above the dam will average between 20,000 and 26,000 acre-feet per year.

The enclosed copy of a letter received recently from Mr. Francis M. Bell, district engineer, United States Geological Survey, Denver, Colo., is self-explanatory. This information from Mr. Bell was at the request of Mr. James Munro, of Sheridan, who represents some of the landowners above Keyhole Dam site, and who insists that there will be no water for the reservoir because under the Belle Fourche River compact, all of it will be held back in stock reservoirs. I do not agree with Mr. Munro on this.

The Bureau of Reclamation estimates the 1929-47 average runoff of the Belle Fourche River above Keyhole Dam at 28,500 acre-feet with a maximum of 243,000 acre-feet in 1929, and a minimum of 3,100 acre-feet in 1934.

In a stream with such large variation in its runoff, a large capacity reservoir is necessary as you know to hold over irrigation water for the short years and control the floods if and when they come.

Since you have a copy of the definite plan report of the Keyhole unit, Cheyenne divi-

sion, South Dakota, Missouri River Basin project, I will conclude by saying that our office is in general agreement with this report although we do believe that the height of the water level of the dam could well be reduced 10 feet, and thus save a million dollars or more in the cost of construction. This we agree will impair the flood-control value to a great extent, and also reduce the carry-over capacity, which, according to past records, will be needed. We urged this at the hearing in Moorcroft, but the Bureau officials did not see fit to make this change.

As you know in allowing the permit, we required an outlet to be constructed at the bottom of the pool and a compromise was later made with the Bureau officials whereby a 24-inch outlet may be placed at elevation 4,034 or 14 feet above the bottom of the pool, and about 1,000 acre-feet of water held as dead storage. The original plan proposed a dead storage of about 10,000 acre-feet.

Yours very truly,

L. C. BISHOP,
State Engineer.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
Denver, Colo., June 5, 1950.

Mr. L. C. BISHOP,
State Engineer, Cheyenne, Wyo.

DEAR MR. BISHOP: I am sending to Mr. Eisenhower at Sheridan a copy of your letter of May 31 relative to average flow of the Belle Fourche River and by copy of this letter am suggesting that he obtain a series of comparative measurements at the Moorcroft gage and at the Keyhole Dam site. Since the Moorcroft gage is located at the upper end of the proposed reservoir, it is my personal opinion that measurements will show no decided increase in flow between the gage and the dam site unless there are some spring-fed streams in the intervening area. Apparently the additional area involved is less than 200 square miles.

Unfortunately, the Moorcroft record itself is too short to permit any accurate determination of average annual discharge. The Moorcroft record is in two periods, the first of which is broken. During the second period the gage was at a different location. The longest record in that part of Wyoming is on the Powder River at Arvada, and although that is a much larger stream it seems reasonable to assume that over a period of time both streams would behave in a similar manner. On this assumption, average discharge may be computed for each period of record for Moorcroft and for the two periods considered as one. The calculations are as follows:

FIRST PERIOD

Average discharge Moorcroft, 1924-32 equals 79 cubic feet per second.

Average discharge Arvada, 1924-32 equals 534 cubic feet per second.

Average discharge Arvada, 1916-49 equals 426 cubic feet per second.

Computed Moorcroft, 1916-49 equals 63 cubic feet per second equals 45,500 Af. (approximate).

SECOND PERIOD

Average discharge Moorcroft, 1944-49 equals 25.5 cubic feet per second.

Average discharge Arvada, 1944-49 equals 330 cubic feet per second.

Average discharge Arvada, 1916-49 equals 426 cubic feet per second.

Computed Moorcroft, 1916-49 equals 33 cubic feet per second equals 23,900 Af. (approximate).

BOTH PERIODS

Average discharge Moorcroft, 1924-32, 1944-49 equals 56 cubic feet per second.

Average discharge Arvada, 1924-32, 1944-49 equals 447 cubic feet per second.

Average discharge Arvada, 1916-49 equals 426 cubic feet per second.

Computed Moorcroft, 1916-49 equals 53 cubic feet per second equals 39,400 Af. (approximate).

The wide range in these values indicates that the original assumption is not entirely correct. However, it seems reasonable to assume that the longer the period of comparison the more accurate would be the result. On this basis the average Moorcroft discharge would be 39,400 acre-feet. It should be pointed out, however, that included in this figure are 2 years of extremely high run-off. If those 2 years were not considered, the figure would be reduced to 22,200 acre-feet which closely approximates the figure obtained by using only the last 6 years of record. Thus, it would appear that the true average annual discharge is somewhere between 22,000 and 39,000 acre-feet.

In view of the influence on the average discharge of the extremely high run-off years of 1924 and 1929, another comparative study may be made using median discharge rather than mean. On this basis it may be determined that the median discharge (likely to occur 50 percent of the time) is about 21,500 acre-feet. Since this method is statistically incorrect this figure cannot be given full weight despite the fact that personal judgment indicates it may not be too far out of line.

Because of the short, broken record at Moorcroft a detailed analysis of precipitation-run-off relations would be required to obtain an idea of the correct annual discharge at the Keyhole dam site or at Moorcroft. Superficial studies of available stream-flow records as shown above indicate that in an ordinary period of years run-off would average about 22,000 acre-feet. However, the occasional occurrence of an extraordinary wet year such as 1924 would greatly increase the average.

Information contained herein should be considered as preliminary and provisional. The results of comparative measurements may throw additional light on the subject.

Very truly yours,

FRANCIS M. BELL,
District Engineer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Arizona, will recall, on pages 837 to 841 of the Senate hearings on the measure a justification was presented by the Bureau of Reclamation for the proposed development of a cooperative farm upon the Riverton project. Included in the testimony is a letter from President Humphrey, of the University of Wyoming. The letter sets forth the interest of the university in the establishment of a development farm on the Riverton project under a cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation, Soil Conservation Service, the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture.

I did not seek to offer any amendment, and I do not now, because the Reclamation Omnibus Adjustment Act, section 40, provides as follows:

Provided, That in connection with the settlement and development of each of these projects the Secretary of the Interior is authorized in his discretion to enter into agreements with the proper authorities of the State or States wherein said projects or divisions are located, whereby such State or States shall cooperate with the United States in promoting the settlement of the projects or divisions after completion and in the securing and selecting of settlers.

So I think the legislative authority is quite sufficient for such a cooperative agreement if the State authorities and the Bureau of Reclamation see fit to carry it out. It is an agreement which I heartily recommend. The Riverton project is one of the most productive and one of the oldest under the reclamation law, and it would be very helpful in encouraging settlement if such a cooperative farm should be established.

Mr. President, I should like to say that I felt it would be very desirable if this farm should include a soil-testing station, but that is a matter to be worked out.

Does the Senator from Arizona agree with the statement which I have made?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am quite sure that the Senator's quotation from the law is correct. There was no budget estimate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 250, line 5, to strike out "\$7,000,000" and to insert "\$7,400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate was treated to the spectacle of a blistering demonstration in a seemingly desperate effort to prove that a fraud and a hoax have been committed by one of its own Members.

The effect of that demonstration will be determined in part by public reaction to the majority report of the Foreign Relations Committee's subcommittee investigating disloyalty in the State Department, when compared to the individual views of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] who has been a minority member of the subcommittee. It will be determined also by public reaction to any political motivation behind the demonstration.

Charges of a fraud and a hoax, with or without provocation, whether substantiated or unsubstantiated, should not be allowed to serve as camouflage for dereliction in duty or failure in performance on the part of those preferring the charges.

Errors in commission by some should not blind us to errors in omission by others.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations had been given the task of conducting a full and complete study and investigation as to whether persons who are disloyal to the United States are or have been employed by the Department of State.

Its duties and functions were not to be limited or confined to an investigation of the charges by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

To the contrary, if there was one function not specifically assigned to the committee, it was an investigation of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] himself.

In fact, investigation of the McCarthy charges was purposely omitted from the text of Senate Resolution 231 as a result of debate in the Senate last February 21.

That resolution as originally offered was as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation as to whether persons who are disloyal to the United States are employed by the Department of State as charged by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

At that time I objected to the inclusion of the words "as charged by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and, speaking on the subject before the Senate, I spoke, in part, as follows; and my remarks can be found at page 2106 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I do not like to see this particular investigation limited to the charges made by one particular individual. * * * If we are going into this matter, it seems to me that we very definitely should not limit the investigation to those charges. If there are conditions in the State Department which ought to be investigated, they certainly ought to be investigated in full, and the investigation should not be limited in any respect.

I wish to say that I intend at the proper time to move to amend the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] by deleting the words "as charged by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]." That would give us a clear investigation of the type which it seems to me should be undertaken if an investigation at all is to be conducted.

After some debate on the question, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] made the following statement, which appears at page 2108 of the RECORD:

I have conferred with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and with other Members of the Senate. We believe that the amendment which was suggested by the able Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is in keeping with the best interests of what we believe to be a thorough and fair investigation. I should like to modify my resolution by striking out * * * the words * * * "as charged by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]."

Subsequently, these words were stricken from the resolution, and the resolution in its final form was adopted on February 22, 1950.

Not until yesterday, however, was the cat let out of the bag when the majority leader stated that the Democratic policy committee drafted the resolution for this investigation.

So there may be some who feel that if a fraud and a hoax have been perpetrated on the Senate of the United States and the American people, such perpetration is evident in the apparently deliberate action of the subcommittee in disregarding the will of the Senate, as expressed in the debate on February 21, and in Senate Resolution 231, as finally adopted by the Senate.

The tone of the report and yesterday's presentation by the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. TYDINGS] show beyond question that the subcommittee's investigation has been aimed primarily and exclusively at the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

The individual views of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and yesterday's statement before the Senate by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] offer compelling evidence that the subcommittee has not performed the function assigned by the Senate to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

With this task, therefore, wholly uncompleted and with no evident effort or even desire to complete it on the part of the majority responsible for it, this important work should now be assigned to a body qualified to finish the undertaking as originally directed by the Senate.

For this reason I strongly support and urge favorable action on the proposal of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], or on any other appropriate proposal, by which the job can be properly concluded.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation to the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] for having so completely and indisputably cleared the record. Our subcommittee was specifically directed by the Senate not to make its work an investigation of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did I understand the Senator from Massachusetts to say that the subcommittee was instructed not to investigate the charges of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LODGE. In effect, yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. How does the Senator come to that conclusion?

Mr. LODGE. I came to that conclusion by listening to the record just read by the Senator from New York, which showed that the Senate voted to strike out the language of the original resolution which provided that the committee should investigate the charges of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator from Massachusetts realize that the Senator from New York was trying to broaden the scope of the investigation and not to eliminate the charges of the Senator from Wisconsin? It was clearly stated by him that he wanted those charges investigated.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Now the Senator from Massachusetts says the committee was not to investigate those charges.

Mr. LODGE. Not to concentrate and focus on them.

Mr. ANDERSON. How much should the committee have done?

Mr. LODGE. I think they should have gone to the whole question of foreign penetration, I will say to my good friend from New Mexico, and the committee definitely did not do that. To create the impression before the country that we have considered the whole question of foreign penetration, to use a not very kind expression—but it is true nevertheless—would be an attempt to hoodwink the country.

Yesterday reference was made a number of times to what I thought about various phases of the investigation. As

a matter of fact, I think every single reference was inaccurate and was based on partial quotations or quotations taken out of context. Therefore today I plan to set the RECORD straight about myself. I shall do so in four or five different parts, and I shall not yield while I am discussing a particular point. When I get through with the discussion of a particular point I shall be very glad to yield for questions. It is understandable that Senators should want to quote each other, but I think that when a Senator is in good health, and is here and not in Siberia, or some other place, it is better to let him speak for himself.

The Senate heard statements made about my vote in the subcommittee in relation to the case of Mr. Philip Jessup. As I recall, we were asked to vote on whether or not the investigation had cleared him, or words to that effect. Let me say that I am very glad to take the word of General Eisenhower for the fact that Mr. Jessup is a splendid American. I would be very much surprised if an investigation into Mr. Jessup were to reveal that he was not a splendid American. However, though I may be wrong about it, when the motion was made in the subcommittee I had the feeling that it was similar in effect to the question which a lawyer may sometimes ask a man as to when he had stopped beating his wife. I thought it was an attempt to be very clever about it, if Senators know what I mean, instead of being frank about it and playing it straight across the board on the merits. I will say that if Mr. Jessup had been investigated I would not have hesitated to vote my conviction on what the investigation showed. It is certainly contrary to the facts, and not at all helpful to Mr. Jessup, to pretend that an investigation has been held when in fact no investigation has been held. There were only two individual cases which the committee investigated. One was the case of John Service, and the other of Owen Lattimore. The Owen Lattimore investigation was, as I shall show in a minute, most incomplete. However, an attempt was made to investigate him.

The Senate was told yesterday what happened after the vote was taken on Mr. Jessup. It seems to me it is always much better when trying to give the story of what went on in one of the subcommittee meetings to give the whole story and let the Senate judge for itself, instead of trying to censor the account which the Senate gets. After the vote on Mr. Jessup was taken, which was a vote of three voting in favor of Mr. Jessup and two members of the committee voting "present," I moved that the committee report a resolution establishing a bipartisan commission to clear up this whole question once and for all. I still think the country demands something of that sort. The motion was defeated, with only two members voting in favor of it. So much for the last meeting of the subcommittee.

Reference has been made to my position with regard to Owen Lattimore. It has been stated that I cleared him. I would prefer to have the word "cleared" set off in quotation marks, because it

pops up all the time. I say to the Senate very frankly that sufficient evidence was not developed with regard to Mr. Lattimore to enable me to clear him or not to clear him. The most I could say, as I said in my individual views—and it is all there for Senators to read—was that the evidence which had been developed did not sustain the charge that he was the "top architect of American foreign policy in the Far East," or that he was the "chief Communist agent in the United States." The most pertinent questions about Mr. Lattimore were never asked. They were questions which would have to be asked in executive session and we were never given a chance to have an executive session in which to ask those questions, although I tried many times to get those questions asked. The pertinent questions related to whether or not Mr. Lattimore influenced American foreign policy. It is perfectly clear of course that he never held a major office in the State Department. That was not the point. The point was whether the unofficial influence which he may have had on the policy makers in the State Department was extensive, and if he did have that influence whether his influence was good or bad. That was an extremely pertinent matter.

I should like to read a few of the questions which I thought should have been asked with regard to this subject. Here are questions in the Lattimore case, which were not covered.

I refer to my individual views:

There is no authoritative and detailed presentation in the record from the State Department setting forth precise evidence, dates, etc., concerning Mr. Lattimore's relationship in the State Department. The persons mentioned by Mr. Budenz as having had relations with Mr. Lattimore have not been examined. There were some 16 in number.

Those who headed the China desk in the State Department have not been questioned to determine whether Mr. Lattimore gave advice on United States policy on China, and whether his advice was followed.

The United States Ambassadors to China who held that office during Mr. Lattimore's period of activity have not been questioned along the same line.

One can very well see that those are pertinent questions. They are questions which could not be gone into in public.

The subcommittee has not discovered whether any new information has come into the possession of the Department of Justice respecting Mr. Lattimore since March 24, 1950, when the members of the subcommittee were allowed to see a summary of Mr. Lattimore's file.

On April 25, Mr. Budenz stated that he would furnish the subcommittee with names of Communists whom he knew to be in the State Department. That list has not come to the subcommittee.

Investigation has not been made of all those whom Mr. Lattimore is supposed to have brought into the Institute of Pacific Relations.

It seems to me that those are all legitimate questions which a trained commission would go into, and which anyone would desire to go into who wanted to reach a dependable conclusion about this case.

This went to the very heart of the whole Lattimore question and it is a pity

cannot be done. I hope that it will be done whenever possible. I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon still wish the floor?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, if it is in order, I wish to move an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not in order until the bill is before the Senate. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3859) to authorize the President to control the anchorage and movement of foreign-flag vessels in waters of the United States when the national security of the United States is endangered, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment was on page 2, line 6, after the word "necessary", to strike out "in his opinion."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I desire to ask the reason for striking out those words. Let me state the point that occurs to me. If I am in error, I am readily susceptible to correction; but I should like to state the point. As I see it, the effect of striking out the words "in his opinion" is to leave it as a question of fact as to whether it is in fact necessary, in order to secure the vessels, that the action may be taken; whereas, if the words "in his opinion" are retained, it leaves it to the President's opinion to determine whether it is necessary. I am wondering whether the committee thinks it advisable to make the amendment—whether the committee thinks it should be narrow, confined to the question of whether there is actual necessity, or whether the committee thinks it better to leave it to the President's own opinion. That is the inquiry I should like to address to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from Missouri that the Senator from Maine was somewhat concerned, not about giving the President the authority, but that a subversive might be picked up on the waterfront who might go into court and even subpoena the President, for the purpose of determining whether the facts supported his opinion that he should declare a waterfront emergency. The Senator from Maine and I agree that the bill would not be damaged in any way by striking out those words, and that it might make clear what we really intended.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. This restriction appears both in line 6 and in line 13, where it reads "not especially authorized by him." I raised the question in both instances, because it is quite ob-

vious that the President of the United States would be a little too busy to have an opinion about this ship or about protecting people who go abroad. Therefore, it is another example of the tendency in recent years to repose all power in the President, understanding that he must necessarily delegate the authority. The tradition of America is to delegate it to the responsible authority, a Cabinet officer or some other official of the Government, and it is contemplated that the President, in his rules and regulations, will determine who shall exercise the authority. I believe that when this bill goes to conference, appropriate language will then emerge which will be a provision that it shall be determined by competent, recognized, or duly created authority; which is the way I think it should be.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the explanation. I think it would be rather unfortunate to require as a condition precedent to the right of the President to take this action that there must be demonstrated and established as a matter of fact the existence of the necessity.

Mr. BREWSTER. I quite agree.

Mr. DONNELL. It seems to me it should be left, if not to the President, at least to a responsible official to use his opinion in determining whether the necessity exists. I am reassured by the assurance by both Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 14, to strike out "by him."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 13, after the word "States", to strike out "and in Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands" and insert "the Canal Zone, and all territory and water, continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, in line 1, after the word "available", to strike out "for the national defense" and insert "to the executive departments."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment was, after line 3, to insert a new section:

SEC. 2. Section 4 of title II of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220; U. S. C., title 50, sec. 194), is amended to read as follows:

"The President may employ such departments, agencies, officers, or instrumentalities of the United States as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this title."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment was, on line 10, to insert a new section:

SEC. 3. Section 2 of title II of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220; U. S. C., title 50, sec. 192), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(a) If any other person fails to comply with any regulation or rule issued or order given under the provisions of this title, or obstructs or interferes with the exercise of any power conferred by this title, he shall be

punished by imprisonment for not more than 10 years and may, at the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$10,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, with reference to the amendment on line 10, I am not certain as to whether the shortened reading by the clerk included all of that section. If it did, then I want to offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk advises the Chair that he read all of it. Is it an amendment to the committee amendment which the Senator wishes to offer?

Mr. CORDON. I desire to offer an amendment to the committee amendment inserting a new section, No. 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment having been agreed to, it will first be necessary to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to. Without objection, that will be done. The Senator may now offer his amendment.

Mr. CORDON. I desire to offer an amendment to section 3, on page 3, line 14, after the word "person", to insert "knowingly"; and, in line 16, before the word "obstructs", to insert "knowingly."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 14, after the word "person" insert "knowingly"; and in line 16, before the word "obstructs" insert the word "knowingly."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. Without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if I may address an inquiry, by unanimous consent, to the distinguished Senator from Washington, I desire to say first that I appreciate the fact that action was taken a moment ago on the amendment on page 3, line 1. I am asking, however, to revert to that for the purpose of my inquiry. It states, as amended, "Any appropriation available to the executive departments shall be available to carry out the provisions of this paragraph." It occurs to me, from a very hasty glance at it, that we may be making a mistake there. I do not know whether there is any appropriation that is available to all executive departments. Would it not be better if it should read "any appropriation available to any of the executive departments?"

Mr. MAGNUSON. That would serve the same purpose. The Coast Guard, as the Senator knows, is under the Treasury Department. The main responsibility for inspection would be in the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard is not under the Department of National Defense. I have always advocated that it should have stayed there, but it went back to the Treasury Department.

Mr. DONNELL. It might be that we would have to find an appropriation available to all executive departments, and there might be none such.

Mr. President, I respectfully move that the Senate reconsider the action by which the amendment was agreed to,

and that the amendment shall read "to any of the executive departments."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall be glad to accept that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the action of the Senate in agreeing to the amendment will be reconsidered.

The clerk will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 1, after the word "to," it is proposed to insert "any of."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 20, it is proposed to strike out the words "on or", and in line 21, to strike out "earlier."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of title II of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 217; U. S. C., title 50, section 191), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Whenever the President finds that the security of the United States is endangered by reason of actual or threatened war, or invasion, or of disturbances or threatened disturbances of the international relations of the United States, the President is authorized to institute such measures and issue such rules and regulations—

"(a) to govern the anchorage and movement of any foreign-flag vessels in the territorial waters of the United States, to inspect such vessels at any time, to place guards thereon, and, if necessary in order to secure such vessels from damage or injury, or to prevent damage or injury to any harbor or waters of the United States, or to secure the observance of rights and obligations to the United States, may take for such purposes full possession and control of such vessels and remove therefrom the officers and crew thereof, and all other persons not especially authorized to go or remain on board thereof;

"(b) to safeguard against destruction, loss, or injury from sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents, or other causes of similar nature, vessels, harbors, ports, and waterfront facilities in the United States, the Canal Zone, and all territory and water, continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

Any appropriation available to any of the Executive Departments shall be available to carry out the provisions of this paragraph."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of title II of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220; U. S. C., title 50, section 194), is amended to read as follows:

"The President may employ such departments, agencies, officers, or instrumentalities of the United States as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this title."

SEC. 3. Section 2 of title II of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220; U. S. C., title 50, section 192), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(a) If any other person knowingly fails to comply with any regulation or rule issued or order given under the provisions of this title, or knowingly obstructs or interferes with the exercise of any power conferred by

this title, he shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 10 years and may, at the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$10,000."

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall expire on such date as may be specified by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, with reference to the appropriation bill, I have two amendments on the desk. If on Monday or Tuesday of next week the section of the bill to which my amendments relate should be agreed to, I hope I may be permitted to discuss them after that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the amendments are to the text of the bill, it would not be in order to consider them until all committee amendments are disposed of.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am quite satisfied that the bill will not be passed before next Tuesday. I have no objection to the Senator's request.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I doubt that the bill will pass by that time, but I hope the Senator will help to expedite its passage.

Mr. WHERRY. I am satisfied that if the Senator from Washington will withdraw his request there will not be any difficulty about it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I can ask unanimous consent upon my return.

Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I submit the following resolution and ask that it be received and lie on the table.

Whereas Report No. 2108, entitled "State Department Employee Loyalty Investigation," as printed and distributed on July 21 differs from the report submitted to the Senate on July 20 in certain important respects, particularly in being called on the cover sheet a "Report of the Committee"; and

Whereas it does not appear that the Foreign Relations Committee has adopted the report; and

Whereas a false impression of the status of this report will be spread abroad by the cover which has been substituted since it was received by this body: Therefore be it

Resolved, That said Report No. 2108 be at once withdrawn from distribution until the cover be replaced to agree with that covering the report as submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received.

The resolution (S. Res. 316) submitted by Mr. FLANDERS, was received and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I am sorry that the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has seen fit to absent himself from the Chamber. I have always understood that the free

State of Maryland prided itself on its tolerance. As I understand, tolerance means an attitude of forbearance toward the views, opinions, and actions of others, even though one finds oneself not entirely in accord with them. I am sorry, too, that the Senator from Maryland is not here because I wanted to pay my tribute to the magnificent histrionic performance which he afforded us yesterday afternoon. I have always enjoyed the theater, Mr. President. I think I know a good show when I see one, and the Senator's performance was good theater from beginning to end.

The decision of the Senator from Maryland to enter the field of statecraft deprived the stage of a shining luminary. The Senator compared the work of his committee with the performance of Macbeth. In my opinion, Mr. President, that part is not exactly suited to the Senator's superb talents. I should rather see him cast in the role of the melancholy Dane. I have, however, a further suggestion. I think the Senator from Maryland would make one of the outstanding Simon Legrees of all times. I can see him now, with a handlebar mustache, high boots, black-snake whip in hand, crossing a river of artificial ice, pursuing with inexorable fury an Uncle Tom, a Little Eva, or perhaps a Joe McCarthy.

George Bernard Shaw once said that it is an extremely difficult thing to put on the stage anything which runs contrary to the opinions of a large body of persons. I think we should bear that in mind in judging the performance of the Senator from Maryland. I think he must have known, when he spoke, that the show he was putting on ran contrary to the opinions of a large body of the American people. I think we should judge his art and his high skill with that in mind.

When the Senator had completed his performance yesterday I think many of us left the Chamber uncertain whether we had seen a farce, a comedy, or a tragedy. For my part, at one point, at least, the Senator, in his performance, reached high tragedy. I was sorry to see the Senator, for whom I have always had and still have a high regard, stoop to an argument unworthy of him. I refer, of course, to the argument he made that all those who in this Chamber have supported a reduction in Marshall plan aid funds were associates of Stalin and playing the Communist line.

I want to be perfectly fair to the Senator. I shall not give any opportunity for misquotation to arise. Therefore I shall read the exact language of the Senator with reference to the argument to which I have referred. I read as follows:

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have in my hand an editorial or statement by Mr. William Z. Foster, noted Communist, writing in Political Affairs. He advocates, as the major point, it seems to me, reduction of the Marshall-plan aid, and the cutting of the arms budget for the Atlantic Pact countries, and so forth. These are issues around which the masses can be rallied. I find that when it comes to cutting the arms aid, and cutting the Marshall-plan aid, the Senator from Indiana has a wonderful record. He has voted against the Marshall-plan aid. He

ceeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistance, to require by subpoena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to make such investigations, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to incur such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The statement presented by Mr. FERGUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

I have submitted to the Senate a resolution calling for the creation of a special committee to monitor the immediate defense effort in the same way that the Truman Committee functioned in the late war. The occasion for such a committee is already here because we are involved in an international police effort approximating war and we are stepping up our home and the Atlantic nation's preparedness efforts far in excess of normal peacetime operations.

Accordingly, the Senate should have at its immediate disposal an instrument in the form of a special committee which can inquire into the progress we are making, monitor the programs being launched, inquire into such bottlenecks as develop, expedite procurement operations, examine contracts, and guard against waste in the use of Government funds in the same efficient manner as was done by the Truman committee.

It is not my intention to have this committee interfere in any manner with the work of other committees. The Armed Services Committee will still have the vital job of keeping its finger on the work and problems of the Armed Services. The Appropriations Committee and the Expenditures Committee will have all they can handle to keep track of the Nation's expenditures for military and civilian purposes. Other committees will still have the job of supervising legislative matters of priorities, allocations, Government contracts, credit policies, and other important phases of the civilian economy and its relation to the preparedness efforts.

But by the very nature of things all these efforts of our regular standing committees must be compartmentalized because jurisdiction over the country's affairs is divided among 15 or more committees. There is urgent need today, just as there was when the Truman committee was formed, for a special committee with full investigatory powers to cut across jurisdictional lines for the purpose of considering problems from many angles and to do the important job of coordination which proved so valuable in the operations of the Truman committee.

The resolution I have proposed calls upon the President of the Senate to appoint a special committee of seven Senators and the presumption is that they will be selected from the several different regular committees which will be immediately concerned with our enlarged preparedness efforts. As in the Truman committee, I hope this new committee will be representative of both our major political parties so as to make the committee national in character in keeping with the high ideals and motives which compel us to engage upon a preparedness program at this time.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT—CHANGE IN CONFEREES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]

be substituted for that of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] as a member of the conference committee conferring on the FDIC bill (S. 2822) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and the substitution will be made.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION—PRINTING OF SENATE BILL WITH HOUSE AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill dealing with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Senate bill 2822, be printed with the House amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 7786), making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 478, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"Sec. . No funds or contract authorizations made available by this act shall be used for the construction of any structure, work, or other project unless (1) such construction is certified by the Secretary of Defense to be essential to national security, or (2) the construction of such structure, work, or other project has been commenced prior to the enactment of this act, and substantial detriment to the interests of the United States will result if the proposed further construction is not carried out."

Mr. WILLIAMS also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7786, making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

CONDITIONS IN ITALY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BENTON

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by him regarding conditions in Italy, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE KOREAN CRISIS AND UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—ADDRESS BY GEORGE N. CRAIG

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the Korean crisis and the need for universal military training, delivered by George N. Craig, national commander, American Legion, before the Special Conference of Department Commanders of the The American Legion in Indianapolis, on July 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

KOREA AS A TEST OF WORLD LAW—ARTICLE BY DR. PAUL F. DOUGLASS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article en-

titled "Test of World Law," written by Dr. Paul F. Douglass, president of American University for the United Nations League of Lawyers, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESETTLEMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS IN WISCONSIN—ARTICLE FROM LA CROSSE REGISTER

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to the resettlement of displaced persons in Wisconsin, published in the La Crosse Register of July 21, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ABANDONMENT BY NORWAY OF SUBSIDY PLAN FOR AGRICULTURE

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Norway Subsidy Plan Too Expensive," published in the St. Paul Dispatch of Thursday, July 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CASE OF MR. KRIPS—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Case of Mr. Krips," published in the New York Times of July 21, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S MILITARY PROGRAM—\$3,000,000,000 ECA PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, taxes need not be raised to meet the cost of the President's military program. The President has requested \$10,000,000,000 for the program. In the face of oncoming war and our preparation for it, the ECA, formerly called the Marshall plan, a peacetime endeavor, could be stopped. The ECA's \$3,000,000,000 could now be used for the President's expanded military program.

Mr. President, other strictly peacetime projects costing the heavily-burdened American taxpayers billions of dollars, should also be stopped during the time the taxpayers are being called upon to pay for the big military program.

ECA FUNDS DIVERTED INSTEAD OF HIGHER TAXES

The \$3,000,000,000 which we could save from ECA would be a big start. We can save more money elsewhere in the budget expenditures without having to increase taxes. It is well known and the statement appeared in press dispatches during the past few days that the actual estimate of the Armed Services for fighting the Korean war is about \$5,000,000,000.

PEACETIME DEFICIT

Apparently the remainder is for preparations elsewhere, except that the President does need probably from three and a half to five billion dollars to cover up his peacetime deficit, which has not been mentioned since the Korean war began, or, rather, since the President said we were pursuing a police action in Korea.

ONE BILLION TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Another \$1,250,000,000 could be found in the appropriation for military assistance to foreign countries. That money could be better spent on our own military preparations.

ECA COUNTRIES' LOYALTY QUESTIONABLE

I doubt if most of the countries receiving our assistance would come to our aid. As a matter of fact, in the present emergency, one after another of the countries has said, "Sorry, we cannot send our men. Some of the things you gave us, maybe, but not our manpower."

Further support of the position which the junior Senator from Nevada takes in this matter may be found in the title of the original ECA statute, Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, chapter 169, second session.

ECA NOT CONSISTENT WITH STABILITY OF UNITED STATES

After reciting the things we are to do for the ECA or Marshall plan countries, it states:

And consistent with the maintenance of the strength and stability of the United States.

I submit that the continuation of aid under the Marshall plan, or ECA, of from three to five billion dollars a year, while we are preparing for war, is not consistent with the maintenance of the strength and stability of the United States.

Further, section 101 says:

This title may be cited as the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

PRESENT RECOVERY STATUS OF ECA NATIONS—NOTE OF RECOVERY

Economic cooperation for what? To expand peacetime facilities. All the argument and controversy about expanding the peacetime industrial facilities in the face of war preparation may be disregarded.

I should like at this time to submit for the RECORD a table showing the recovery of the ECA nations. All ECA nations show a 100-percent or greater recovery, on the basis of the 1937 percent industrial index, with the exception of Belgium, which shows a 95-percent recovery, Germany bizone, 95 percent, and Greece, 97 percent. The recovery of the remaining countries goes up as high as 148 percent, as in the case of Sweden. The United Kingdom's percentage is 124. The percentage of recovery from 1946, the year following the year, to 1947, and from 1947 and 1948, prior to the passage of the Marshall plan, was at about the same rate of recovery as from 1948 to 1949, and during 1949 and the first 3 months of 1950 under the Marshall plan. In other words, there is no clear acceleration of the trend of recovery after the Marshall plan was adopted.

However, regardless of what the effect of the Marshall plan may have been—and I intend to say more about that during the course of my address—Marshall plan countries are on an average approximately 120 percent recovered over the 1937 industrial index.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the table in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECA nations—Index numbers of industrial production—1937=100 (except where otherwise noted)—Annual, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, and latest monthly figure

RECOVERY OF THE ECA NATIONS SINCE 1946

[As of May 5, 1950]

	1946	1947	1948	1949	Latest monthly figure	Date
Austria.....	(¹)	51	78	104	114	December 1949.
Belgium.....	74	86	93	49	95	Do.
Denmark.....	101	116	129	137	145	February 1950.
France.....	73	87	102	112	119	January 1950.
Germany bizone.....	² 34	40	60	³ 89	³ 95	December 1949.
Greece.....	53	67	73	87	97	Do.
Ireland.....	109	113	130	⁴ 135	138	Third quarter 1949.
Italy.....	(¹)	93	98	104	108	January 1950.
Luxemburg.....	(¹)	89	(¹)	113	103	Do.
Netherlands.....	75	95	114	127	135	Do.
Norway.....	100	115	125	132	135	Do.
Sweden.....	137	141	149	(¹)	148	December 1949.
United Kingdom.....	90	98	109	116	124	January 1950.

¹ Not available.

² Base 1936=100.

³ Federal republic.

⁴ 3 quarter average.

Source: Statistical Bulletin of the United Nations, April 1950.

HIGHER TAXES FIRST THOUGHT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in an editorial in this morning's Wall Street Journal appears a very interesting comment on how to raise the money required to fight a war. I quote the editorial in part:

It is characteristic of the way we have been induced to think that the first reaction to the "pay as we go" suggestion is higher taxes. And perhaps they will have to come; but higher taxes are not the way to start. The start should be cutting expenditures.

If Congress began now to consider a tax bill—and it has every wish to postpone it—the country would be half through the current fiscal year before the new taxes could be collected. But by cutting down expenditures the same result of balancing Treasury receipts and expenditures begins immediately.

The serious implications of Korea have been apparent for some days. Yet so far as we know there has been no indication from Congress that anything has happened to change the Government financial outlook. Instead, Congress seems to take the attitude that it is perfectly sound to add more appendages to an overgrown Government establishment.

Mr. President, it seems our first reaction in Congress unfortunately is to add to expenditures and to raise taxes. To many, it is a very simple way to carry on the Government business.

THE ECA \$3,000,000,000—HOW USELESS

Mr. President, I now desire to show for the RECORD exactly where the approximately \$3,000,000,000 is located. The direction of this expenditure could easily be changed so that the money would go for national defense, instead of our having to raise taxes while creating more peacetime business in the Marshall plan countries.

Mr. President, the following table shows the conditions of the ECA appropriations up to date:

Spent Apr. 3, 1948, to June 30, 1948.....	\$738,500,000
Spent July 1, 1948 to June 30, 1949 (1949 fiscal year).....	5,170,800,000
Spent July 1, 1949 to June 30, 1950 (1950 fiscal year).....	3,592,090,000

Total spent to June 30, 1950..... 9,501,390,000

Spent July 1 to July 23, 1950..... \$24,410,000

9,525,800,000

Carry-over from 1950 fiscal..... 277,000,000

New appropriation for 1951..... 2,700,000,000

Available for 1951 fiscal..... 2,977,000,000

Less amount spent since

July 1..... 24,410,000

Leaving available now..... 2,952,590,000

AMOUNT AVAILABLE

So, we can see that there is approximately \$3,000,000,000 available for national defense as of today.

Mr. LANGER. Available for what?

Mr. MALONE. Available for anything? Congress desires to do with it. The taxes are levied and the appropriation is made, and the money is lying there.

In further answer to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, a simple amendment to the act by the Senate and the House, signed by the President, would direct where the money should go, where it should have gone long before.

Mr. President, I have here a table showing the total procurement authorizations for ECA by countries, and I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total by country, as of July 19, 1950:	Purchase approvals, total
Austria.....	\$445,561,000
Belgium-Luxemburg.....	490,902,000
Denmark.....	208,774,000
France.....	2,005,107,000
Germany (Federal Republic).....	893,837,000
Greece.....	362,825,000
Iceland.....	15,415,000
Ireland.....	134,603,000
Italy.....	1,071,020,000
Indonesia.....	101,472,000
Netherlands.....	771,578,000
Norway.....	185,581,000
Portugal.....	32,129,000
Sweden.....	96,711,000
Trieste.....	29,500,000
Turkey.....	103,023,000
United Kingdom.....	2,567,753,000
Total, Europe.....	9,525,800,000

was made. In these cases the employing agencies were immediately notified that unfavorable information relating to suitability is available to them in the files of the Department of State, and steps were taken to initiate investigation by the Commission. We were subsequently notified that one of these persons was separated by the employing agency. The case of the other is currently being investigated by the Commission.

Of the 13 cases referred to in our letter to Senator WHERRY, only 1 is still employed in the executive branch of the Federal service. In this case the Commission does not have jurisdiction to require separation. The information in our files has been reported to the employing agency. The agency has advised that after considering all the facts in the case it does not contemplate separating this employee.

It is hoped that this will supply you with the desired information concerning these cases.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1950.

Hon. HOMER FERGUSON,

United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR FERGUSON: Answering your letter of May 16, 1950, it will take some time to get together the information desired, particularly in relation to classification of jobs.

However, we are proceeding with the matter and will advise you further as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
Chairman.

(P. 601)

Of the group of 11 individuals terminated under the McCarran rider in June 1947, one was reappointed to a temporary position in the Department. The rider under which this action was taken provided, among other things, that "such terminations shall not affect the rights of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government, if declared eligible for such employment by the United States Civil Service Commission." Subsequent to his termination, the individual referred to pursued the provision of the law quoted above, and was rated eligible on loyalty and suitability for Federal employment by the Civil Service Commission. The individual's case was considered by the Fourth Regional Loyalty Board of the Civil Service Commission and later post-audited by the Loyalty Review Board. The loyalty boards acted on the basis of a full field investigation conducted by the FBI after his original termination.

Following the decision of the Civil Service Commission, the individual requested reinstatement. The Department took the matter under consideration and in the meantime reviewed the information upon which the Civil Service Commission based its determination. As a result of this review, the Department agreed with the findings of the Civil Service Commission Loyalty Board and determined that the individual could be reemployed without adversely affecting the national interest.

It was about this time that the Department started work on the United States Government's participation in the Haitian Government's bicentennial celebration. There was a temporary need on this project for a person with the technical skills possessed by the individual in question. I therefore approved the employment of this person for the temporary job.

On December 7, 1949 the individual was given a 90-day appointment to expire on March 7, 1950.

The Civil Service Commission has advised the Department that its records do not reflect employment of the other individuals by the Federal Government.

MAY 16, 1950.

Hon. JOHN PEURIFOY,

Assistant Secretary of State,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: I appreciated your furnishing me today with the copy of the letter of May 16 from Chairman Mitchell of the Civil Service Commission to Senator Wherry. That letter was in response to the latter's request for information "as to how many of the 91 persons removed from the Department of State because of a sexual deviation have been subsequently reemployed by other Federal departments or agencies."

I had made a similar inquiry of you in person and on the record of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee hearing February 28. Mr. Mitchell's letter is responsive to that inquiry which I had addressed to you, but I find it inconclusive for my purposes. In view of the fact that Mr. Mitchell apparently has the full information I am seeking I have redirected an inquiry to him, a copy of which I am enclosing for your information.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

DEMAND OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF HAWAII THAT UNITED STATES QUIT KOREA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point an article from the Honolulu Advertiser of July 20, entitled "Territory of Hawaii Communist Party Demands United States Quit Korea," which makes it clear that the Communists in Hawaii will do their utmost to sabotage the American military effort in Korea.

I believe this news article indicates strongly the great importance of maintaining Federal control of Hawaii through the territorial form of government and through a federally appointed governor in order to make sure that the Communists there are not successful in endangering our military operations in the Far East.

LEAFLET DISTRIBUTED—TERRITORY OF HAWAII COMMUNIST PARTY DEMANDS UNITED STATES QUIT KOREA

The underground Communist Party of Hawaii has called for immediate withdrawal of American military forces in Korea and a ban on the use of the atomic bomb in a one-page mimeographed sheet widely circulated in Honolulu Wednesday. The circular, violently attacking the policies of the American Government in the Far East, carried no individual signatures. At the bottom it said "issued by the Communist Party of Hawaii, P. O. Box 3886."

Both the FBI and the Army counterintelligence department have knowledge of the vitriolic leaflet and its contents. Both agencies are noncommittal on what action might be taken.

Sole acknowledged Communist in the Territory is Charles K. Fujimoto, who purports to be the party's chairman.

Entitled "Prevent World War III," the circular turned up on streets throughout the city.

It alleges that President Truman increased the danger of an atomic war when he ordered military action against the peoples of Asia, which can only lead to world disaster.

The Red propaganda leaflet echoed the hands off Korea policy of the Communist Daily Worker newspaper, published in New York City, and demanded that the Government which first uses the atomic bomb be labeled an enemy of mankind.

The mimeographed broadside, ignoring the fact that this Nation now is engaged in a critical military action, alleges that "the military provocation in Korea was a planned smoke screen behind which to intervene against the struggle for independence of the peoples of Korea, China, Formosa, the Philippines, Viet Nam, Indonesia, and Malaya."

It further charges an attempt to nullify the will of the Korean people which was expressed in the last election by force of American arms.

The local Communist mouthpiece also alleges that the United States Government is carrying on the policy of Wall Street big business to dominate the world.

Then, making the customary Communist pitch, the leaflet continues:

"Think clearly, fellow Americans; consider the facts deeply. Our country, our sons and daughters, are in grave danger. At first it was military supplies, and naval and air force aid. A few days later it was a few battalions of American troops; now it is divisions and whole armies. Next it will be atomic bombs and wholesale slaughter of millions of people. Such a course can only lead to a third world war with the existence of all the people of the world at stake."

"Such a course can be stopped by the united demand of the people for peace."

"Demand a halt to the aggressive military adventures of our administration before they touch off world-wide atomic war."

"Hands off Korea. Demand the immediate withdrawal of United States warships, air force, and troops, and an end to shipment of arms to the puppet regimes in Korea, Formosa, Viet Nam."

"Ban the atomic bomb and declare that government an enemy of mankind that first uses it."

"We must—all of us who cherish freedom, who abhor atomic death for hundreds of millions—unite our ranks, combine in a solid front of the people for peace."

"Let your desire for peace be heard."

"Issued by the Communist Party of Hawaii, post office box 3886."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2160) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize annual and sick leave with pay for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, to authorize the payment of accumulated and accrued annual leave in excess of 60 days, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PRIEST, Mr. BIEMILLER, Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma, Mr. WOLVERTON, and Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2822) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264), disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, and Mr. KUNKEL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appro-

priations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the time for debate on the appropriation bill is limited to 10 minutes to any Senator, and the debate or comment must be pertinent to the issue.

The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 250, line 5, to strike out "\$7,000,000" and to insert "\$7,400,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the appropriation in the Budget for the general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Reclamation last year was \$4,300,000. I understand that due to a reallocation of functions probably a comparable figure for the functions to be performed this year would be \$7,490,000. The House cut this amount to \$7,000,000. The committee has raised the figure to \$7,400,000, or virtually to a figure identical with the appropriation for the group functions of last year. Since the over-all program of the Bureau of Reclamation for 1951 is being reduced below that of 1949-50, it seems to me that the administrative costs of the Bureau of Reclamation can also be reduced. Therefore, I think we should go back to the House figure of \$7,000,000. I hope the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has stated the basic reason for the increase from \$4,300,000 to the amount that appears in the bill. He is in error, however, about one figure.

The record which I have before me shows that to the \$4,300,000 there was transferred from other branches of the service \$3,189,000, which had been paid on separate projects. The Senator also overlooked the increased cost required by law by reason of the pay acts, which amounts to \$224,000. Actually if we appropriated a comparable amount to last year it would be \$7,713,000. The Budget allowed \$86,000 more, or \$7,800,000. As it stands, the appropriation is \$400,000 under the Budget Bureau's figure. We are actually providing less money than was provided for all these purposes last year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I read from the report of the House Committee on Appropriations at page 173:

Since the over-all program of the Bureau in 1951 is reduced below that of the current year, \$7,000,000 should be entirely adequate for general administrative expenses.

Mr. HAYDEN. We listened to the explanations, and the committee decided to increase the amount \$400,000 under the Budget estimate. We should like to take it to conference on that basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 250, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 251, line 10, after the word "expenses", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That not exceeding \$150,000 of funds available for expenditure under this appropriation shall be used for salaries and expenses in connection with information work."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 251, line 20, after the word "binding", to strike out "not to exceed \$75,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary" and insert "services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem (not exceeding \$100,000 for individuals)"; on page 252, line 4, after the word "Reclamation", to insert "payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts; and, without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws;"; in line 13, after "(e)", to insert "including payments on account of dependents of employees in field offices in project areas engaged in construction and related activities"; in line 18, after the numerals "1945", to insert "to be reimbursable to the extent therein provided"; in line 21, after the word "prints", to strike out the semicolon and "and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, as authorized by law"; in line 22, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That funds appropriated for the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for expenditure through the facilities of the National Park Service in amounts of not to exceed \$25,000 for any one reservoir area for studies of recreational areas and planning for their utilization, and funds so expended shall not be reimbursable or returnable under the reclamation law."; on page 253, line 4, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation of projects except \$7,000,000 under the head 'General administrative expenses' and \$375,000 (\$175,000 for reconnaissance and \$200,000 for general engineering and research) under the head 'General investigations'"; and in line 11, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided further, That, except as otherwise provided by the act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), or by any other law, no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the said act of April 19, 1945, for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except expenses under the head 'General administrative expenses' and under the head 'General investigations'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 256, after line 10, to insert:

TRANSFER OF EPHRATA AIR FORCE BASE

For the purpose of assisting in the construction, operation, and maintenance, and settlement programs on the Columbia Basin

project in the State of Washington, the Armed Services, General Services Administration, or other Federal agency having ownership or custody thereof or interest therein, is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, all of their right, title, and interest to certain buildings, facilities, and equipment at the Ephrata Air Force Base, Ephrata, Wash., including the following buildings in accordance with block and building numbers: Block 800, building No. 68; block 1900, buildings Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17; block 2000, four buildings numbered 75, two buildings numbered 56; block 3000, buildings Nos. 56, 131, 58; block 2900, buildings Nos. 59, 53, 55, 57, 66, 89, 90, 85, 84, 124, 141, two buildings numbered 60, two buildings numbered 64, two buildings numbered 65; block 3300, eleven buildings numbered 28; block 3400, seven buildings numbered 28; block 3500, buildings Nos. 43, 46; block 3600, buildings Nos. 34, 35, 36, 38, two buildings numbered 37; block 3700, buildings Nos. 35, 38, four buildings numbered 31, two buildings numbered 32, two buildings numbered 34, two buildings numbered 37; block 3800, buildings Nos. 35, 38, 39, 42, two buildings numbered 37; block 4300, buildings Nos. 19, 20, 21, 22; block 4400, buildings Nos. 113, 114, two buildings numbered 112; block 4600, buildings No. 134; block 4700, buildings Nos. 94, 95, 93, 99, 109, 100, 35, 108, 104, 110, six buildings numbered 97; block 4800, buildings Nos. 53, 40, 102, 101, 103, 105, 107, 111, two buildings numbered 32, five buildings numbered 106, three buildings numbered 98, together with one sewage-disposal plant No. 116, one water tank No. 115, one well, one flag pole No. 118, two garbage racks Nos. 155, two garbage racks Nos. 158, one wash rack No. 63, two grease racks No. 62, and sewer system, water lines, electric-power lines, railroad spur and siding, road improvements, and all other facilities and equipment incident to the foregoing property, and including land and rights-of-way formerly under Reclamation withdrawal to other federally owned land on which said buildings are situate, which have heretofore or which may hereafter be declared surplus to the needs of the Armed Forces.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Geological Survey—Surveys, investigations, and research," on page 258, line 18, after the word "activities", to strike out "\$19,129,000" and insert "\$19,382,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Mines—Construction," on page 261, line 4, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$1,372,600" and insert "\$1,268,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 261, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "one hundred and forty-five" and insert "one hundred and fifty, of which one hundred and forty-five shall be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 263, after line 8, to insert:

The Veterans' Administration is authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior, for the use of the Bureau of Mines, without compensation therefor, full jurisdiction, possession, and control of a parcel of 43 acres, more or less within the boundaries of the Fort Snelling Government Reservation in Hennepin County, Minn.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Park Service—Main-

tenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities," on page 264, line 10, after the word "Service", to strike out "\$7,250,000" and insert "\$7,448,100."

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is an appropriation for the maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities of the National Park Service. I should like to call attention to the fact that for the fiscal year 1949-1950 the appropriation was \$6,990,000. The House bill increased this amount by \$260,000, to \$7,250,000. The Senate committee is raising the amount by virtually \$200,000 more, to a figure which is nearly a half million dollars more than the amounts for last year. Mr. President, this appears to have been inserted in the bill prior to the outbreak of the Korean war. I think we must transform our thinking with reference to these matters in view of the events of last month. We must curtail our civilian expenditures. As the President has very properly stated, new capital investments should be reduced. Similarly, maintenance and rehabilitation appropriations should be reduced. I see no justification, in view of the national emergency, of spending half a million dollars more on the maintenance and rehabilitation facilities in the national parks than we spent last year. I hope the committee amendment will be rejected. This is a very mild thing to do, because even under the House bill we would spending about \$200,000 more than we spent last year.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to point out that we made a very serious mistake during the Second World War in following the philosophy which is advocated by the Senator from Illinois. We thought it would be a good thing to cut down on capital investments and on operation and maintenance expenditures. As a matter of fact, during the war the parks were occupied by military personnel, and the public was able to go there as well.

For lack of maintenance, the roads are now in a deplorable condition. This money would merely keep them open so that the public could get in and out of the parks. No extravagance is involved in this appropriation. It is designed primarily to maintain what we have. War or no war, that must be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 264, line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 264, line 17, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$20,542,000" and insert "\$19,667,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, now we come to an item of new construction. Last year, 1949-50, \$14,595,000 was appropriated. On the face of it the committee seems to be covering itself with glory because it has reduced the amount appropriated by the House. It reduces the figure from \$20,542,000 to \$19,667,000. The first reaction on seeing the reduction is to say to the committee, "What a fine job it is, because you

are cutting down the appropriation by nearly \$900,000." However, if we go back and make comparisons with last year we find that it is more than \$5,000,000 above the 1949-50 figure. Mr. President, I can see no excuse for increasing the construction appropriation by \$5,000,000 when we are in the midst of hot hostilities in Korea and when we are faced with terrific financial difficulties.

So, Mr. President, I move to strike the amount in the committee amendment and substitute in its stead "\$15,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was on page 264, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$8,935,000" and insert "\$7,935,000."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the city of Charleston, S. C., is celebrating the two hundredth anniversary—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement there can be discussion only of an amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Presiding Officer. I was absent in a meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency when the agreement was entered into.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair realizes that. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 264, line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment of the committee was on page 264, line 23, after the numerals "1950," to insert "and, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to incur obligations and enter into contracts, not exceeding a total of \$100,000 for the construction of a public information building in the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak.;" and on page 265, line 6, after the word "appropriation", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$150,000 of the funds available for the Independence National Historical Park, Pa., shall be available after January 1, 1951, for the management, protection, maintenance, and rehabilitation of Independence Hall, grounds, and structures in that park."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General administrative expenses," on page 265, line 15, after the word "officers", to strike out "\$1,264,500" and insert "\$1,314,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, before proceeding further, I should like to revert for a moment if I may, to the amendment on page 260? Last year the Committee on Appropriations inserted an amendment to provide that the Gov-

ernment should take over the chrome mine in Montana, and that amendment was in the bill when it passed the Senate. The conference committee deleted it. In view of the Korean situation and the emergency of the war, I wondered if the distinguished Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the subcommittee, would consider an amendment along that line at this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Under the parliamentary situation, Mr. President, committee amendments are to be acted on first. The Senator does not propose to amend the committee amendment, but proposes to add a new provision, does he not?

Mr. ECTON. I propose to add a new provision.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator will have an opportunity to do that after the committee amendments have been acted on. It is not in order at this time.

Mr. ECTON. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Fish and Wildlife Service—Management of resources," on page 266, line 11, after "(16 U. S. C. 695-695c)", to insert "and not to exceed \$30,000 for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service"; and in line 14, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$7,157,000" and insert "\$7,082,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Investigations of resources," on page 266, line 22, after the word "law", to strike out "\$3,900,000" and insert "\$4,125,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last year there was appropriated \$3,324,000 for "Investigations of resources" in the Fish and Wildlife Service, a term which, like an overcoat, can cover a multitude of sins. The House, passing on this provision long before the Korean crisis, raised the sum to \$3,900,000. The Senate committee, not to be outdone, raised it to \$4,125,000, or \$800,000 above last year's appropriation.

Mr. President, I cannot believe that the need for investigations into scientific and economic studies and investigations, conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, including related aquatic plants and products, is so great a national necessity that we should spend \$800,000 more for them than we did last year. I believe we can let the aquatic life be relatively less investigated than the committee plans call for, and the war effort can then move forward a little bit better. Eight hundred thousand dollars will equip two or three companies of soldiers. I cannot see that economic and scientific investigations of fish and wildlife, aquatic plants and products, publication and statistics, are as important as guns, artillery, and other munitions of war. So I hope very much that the committee will agree with me. I still hope that they will agree when I propose that we strike out "\$4,125,000" and substitute "\$3,325,000", which is the same as last year's appropriation, thus saving

\$800,000. I look toward the very able Senator from Arizona with a gleam of hope in my eye that at last we may be able to save some money. I wait with bated anxiety for his reply.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I sincerely regret to disappoint the Senator, but he forgets a very important fact, namely, that the fish supply is a very large part of the food of the American people, and that it is essential, in order to carry on a war, that we have an adequate food supply. The only increase the committee has allowed above the House figure was for fish freezing experiments. At present it is exceedingly difficult to catch the fish at sea and bring them in in a fresh condition. Another provision is for a fish survey of the blue fin tuna in the North Atlantic. On the whole, this appropriation is fully justified.

I might add, if the Senator is interested in knowing it, that the committee denied requests for \$977,000 worth of new construction and new development by this bureau. We felt we should hold it to where it is, but that if it is to operate effectively, the amount carried in the bill is required. Therefore I hope the committee amendment will be supported.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks made by the able junior Senator from Illinois. With the exception of the appropriation for the office building, we have not been making any savings, and have not very much to show for our efforts in economy. It seems to me that one thing the Members of the Senate overlook is the fact that in the case of this appropriation bill, many of the increases were drafted before the Korean situation developed, and before it appeared that we may be involved on an even wider scale in other parts of the world.

I would ordinarily follow the recommendations of a standing committee, because I know the amount of work and effort that has gone into any report a standing committee makes, but it seems to me that wherever it is possible now to save money without affecting the national defense or the national security, or without impairing or prejudicing measures necessary for the health and welfare of the people, or the efficient prosecution of the ordinary and current activities of the Government, we should do so. It seems to me that this is an item which could very readily be cut without detriment to any of the people of the country. Therefore I urge that the amendment to the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like very briefly to state that I hope that the committee recommendation will be followed. This amendment is vital to the New England fish industry, which at the present time is competing, with a great deal of difficulty, with Canada, Newfoundland, and Greenland.

Two hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars of the amount proposed is to carry on experiments in freezing fish at sea. The purpose of doing that is to bring them in in an orderly way, so as not to have a glut on the market at one time.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, this is not only proposed for the benefit of New England, but for the benefit of the entire country, including Illinois.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from New York that we should do something because of the military emergency, by way of proper retrenchment; but American soldiers cannot fight well unless they have something to eat. Food is just as much a part of warfare as is a gun, or artillery, or some other military equipment. I am glad the amendment of the Senator from Illinois was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 266, line 23.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment I should like to make the statement that last year there were established four new stations for the training of men who are engaged in this service. I have been advised that there is some question as to whether the estimates as set forth in the 1951 justifications provide sufficient funds for continuing on a full-year basis four additional cooperative wildlife units created by the Congress last year.

It is my understanding that \$11,000 additional is required to activate completely these units on a full-year basis, and I see no objection to the Fish and Wildlife Service making up this deficiency for these units out of lapses, delay in filling positions, or such other minor adjustments as might be necessary within the total appropriation recommended for "Investigations of resources."

It was suggested that we add to the amount of money provided in the bill to accomplish this purpose, but I believe it can be done within the sum appropriated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 267, line 6, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$2,401,000" and insert "\$2,423,450."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an item, "For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities alleged to be required in the conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, including continuing the construction of fish cultural facilities on lands owned by the State of South Dakota."

Mr. President, for this purpose last year we appropriated \$1,800,000. The Bureau of the Budget, which has looked on these appropriations with a somewhat liberal eye, I may say, and has not exercised great intestinal fortitude in trying to save money for the taxpayer, raised this sum to \$2,401,000. The House went

along with the Bureau of the Budget. The Senate committee, however, in its anxiety to improve the fish culture facilities of South Dakota and elsewhere, raised the sum by \$22,000. This may seem to be a small amount, but it is \$600,000 over the amount appropriated last year.

While I do not wish to have an undue amount of fun with this appropriation, I should like to suggest that culture can be furthered in other ways than piscatorial culture, and it would seem to me that the general cause of enlightenment is not particularly helped by raising the cultural level of the fish in this area. Mr. President, here is a chance where we can save money; we can spend as much as last year, but reduce appropriations \$600,000.

I want to underscore what the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] has said. This budget was drafted in December, presented to Congress in January, long before the Korean hostilities were ever dreamed of. Yet we are blithely going ahead, not only putting it into effect, but raising the ante in a great many instances. Now, let us go back to last year at least and save \$600,000, even though the cultural level of the fish in South Dakota may be somewhat less than it otherwise would be.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, permit me to say to the Senator from Illinois, that the Senate committee did not insert the item for the State of South Dakota. That was adopted by the House of Representatives. The amount provided for in this bill is modest. The increases allowed by the Senate committee are very small compared with the absolute need. The demand throughout the United States, if we could supply it, would require \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 to provide for the hatching of fish so that they might be placed in the streams where they could be caught. We have added nothing of that kind to the bill at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the committee amendment on page 267, line 6, I move to strike out the Senate committee figure of \$2,423,450, and to insert the figure \$1,800,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Migratory bird conservation fund," on page 267, after line 21, to strike out:

For carrying into effect section 4 of the act of March 16, 1934, as amended (16 U. S. C. 718-718 h), an amount equal to the sum received during the current fiscal year from the proceeds from the sale of stamps, to be warranted monthly and to remain available until expended.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

For carrying into effect section 4 of the act of March 16, 1934, as amended (16 U. S. C. 718-718h), amounts equal to the sums received during the current year and each fiscal year thereafter from the proceeds from the sale of stamps, to be warranted monthly and to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Territories and island possessions—Administration of Territories and possessions," on page 270, line 8, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "\$3,329,500" and insert "\$3,392,180."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction of roads, Alaska," on page 270, line 17, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$20,400,000" and insert "\$18,883,212."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 271, after line 8, to insert:

CLAIMS, ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION

For payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States to be due for overtime compensation earned in 1945 and prior fiscal years under the provisions of section 23 of the act of March 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 522), \$12,893, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That no part of the amount received by any claimant in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding, and any person violating this provision shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction, Alaska Railroad," on page 272, line 1, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$31,000,000" and insert "\$28,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment in the next chapter.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter VIII—Executive and independent offices—Title I, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget," on page 280, line 9, after "(28 U. S. C. 2672)", to strike out "\$3,386,000" and insert "\$3,412,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office for Emergency Management—Philippine Alien Property Administration," on page 281, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$160,000" and insert "\$215,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Offices—American Battle Monuments Commission," on page 282, line 19, after the word "typewriting", to strike out "\$695,000" and insert "\$670,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 283, line 11, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "\$8,680,000" and insert "\$8,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Atom Energy Commission," on

page 287, line 1, after the word "justified", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authorization shall be used in connection with the payment of any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost plus a fixed fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where the fee for community management is at a rate in excess of \$90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where the fee is at a rate in excess of \$45,000 per annum.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the clerk has proceeded to the chapter dealing with the Independent Offices. I think it was the understanding that the chapter on Labor and Federal Security of the measure would be taken up next. The chapter on Labor and Federal Security was postponed because of the absence of one of the members of the committee. I think that is the next in order of business. While I am very happy to have the rapid progress we have achieved in the last few minutes on chapter VIII, it is my opinion that the orderly procedure should be to return to chapter V.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are ready to proceed with that chapter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to chapter V.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be in order. The clerk will state the first committee amendment, in chapter V.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope very much the Chair will rule that the items in the Independent Offices chapter which we dealt with thus far have not been formally approved.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; they have been.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments which have been considered have all been approved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I did not hear the title of the new chapter read. I have never seen Walter Johnson or Bob Feller in their palmiest days move with such speed as the clerk moved in reading those items. In the space of about 2 seconds we suddenly got over to page 287, and I had a batch of amendments ready from page 280 on. I am a green rookie here, and I will not say that there are curve balls, but I will say that there are some speed balls being thrown. I move to reconsider the votes by which the amendments from page 280 on were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Which amendments?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest that when we return to chapter VIII we begin afresh.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Illinois can present the amendments he has in mind. There is no need to reconsider amendments which have been agreed to, to which the Senator does not propose to offer amendments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have amendments on pages 280, 281, 282—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments from page 277 through page 283 have been adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I did not hear the title of that chapter read. We seem to have suddenly moved out of Interior into Independent Offices, and as I said, Walter Johnson never threw faster balls in his life than were thrown just now.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when we return to chapter VIII, the Senator from Illinois may offer his amendments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The matter will be left standing as it is then, and when we return to chapter VIII the Senator may offer his amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may we proceed now with chapter V?

Mr. McKELLAR. It begins on page 128.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment under chapter V will be stated.

The first amendment under the heading "Chapter V—Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency—Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary," was on page 128, line 19, after the figures \$1,861,000", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the compensation of the Solicitor shall be \$14,000 per annum."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the amendment just stated was in line 1, on page 129; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is at the top of page 129.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it is too late for the Senator to raise the point of order at this time, for the amendment has already been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware wish to move that the vote on the amendment be reconsidered?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and I so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware that the vote by which the amendment was adopted be reconsidered. [Putting the question.]

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment on page 129, lines 1 and 2, is now before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that this amendment constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well made, and is sustained.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the amendment just rejected on a point of order is on page 129.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, at the top of that page.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That amendment relates to the Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Federal Security Agency—Food and Drug Administration," on page 138, line 7, after the word "exceed," to strike out "seventeen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only" and insert "sixty-five passenger motor vehicles, of which seventeen shall be for replacement only."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 138, in line 15, after the word "operations", to strike out "\$5,066,700" and insert "\$5,666,700."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am trying to move with speed, but it is a little difficult for me to make sure just what amendment is now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is that in line 15, on page 138.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In that connection, let me ask the reason for the inclusion of provision for the purchase of 48 automobiles. Is that provision proposed in order to enforce the oleomargarine law?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. The reason for the addition is because of the necessity for replacements. It has been a long time since the department has had any replacements whatever of the old cars. After complete hearings and a showing made by the Department as to the real necessity for obtaining automobiles as replacements, the committee made this recommendation.

Another reason which justifies the adoption of the recommendation which is made by the committee is that a short time ago the Congress passed legislation by which oleomargarine became a legal commodity, as it were; and Congress placed upon the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Labor the duty and function of carrying out the provisions of the oleomargarine law. Some of the automobiles covered by the amendment are to be used by that particular agency.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, to this committee amendment I call up my amendment marked "7-13-50-F." That amendment is submitted on behalf of myself, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. McKELLAR. To what amendment does it relate? Does it relate to the one on page 138, in line 15?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York, for himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 138, in line 15, it is proposed to strike out "\$5,666,700" and insert "\$5,966,700."

In the committee amendment, on page 161, in line 1, it is proposed to strike out "\$535,100" and insert "\$547,100."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to increase from \$624,000 to \$936,000 the funds available for the enforcement of the inspection provision of the oleomargarine law recently enacted by this Congress. I submit this amendment to the committee amendment only because I believe that adequate inspection affects millions of our people.

In letters printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 1, 1949, the Food and Drug Administration and the Bureau of the Budget estimated that enforcement of the new oleo law would require 950 agents on the basis of only one check or inspection visit a year to every public eating place in the United States. This would mean an expenditure of \$6,000,000. Of course, I do not ask for any such sum. I do propose and urge that the sum appropriated be increased to that requested by the President, namely, \$936,000. Even that sum, according to testimony of Mr. George Larrick of the Food and Drug Administration, would allow an inspection of only one out of five eating places a year.

There are in the United States 525,000 public eating places which should be—if the law is to be adequately enforced—inspected at least once annually. The amount here proposed, \$936,000, would not provide adequate enforcement; but if it is the amount the Food and Drug Administration now requests, I am reluctantly willing to go along with that program. In these times when the emphasis must necessarily be on expenditures required for our essential security, we must be content with less than what we would ordinarily ask.

It was testified that perhaps 10 percent of the restaurants in America, or 50,000 public eating places, are now serving yellow oleomargarine in place of butter, without notice to the public. This is fraud, Mr. President—fraud upon the public and fraud upon the dairy industry. I think it should be stopped in any way that is practicable.

Rigid enforcement of the law against such fraud and deception was promised by the sponsors of the legislation to take the excise tax off oleomargarine. I now ask that my colleagues who supported this measure join me in voting for an increased appropriation for the enforcement of that law.

Testimony given before the Senate Finance Committee last year disclosed that in Pennsylvania, 153 out of 500 public eating places which were inspected were violating the law against the substitution of oleo for butter without notice to the public. If this was the situation in Pennsylvania while the tax was still in effect, what will the situation be with the tax removed and the incentive to substitute oleomargarine for butter obviously increased by the greater spread between the price of oleo and the price of butter?

Mr. President, I hope the pending amendment to the committee amendment is approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York and other Senators to the com-

mittee amendment on page 138, in line 15.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 138, in line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Education," on page 142, line 4, after the word "same", to strike out "\$1,900,000" and insert "\$2,023,420."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee, the ranking minority member, and also the acting majority leader. I wish to inquire whether it is contemplated that we shall conclude action on the bill tonight. In that connection let me refer to a colloquy I had on Friday last with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] as shown at page 10954 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, just before he left the city of Washington. He asked unanimous consent that two amendments in which he was interested not be discussed until his return.

Mr. McKELLAR. They should be returned to and will be returned to when he comes back to the city.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not know whether separate arrangements had been made about that with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand that the Senator from Washington will be back tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the colloquy I had with the distinguished Senator from Washington was to the effect that we would protect him until Tuesday. That arrangement was made in order to get him to withhold objection to consideration of the bill in his absence. In the event it is contemplated that the bill will be passed tonight, I thought I should make that point now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is the pending amendment that on page 142, in line 4?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the appropriation bill for last year—that is for 1949–50—we provided \$1,900,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of Education.

The appropriation bill as passed this year by the House provides that that sum shall be continued, and the bill as passed by the House also provides that the salary increase which went into effect shall be absorbed by means of a reduction of the personnel of that agency. In the judgment of the House of Representatives the number of employees in the Office of Education, particularly for overall administration, is excessive—or, in other words, that there is fat in that office, and that the increases in salaries can be absorbed by means of a reduction in the personnel.

However, our committee has recommended an increase in that amount by \$123,420, both over the amount of the

appropriation made last year and over the amount voted by the House of Representatives this year.

Mr. President, here is a bureau or agency which the House of Representatives thinks is overstaffed. I think my sympathy with the objectives of the Office of Education is rather well known. However, this is no time to play favorites. We need general retrenchment. I believe that this office, by means of increasing the efficiency of its work, can carry on at last year's level with the amount voted by the House of Representatives.

So, Mr. President, I hope the committee amendment will be rejected, so that we may save \$123,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Illinois, and to support the committee amendment. Speaking as the ranking member on the minority side of the aisle, we went into this very thoroughly. As a matter of fact, the amount allowed the Office of Education will keep that office only at its present level, and, because of the salary adjustments, if this amount were not allowed, it would actually mean a curtailment of the Office of Education. There has been considerable reorganization in the Department over a period of time, and I think that the justifications for this amount were amply sustained before the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only that, but the budget estimate for the 1951 item was \$2,168,600. The committee allowed only sufficient to keep up the 1950 item, as it were, and allowed only \$2,250,300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 145, line 11, after the word "determine", to strike out "\$14,900,000" and insert "\$14,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 145, line 15, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$9,600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 148, line 8, after the word "only", to strike out "\$1,357,000" and insert \$2,107,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this appropriation is for the administration, namely, the payment of salaries and expenses of hospital constructions service. The Hill-Burton Act is one of the best bills I think that this Senate has passed in recent years. But this is not an item for the construction of hospitals; it is an item for the administration of the Federal grants which are given for hospitals. It is overhead. For the year 1949-50 there was appropriated \$1,132,000. The House increased this by \$225,000, to \$1,357,000. The Senate increased the amount to \$2,107,000, or a figure \$750,000 above the House, and about \$1,000,000 over last year.

The increase allowed by the committee is for research in hospital administration—not basic research into diseases, but research into the management of hospitals. I think such research can be done by private agencies. I do not think the Federal Government is exactly famous for its efficient hospital management. At any rate now is not the time to start such a program. The House has already allowed \$225,000 more than last year for this item.

Mr. President, this is another illustration of a budget drawn up long before the Korean hostilities, long before these additional expenditures of at least \$10,000,000,000 had fallen upon us, which for various reasons the Senate feels itself committed to. Despite the fact that the circumstances have certainly changed an increase is asked. I very much hope that we can hold to the House figure and thus save \$750,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 150, line 2, after the word "including", to insert "grants of adrenocorticotrophic hormone (ACTH), cortisone, and other chemical substances, and for", and in line 7, after the word "diseases", to strike out "and including not to exceed \$200,000 for transfer to the Department of Agriculture for research into utilization of plant material and vegetable sources of cortisone."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 150, line 21, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$20,086,000" and insert "\$20,686,000."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I understand that this portion of the bill is to be passed over until the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] can be present.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That, I think, was one of the items the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] had in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have these items passed over?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We were to act on them today, but when the Senator from Washington returned, if he wanted them reconsidered, he would have the opportunity.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was the understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With that understanding—

Mr. MURRAY. I was not here, of course, when that understanding was arrived at. Had I been here, I should have asked for an opportunity, myself, to present an argument in support of the program covered by the item.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator wants to do that, he can do it tomorrow.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Montana can speak then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized. The amendment is offered, and he can discuss it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am not prepared to discuss the amendment at this particular time. I did not know

it was to come up, because I had been assured it would come up in the absence of the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state to the Senator from Montana that under the arrangement he will have an opportunity to discuss the amendment when it comes up tomorrow, or at some future time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; when it is reconsidered tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 151, line 3, after the word "diseases", to strike out "\$9,944,000 and insert \$10,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 151, line 10, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$14,150,000" and insert "\$14,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 151, line 18, after the word "only", to strike out "\$2,040,000" and insert "\$2,140,000."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, that is an item in which I am interested, and I assume it is one of the projects that will go over.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understood that was the request of the Senator from Nebraska, to which the chairman agreed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will go over.

The next amendment was, on page 152, line 16, after the figures "\$1,375,000", to insert a colon and the following provisos: "Provided, That the Surgeon General is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe not to exceed 25,000 square feet of land presently included in the site of the National Institutes of Health to the Bethesda Fire Department, a body corporate of the State of Maryland, for the purpose of erecting and maintaining a fire station to provide protection for the facilities of the National Institutes of Health and for the adjacent community: *Provided further*, That such terms and conditions may include an agreement by the Surgeon General to pay to such department on behalf of the United States 33 1/3 percent of the cost of the construction of the station but not to exceed \$20,000, to be charged to the maximum limits of costs set out in this paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "St. Elizabeths Hospital," on page 154, line 20, after the word "illness", to strike out "\$1,948,000" and insert "\$2,005,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Administration," on page 156, line 9, after the word "Columbia," to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$300,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is an appropriation for salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. This is a very worthy work. I have been a member of a credit union myself. I have subscribed to the capital stock of a credit union, and sometimes

when I was hard pressed I contemplated the possibility of borrowing from the credit union; although I never did. It is a very worthy work. But there is a private association of credit unions, with its headquarters in Madison, Wis., and the President, I believe, some weeks ago laid the cornerstone for the headquarters. The Government did a splendid job in promoting the growth of credit unions, but the conduct of these credit unions is more and more passing into private hands, and I think properly so. Last year we appropriated for this Bureau \$200,000, and that is the sum contained in the House report.

But there is a further reason why the House figure should not be increased I quote from page 103:

Last year the committee suggested that the agency recommend changes in the basic legislation and the committee's action—

Namely, in holding the appropriation down to \$200,000—

may stimulate the agency to move with greater dispatch in that direction.

This indicates that in the opinion of the House the Bureau had not shown great alacrity in putting itself on a more efficient footing. The Senate committee, in its report, on page 74, said:

The Bureau is directed to formulate and execute plans with more dispatch than has thus far been displayed to achieve a program more nearly self-sustaining.

Implying that in the opinion of the Senate committee this Bureau had been dragging its feet in reorganizing itself and making itself more efficient. But nevertheless, the committee, instead of applying a financial stimulus to them to do better, gave them a \$100,000 increase. That seems to me like telling a child that he cannot have any more cake, then giving him more cake and telling him not to ask for any more. This may seem to be a small item, but I hope that we will hold to the House figure of \$200,000, and save \$100,000 for the taxpayers and our defense effort.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the members of the subcommittee who listened to the testimony were just as sincere and just as anxious to protect the taxpayer as is the Senator from Illinois. We dislike to think, every once in a while, that the only person on the Senate floor or before committees who is honest and has regard for the taxpayer is the Senator from Illinois. I deny that to be the fact. What happened before the committee was that the committee tried to provide the stimulus about which the Senator from Illinois so much loves to speak, but once in a while he forgets that there are 95 other Senators who are also sincere and are trying to bring about the best results for the Nation.

The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions had been for many years working under the authority of Congress, and it is now about to achieve the ideal about which the Senator from Illinois talks, and to become self-sustaining. It was for that reason that the subcommittee, after listening to the testimony, decided to recommend \$300,000, an increase of \$100,000 over the House allowance. That is greater than the 1950 appropriation.

The Senator from Illinois speaks about the budget when it suits his convenience, and he forgets about it when it does not suit his convenience. The amount is \$75,000 below the Budget Bureau estimate.

The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions was directed to formulate and execute its business with more dispatch than has thus far been achieved.

That is the dispatch which has been so eloquently discussed by the Senator from Illinois. The committee wanted to make it self-sustaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 156, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 156, line 19, after the word "fund", to insert "of which not more than \$404 shall be available for payment in advance when authorized by the Federal Security Administrator for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 158, line 7, after the word "distribution", to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$1,510,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Administrator", on page 161, line 1, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "\$511,100" and insert "\$535,100."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say, before I speak on the amendment, that I regret it very much if I have given to any Senator the impression that I regard myself as having either more wisdom or more virtue than has any other Member of the Senate. I do not feel that way, and it is not true. I certainly have not wished to convey that impression. It is not pleasant to rise with respect to item after item and be bowled over. I had a feeling this afternoon that it would be futile for me to make this effort, and that the most discreet thing for me to do was to keep my mouth shut and not try to speak on these items. I was afraid that what I would have to say would be misunderstood and that Members of the Senate would feel I was either a crank or I was self-righteous. I certainly hope that I am neither.

But, Mr. President, we are in a very serious position. We have a deficit of \$4,000,000,000, exclusive of the Korean war, and unless we tax for the Korean war, the deficit will amount to billions of dollars in addition. We are told that the way to approach the question is by selective cutting. If we do that, we can deal with items only as they arise. It is not a pleasant thing to study this whole bill, item by item and to get up time after time, but I have to do it in this instance as I have to do it in other instances, because I feel that it is the best way to reduce appropriations.

To get down to business, I should like to point out that this is an item for

salaries and expenses of the general counsel of the Federal Security Administrator. We expended on this group last year \$455,000. The House raised this amount by \$56,000, thus providing an increase for doing the work which the oleomargarine law will entail. The Senate raised that amount by another \$24,000. This means that we shall be spending \$80,000 more for lawyers than we did last year. If there is anything of which we have a surplus supply in Government it is lawyers, and we can take some of the existing lawyers and have them work a little harder. Also, the various agencies should use the legal services of the Department of Justice. I should be perfectly willing to adopt the House figure of \$511,000 and provide a 10-percent increase, but I hope we can save at least \$24,000 by rejecting the committee amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We should like to do that, but the difficulty is that last year there was less money for lawyers in this particular department. This year we gave the particular agency more work to do. While the Senator from Illinois may not have voted for the oleomargarine bill, Congress did create additional work for the agency. The Senate has heard the Senator from New York this afternoon complain because we cut \$300,000 off the oleomargarine enforcement provision, and now comes the Senator from Illinois who complains because there are a few additional lawyers required to enforce a law which Congress passed. The amount is still under that recommended by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words on this particular item. I believe the Departments of the Government have too many lawyers. I have many times on the floor advocated that the Attorney General's office, through the Solicitor General's office, should be the legal adviser to the various departments, so that they would be receiving, as far as possible, impartial advice on legal questions. I believe that no private concern hires as many lawyers to do work, much of which is clerical and much of which is propaganda to the people of the United States, as does the Government. While I know that private concerns pay their top lawyers more money, they do not have as many lawyers as the Government employs. I hope the Senate will not continue to increase the legal forces so far as the Government is concerned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the committee, I wish to support the position taken by the chairman of the subcommittee. I do not disagree with the Senator from Michigan, as a general proposition, that complete reorganization of the legal functions of the Federal Government is in order and should perhaps be concentrated in the Office of the Attorney General. During the 6 years in which I served in the legislature of California I was one of the authors of a bill which did away with independent attorneys and concentrated the work in the

office of the attorney general. But I think that should be done by general legislation, after a study by the Judiciary Committee of which the able Senator from Michigan is a member. I think the testimony before our committee justified this nominal increase because of the oleomargarine work and other enforcement work which is connected with it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not always agree with my two distinguished friends, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I usually agree with my friends on this side of the aisle, and as an efficient and competent committee has passed upon this question, I hope the Senate will sustain the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 161, line 1.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 162, after line 9, to insert:

SEC. 207. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the functions or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 162, line 15, to change the section number from "207" to "208."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—National Labor Relations Board," on page 163, line 17, after "(5 U. S. C. 150)", to strike out "\$8,550,000" and insert "\$8,615,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes consideration of chapter V.

Mr. MAYBANK obtained the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, at this point I believe it necessary to discuss briefly the effect upon the public assistance grants of section 1111, beginning on page 468 of the bill, and known as the anti-deficiency section, which section further amends section 3679 of the Revised Statutes.

The subcommittee of which I am chairman received hundreds of communications requesting clarification of this anti-deficiency section with respect to the apportionment of funds for grants.

The committee did not consider it necessary to amend the language, and wishes to register its understanding that subsection (e) (1) (B), as it appears on page 472 of the bill, will permit the apportionment of funds for public assistance grants in order to observe the legal commitments to the several States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulas prescribed by law.

This same understanding exists likewise in connection with the Employees' Compensation Fund, administered by the

Department of Labor, to which the Federal Government makes contributions from which payments are made to employees suffering injuries and occupational disabilities.

Let me read the language in the bill to which I have referred:

(e) (1) No apportionment or reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate shall be made except upon a determination by such officer that such action is required because of * * * (B) emergencies involving the * * * immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulas prescribed by law.

I thought it would be of interest to the Senate to make this statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I inquire as to the page and line at which we stopped when there were under consideration the amendments to chapter VIII of the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On page 283. The Senate stopped there with the understanding that the Senator from Illinois would have the right to move to reconsider the committee amendments from page 277 to page 283, for the purpose of offering amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Chair.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CHILDREN'S BUREAU

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Appropriations recommended \$1,510,000 for the 1951 appropriation for the Children's Bureau. The committee indicated that the recommended figure would permit "the Bureau to continue its staff and program at the 1950 level."

In a letter to me, Mrs. Jack B. Fahy, executive director of the American Parents Committee, indicates that the recommended appropriation will not permit the Children's Bureau to operate at its 1950 level. During the present emergency I have no intention of seeking an increase in the recommended figure, but I feel this letter may be of interest to Senators and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed, as follows:

AMERICAN PARENTS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., July 13, 1950.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: The Senate Appropriations Committee reported out \$1,510,000 for the Children's Bureau. This is \$12,300 under the budget estimate recommended by the President. In the Senate Report 1941 it states "The amount recommended will permit the Bureau to continue its staff and program at the 1950 level."

This is untrue.

If Congress appropriates any amount less than what the President requested, the Children's Bureau will have to abandon plans to employ part-time consultants in plastic surgery, nutrition of children in hospitals, and medical care of premature infants. In addition they will have to choose

between reducing services in regional offices or in headquarters.

In order to absorb a cut in amounts set aside for operation of regional offices, the Bureau would be forced, either (1) to reduce in at least one additional regional office the professional services already greatly curtailed, by releasing, for example, the medical director, a public-health nurse, or a medical social worker, each of whom performs services that are essential in the development and administration of maternal and child health and crippled children's programs; or (2) to curtail even further the travel funds available to regional staff who even now are unable to meet the requests of State agencies for consultation.

If the Bureau were to absorb the cut in its operation at headquarters, it would be forced to choose between several alternatives, each signifying elimination or curtailment of greatly needed services, such as: (1) to release one or more of its specialists such as the sole adviser on children's dentistry, the one consultant on juvenile-court work, or the only adviser on State training schools for delinquent children; or (2) to eliminate a greatly needed bulletin for parents—in spite of parents' expressed need for nontechnical material to help them understand and work with such children at home; or (3) to cease immediately all efforts to develop and carry out a study of different types of hospital care given premature babies—although prematurity is one of the leading causes of infant deaths today.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JACK B. FAHY,
Executive Director.

DIXIE MARGARINE CO.—VETO MESSAGE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill (S. 1036) "For the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, Memphis, Tenn."

The bill provides for payment of the sum of \$69,530.40 to the Dixie Margarine Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Tennessee, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for refund of capital exacted by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, for taxes for the period March 1923 to November 28, 1925. The bill recites that the statutory period for refund of the moneys collected had expired prior to the date of a decision of the United States Supreme Court that the moneys had been illegally collected as taxes and it also having been held by both the United States Court of Claims and the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals that relief must be from the Congress and not from the courts.

It appears that in 1932 the Supreme Court held in the case of *Miller v. Nut Margarine Co.* (284 U. S. 498), that products similar to, if not identical with, the products manufactured by the Dixie Margarine Co. were not subject to the tax on oleomargarine. Thereafter, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue refunded to the Dixie Margarine Co. the sum of \$234,512.86 representing all amounts collected as such tax from that company prior to the effective date of the act of July 10, 1930, refund of which

was not then barred by the statute of limitations. The act of July 10, 1930 (46 Stat. 1022), amended the act relating to taxes on products defined as oleomargarine so as to include products such as manufactured by claimant company. The Commissioner refused to refund the sum of \$87,410 paid during the period covered by this bill for the reason that no refund claim therefor had been filed by the company within the 4 years required by section 3228 (a) of the revised statutes, as amended, now section 3313 of the Internal Revenue Code.

In justice to all taxpayers the Government has had no alternative other than to disapprove, because of its discriminatory nature, the enactment of special legislation designed to relieve taxpayers who allow their rights to become barred by the statute of limitations. To approve the instant bill would be to prefer this taxpayer not only over other taxpayers similarly situated from whom such taxes were collected prior to the Supreme Court's decision in the Miller case, but also over taxpayers generally who are bound by the same statute of limitations.

It is contended that the instant case is to be distinguished from the ordinary case of refund of taxes on the ground that in the Miller case the Supreme Court held that the money collected was not taxes but was an exaction in the guise of a tax. In this connection it is pertinent to note that the Supreme Court case did not involve the Dixie Margarine Co. and the language of its opinion when read in context is hardly susceptible of this construction. However, even conceding such a distinction, the case would not differ from those in which similar exactions have been collected by the Government, such as the processing and floor-stocks taxes collected under the Agricultural Adjustment Act—held unconstitutional in *United States v. Butler* (297 U. S. 1) and *Fontenot v. Ricker Rice Mills* (297 U. S. 110), gift taxes collected under the Revenue Act of 1924 on gifts made prior to its enactment, *Blodgett v. Holden* (275 U. S. 142); *Untermeyer v. Anderson* (276 U. S. 440), taxes collected under earlier acts on articles later held not to be taxable as automobile parts and accessories, *United States v. Jefferson Electric Co.* (291 U. S. 386), and cases discussed; Cf. *Indian Motorcycle Co. v. United States* (283 U. S. 570), and many other situations far too numerous and of too general occurrence to warrant further consideration. Return of this tax to claimant would constitute little more than a windfall. It would not reach the consumers who must be presumed to have paid it.

For the foregoing reasons, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 24, 1950.

JEWIS IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, Harry L. Golden and Martin Rywell wrote a book entitled "Jews in American History," in which is contained a foreword by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM]. The book deals with the

Jewish people in my community, Charleston, S. C.

In the book are contained a great many articles taken from Charleston newspapers, with which I am familiar, because this year we are celebrating the two-hundredth anniversary of the Jewish congregation in Charleston, S. C. Therefore I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point the articles to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JEWISH CONGREGATION OF CHARLESTON, S. C., 1750-1950

[From *Jews in American History*, by Harry L. Golden and Martin Rywell, with a foreword by Senator Frank Graham]

Remembrances of Charleston—the remembrances of her laurels as they form a wreath and a song is on her lyre, Charleston with its stately mansions, high piazzas and colorful gardens looks out upon the harbor. A subtle strength permeates the peaceful brightness of her sun, the luminous turquoise sky and ecstasy is in the air. Charleston, mistress of the harbor and busy with its commerce. Fort Sumter out on the harbor as a reminder of a period bygone. Charleston stands picturesque and colorful—famed and fortunate.

1950 marks the two hundredth anniversary of the organization of the congregation in Charleston. Jews settled early in South Carolina since Gov. John Archdale states he had a Jew for an interpreter in Charleston in 1695.

Many have been illustrious citizens in its history, Moses Lindo, Francis Salvador, the Jews of Charleston who fought under Captain Lushington in the Revolution, Solomon N. Carvalho, the artist who accompanied John C. Fremont in 1853 on his expedition to the west. Michael Lazarus who opened the Savannah River to navigation by steam between Charleston and Augusta. De Leon, Penina Moise, the Harleys, Franklin J. Moses, brilliant lawyer who served as chief justice of the South Carolina Supreme Court, Philip Phillips, and Maj. Edwin Warren Moise of the Confederate Army and prominent lawyer. Dr. Elias Marks founded the Columbia Female Academy in 1820 and later the Barhamville school from which Miss Martha Bullock, mother of President Theodore Roosevelt was graduated. Dr. B. A. Rodriguez was a prominent dentist who in 1836 was the first to make an artificial plate.

Gov. John Archdale, in his new description of that fertile and pleasant province of Carolina (London, 1707), tells how, in 1695, he employed a Spanish-speaking Jew—a marrano who professed "the Christian religion as the Papists do"—as an interpreter between himself and the Florida Indians. The name of a certain Mordecai Nathan appears in connection with an assessment of 1694. Samuel Mendis is mentioned in the records of 1696. Jews also were among the first to take advantage of "the act for making aliens free in this part of the Province and for granting liberty of conscience to all Protestants" (1696-97), as is indicated by the naturalization papers of Jacob Mendis, Abraham Avila (1697), and of Simon Valentine who was designated as "an alien of Ye Jewish Nation." Reference is made to David Riz and Moses Modina in 1700, and Jews are on record as having voted in the municipal election of 1703.

In the eighteenth century the number of Jewish settlers in Charleston (or, as it was then known, Charles Town), increased steadily. Most of them hailed from London, but some came from France, Holland, Jamaica, and Barbados. In 1741, there were several

arrivals from Savannah, Ga., and thereafter others came from New York and Rhode Island, Germany and even Poland, where the author of the *Sefer Haberith* (Vilna, 1798), referred to Charleston as Charlottesville.

These early Jewish settlers were mostly small traders, but some of them engaged in banking, agriculture, and industry on a large scale. Indigo culture, which in provincial days was the most lucrative industry of South Carolina, excepting the rice trade, flourished largely through the efforts of Moses Lindo, who arrived from London in 1756. In 1762, Lindo was appointed Surveyor and Inspector General of Indigo, a post created especially for him. Mordecai Sheftall, Philip Hart and the Joseph family did an extensive banking and exchange business with England and other countries. Also prominent in the colonial period was Joseph Levy, who was commissioned lieutenant in the Cherokee War of 1761.

In 1770, a number of Charleston Jews, including Lindo and Benjamin Hart, subscribed a substantial sum toward the maintenance of Brown University, a new institution in far-off Providence, R. I. Impressed by this generosity, the college trustees voted that "children of Jews may be admitted to this institution, and entirely enjoy the freedom of their own religion, without any restraint or imposition whatever."

During the period of the American Revolution the Jews, like the rest of the population, were divided in sympathy between the Patriot and Tory camps. But a remarkably large number served the Revolutionary cause. Indeed, after Charleston fell to the British, many Jewish families preferred to flee to Philadelphia, where 10 Charleston Jews were among the founders of Congregation Mikveh Israel in 1782. Of the 60 Charleston citizens who constituted the militia company of Capt. Richard Lushington, about 20 were Jews, and one of them, Joseph Solomon, was killed in the battle of Beaufort. At least 34 Jews served in the Revolution Armies. Of these, David N. Cardozo, who distinguished himself in the attempt to recapture Savannah, and Markes Lazarus were sergeants major; Jacob de la Motta and Abraham Seixas were captains. Maj. Benjamin Nones, of Philadelphia, distinguished himself in the siege of Charleston. Mordecai Sheftall was deputy commissioner general of issues to the Continental Army assigned to the southern department. Mordecai Manual Noah (1747-1845; not to be confused with his more famous namesake), contributed \$20,000 to the cause of the Revolution, while Myer Moses, who supplied the Continental Army with provisions and aided the wounded and imprisoned American patriots, earned "the good wishes and gratitude of all," according to Gen. Thomas Sumter.

In 1791, the community, now incorporated and numbering over 400 persons, decided to erect a larger synagogue, and within a short period raised the amount of \$20,000 for the purpose. This "new synagogue" which Lafayette later described as "spacious and elegant" was dedicated on Friday, December 19, 1794, with imposing ceremonies attended by the governor, the civil and military officers of the State, the municipal authorities, the clergy, and the public in general. It was regarded as the handsomest synagogue in America until its destruction in the great fire on Saturday, April 27, 1838.

Charleston Jews began their formal communal life on the day after Rosh Hashanah, 5510 (1749) when they organized Kahal Kadosh Beth Elohim (originally called Beth Elohim Nnveh Shallom), the fourth oldest congregation in what is now the United States. Moses Cohen was elected Haham or chief rabbi of the congregation, Isaac da Costa became Hazan or reader, Joseph Tobias, parnes or president, and Michael Lazarus,

military assistance program with our own military program. What was said in yesterday's debate is not going to be repeated. We shall go on to the additional \$4,000,000,000.

Three billion dollars has been made available for the peacetime expansion of industry in the 16 European countries, which is already overexpanded for peacetime production. Consequently, it was found that these countries must sell their peacetime products in our country and thus displace our own workmen. The \$3,000,000,000 could be transferred immediately. The appropriation has been made. What is the reason, then, that it must be expended in wartime on an already overexpanded peacetime industry? The \$3,000,000,000 additional should be made available immediately for national defense.

First I should like to read into the RECORD a brief excerpt from an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Times-Herald. It referred to the appropriation of approximately \$3,000,000,000 to build up the European countries' civilian peacetime economy and went on to say:

Considering the lack of response from these countries when the United Nations asked for troops to help our foot soldiers in Korea, it would be a good thing if we stopped some of our dollars from going abroad next year.

There is no valid reason for putting the people in this country on a wartime basis and still keep gouging them to build up peacetime economy in Europe. We will do enough along this line when we begin spending the ten billions for military purposes. We will increase our imports of tin, rubber, and so forth, and they will get the profits. And beyond that we may expect the administration to siphon off some of the goods as well to increase European munitions production.

Therefore, we urge that the civilian foreign aid be cut to a liquidation figure.

Mr. President, in the new appropriation bill there is an item of \$500,000,000 for peacetime public works. In wartime such works are unnecessary, and, in fact, undesirable. Our money and our man-hours should be devoted to the war effort. This \$500,000,000 should be transferred to the military program, except, of course, a relatively minor amount retained for emergency works.

The new budget is approximately \$42,000,000,000; \$13,500,000,000 is for the military; \$6,000,000,000 for veteran services and benefits; \$5,500,000,000 for interest on the public debt; and \$17,000,000,000 for the civil government, exclusive of the items mentioned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the exact figures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget, July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951

Requested for—	
National defense.....	\$13,545,000,000
Veterans' services and benefits.....	6,080,000,000
Interest on public debt.....	5,625,000,000
Remaining.....	17,189,000,000
Total.....	42,439,000,000

Mr. MALONE. Now, Mr. President, I wish to quote from the same editorial, as follows:

Last December, Senator BYRD made a proposal to save \$5,200,000,000 by cutting back Government domestic expenditures to the 1948 level.

BYRD's plan excluded any reductions in defense or any lessening of stockpiling atomic energy, veterans' aid, foreign aid, or interest on the public debt.

The Virginia Senator picked 1948 as a base because it was the soundest postwar year. The budget was balanced in 1948, Government expenditures were trimmed, and taxes were cut.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DOMESTIC PROGRAM

In 1948, the Federal Government spent the \$6,400,000,000 on its domestic program. When the distinguished Senator from Virginia recommended his plan, the country was not proceeding into a wartime economy as it is now, it was looking forward to another year in which the Government would be geared to peacetime operations. Now, with the abrupt change to wartime operations, it might be considered logical to make even deeper domestic cuts than those suggested by the distinguished Senator from Virginia. However, in order to raise the necessary funds, we need not go even as far as then suggested. The junior Senator from Nevada proposes that we save 20 percent of the seventeen billion for civil government. That would be approximately three and a half billions saved.

EIGHT BILLION DOLLARS OUT OF THE TEN BILLION DOLLARS REQUESTED AVAILABLE

Add this three and one-half billion to the half billion saved from peacetime public works and the four billions mentioned yesterday, which we can save by stopping ECA and by unifying our military programs, and we have eight billions for the new military program.

Under this plan, Mr. President, we need not load down our taxpayers with additional burdens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the complete editorial which appeared in the Times-Herald of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How To Save \$10,000,000,000

Here is a way for Congress to find that \$10,000,000,000 Mr. Truman is asking as a down payment on the cost the Nation is called on to pay for the administration's bonehead operations in Korea and elsewhere.

This plan does not call for added taxes. It calls for less costly civil government, and it is not dream stuff. Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, is the draftsman of its principles.

Senator BYRD is known from one end of the country to the other as a practical authority on government. If he says a thing can be done, it can be done.

Therefore, we offer this program for consideration in full confidence that any citizen can support it who sincerely wants the United States pulled safely through the misadventures of the Truman gang without the destruction of our domestic life.

Last December, Senator BYRD made a proposal to save \$5,200,000,000 by cutting back Government domestic expenditures to the 1948 level.

BYRD's plan excluded any reductions in defense or any lessening of stockpiling atomic energy, veterans' aid, foreign aid, or interest on the public debt.

The Virginia Senator picked 1948 as a base because it was the soundest postwar year. The budget was balanced in 1948, Government expenditures were trimmed, and taxes were cut.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS ECONOMICAL

It's also worthy of note that the Republican Eightieth Congress was in power that year and received as its reward for work well done a scathing attack from Truman, who called it the "worst Congress" in our history.

In 1948 the Federal Government spent \$6,400,000,000 on its domestic programs. In the 1951 budget Truman has asked Congress to give him \$11,600,000,000 for the same programs, therefore a return to the 1948 budget would result in the \$5,200,000,000 savings.

However, when Senator BYRD recommended this plan the country was not proceeding into a wartime economy as it is now. It was looking forward to another year in which the Government would be geared to peacetime operations. Now with the abrupt change to wartime operations it is only logical that we follow up Senator BYRD's basic program with even further cuts from the 1948 budget he proposed.

For example, there were \$200,000,000 in that 1948 budget for work relief. Certainly our increased production demands will wipe out need for any such expenditures. In that budget there were also \$100,000,000 for housing. The President in his message recommended knocking out all housing money. There were also in that 1948 budget, \$500,000,000 for peacetime public works. In wartime such are unnecessary and undesirable.

That budget also carried \$30,000,000 for agriculture support. That can't be justified. Another item on which the saving can be made is the \$300,000,000 postal deficit which should be wiped out immediately, regardless of whether we are to operate a peacetime or wartime economy. The Hoover reorganization report gives a full blueprint on how to accomplish this.

If these cuts were made it would bring the savings to \$6,300,000,000.

FOREIGN AID CAN BE CUT

Although BYRD did not recommend slashing the veterans' program for his peacetime budget it appears that there is sufficient room in the six billions asked by Truman in the 1951 budget to save at least 25 percent or \$700,000,000. In that 1951 request, for example, there are \$2,700,000,000 for the veterans' readjustment program. Certainly there will be a considerable cut in such activities as we build up the armed services.

Thus, the domestic cuts would save seven billion.

And we think that since America must tighten its belt again it would be a good time to look at the foreign-aid program for immediate relief. Since the war we have set up approximately 23 foreign-aid programs into which we have poured \$35,000,000,000.

The 1950 budget carries three and seven-tenths billions to build up Europe's civilian economy over and above the military aid we are giving.

Considering the lack of response from these countries when the United Nations asked for troops to help our foot soldiers in Korea, it would be a good thing if we stopped some of our dollars from going abroad next year.

There is no valid reason for putting the people in this country on a wartime basis and still keep gouging them to build up peacetime economy in Europe. We will do enough along this line when we begin spending the ten billions for military purposes. We will increase our imports of tin, rubber, etc., and they will get the profits. And beyond that we may expect the administration

to siphon off some of the goods as well to increase European munitions production.

Therefore, we urge that the civilian foreign aid be cut to a liquidation figure of \$700,000,000. The three billion cut on this item will then bring the total saving to ten billions. This bill produce a complete set-off to the ten billions to be spent.

To us it seems that economy is a much sounder method of meeting the increased military costs than burdening the American people with more taxes and more Government controls.

TIME TO TAKE STOCK

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is time for the Congress of the United States to take stock. It is time to gather the loose ends of this Government together, furnish the requested national defense fund of ten and one-half billion, but use the available funds before raising taxes.

All will agree that the Congress has been liberal with appropriations for national defense, the appropriations having amounted to \$89,124,000,000 since the close of World War II.

The junior Senator from Nevada has suggested the source of eight billion, available to be applied on the ten and one-half billion needed at this time, according to the President's request. Additional funds are available from other sources.

The junior Senator from Nevada will have more to say about this subject later.

THE WAR IN KOREA—OBLIGATION OF ALL MEMBERS OF UNITED NATIONS TO FURNISH TROOPS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, my remarks this afternoon will be very brief.

The United Nations are in a war to win. We will win. In fact, we will win even if the United States has to do the job with its own ground troops alone. Of that, there can be no doubt.

Republicans are giving this administration full support in the Korean crisis. However, the time has come for this country to be realistic.

The United States has not unlimited manpower. We are willing to furnish more than our share of arms and munitions of war in this fight to halt communism. We are willing to furnish our share of men, but I am convinced that this administration has not done all it can to secure the cooperation of the other United Nations in furnishing their share of manpower.

England, Australia, France, the Philippines, and other countries have large numbers of able-bodied young men who should be trained right now to take their places alongside our valiant soldiers on the Korean front. It is not just or prudent for this Nation to bear the whole brunt of the Communist onslaught. I urge the administration to call immediately an emergency meeting of the Security Council to discuss means of training their young men forthwith to do their share of the fighting in Korea, and thus make more modest inroads in our supply of reservists and the use of Americans.

Trygve Lie's appeal to the United Nations for support should be followed by vigorous action on the part of the administration to translate the general de-

sires and pious hopes into concrete results in the way of infantry troops and antitank battalions of all nations.

Let us make this in fact the fight of all the free world in the United Nations against communism.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Atomic Energy Commission," on page 287, line 1, to strike out the following proviso:

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authorization shall be used in connection with the payment of any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost plus a fixed fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where the fee for community management is at a rate in excess of \$90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where the fee is at a rate in excess of \$45,000 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Civil Service Commission," on page 287, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$80,000," and on page 288, line 4, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$15,261,913" and insert "\$15,761,913."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion," on page 291, line 5, after the word "Congress", to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Displaced Persons Commission," on page 291, after line 109, to strike out:

Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (Public Law 774, approved June 25, 1948), including personal services and rents in the District of Columbia; travel expenses, including travel expenses outside continental United States without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; and payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; \$455,100: *Provided*, That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are

allocated: *Provided further*, That the Commission may enter into agreements with governmental and private agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this act.

And in lieu thereof, to insert the following:

Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended by the act of June 16, 1950 (Public Law 555), including personal services and rents in the District of Columbia; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; purchase (not to exceed three), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); expenses incident to the primary and secondary education of American children who are dependents of Government personnel paid from this appropriation and stationed overseas; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; and payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; \$9,000,000: *Provided*, That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further*, That the Commission may enter into agreements with international, governmental, and private agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Power Commission," on page 295, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$247,500" and insert "\$256,500", and in line 16, after the word "newspapers", to strike out "\$3,938,300" and insert "\$4,013,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Trade Commission," on page 296, line 10, after the word "newspapers", to strike out \$3,866,695" and insert "\$3,916,695", and in line 11, after the word "available", to strike out "to the Bureau of Trade Practice Conferences."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Accounting Office," on page 296, line 21, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "\$34,500,000" and insert "\$32,689,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 297, line 3, after "(28 U. S. C. 2672)", to insert "for newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding \$600)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Services Administra-

tion," on page 297, line 15, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "\$28,000,000" and insert "\$22,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 300, line 17, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$333,608,240" and insert "\$605,000,000"; in line 19, after the word "expended", to strike out "of which not to exceed \$25,000,000 may be expended in accordance with the purposes of said act of July 23, 1946, through purchase contracts negotiated with operators within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and in making advance payments on such contracts to the extent determined to be necessary to the performance thereof, and"; and on page 301, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$125,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 332, line 24, after the word "vehicles", to insert a semicolon and "and in addition, the General Services Administration is authorized to enter into contracts in an amount not to exceed \$4,000,000 for the purposes of this appropriation"; and on page 303, line 3, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure on any project until a certificate has been received from the Secretary of Defense that the installation of such facility will be of value in connection with national defense.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 303, line 12, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$28,000,000" and insert "\$20,000,000", and in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$32,000,000" and insert "\$27,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 304, line 2, after "(62 Stat. 1155)", to strike out "\$900,000" and insert "\$750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 304, line 12, after the word "books", to strike out "\$60,000" and insert "\$52,285."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 304, line 15, after "(58 Stat. 827)", to strike out "\$1,300,000" and insert "\$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 307, line 12, after the word "War", to strike out "\$76,500,000" and insert "\$82,725,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 309, after line 6, to strike out:

During the current fiscal year, no part of any money appropriated in this or any other act shall be used during any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase typewriting machines (except bookkeeping and billing machines) at a price which exceeds 90 percent of the lowest net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the most-favored customer (other than the Government, the American National Red Cross, and the purchasers of typewriting machines for educational purposes only) of the manufacturer of such machines during the 6-month period immediately preceding such quarter.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 309, after line 17, to strike out:

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other act for any agency of the executive branch of the Government (which shall include all departments, independent establishments, and wholly owned Government corporations) shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines (except typewriting machines for veterans under public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration) unless the Administrator of General Services certifies that he is unable to furnish such agency with suitable typewriting machines out of stock on hand. The Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed at such times as he may determine to be necessary to survey and determine the numbers and kinds of typewriting machines located in the continental limits of the United States which are at any time surplus to the requirements of any agency in the executive branch of the Government (which shall include all departments, independent establishments, and wholly owned Government corporations). Upon such determination the Administrator of General Services is authorized to direct, upon such notice and in such manner as he may prescribe, the head of any such agency to surrender to the General Services Administration any and all typewriting machines surplus to its requirements, the costs of packing, shipping, and handling thereof to be charged to the general supply fund. Each such agency shall furnish the Administrator of General Services such information regarding typewriting machines, wherever located, as he may from time to time request. The General Services Administration is authorized and directed to receive, hold, sell, exchange, or supply to any branch of the Government, including the District of Columbia, typewriting machines surrendered to it hereunder. The Administrator of General Services is authorized to charge each agency to which typewriting machines are supplied hereunder amounts equal to the fair value thereof, as determined by him, and such amounts shall be credited to the general supply fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Office of the Administrator," on page 311, line 22, after the numerals "1949", to strike out "\$4,200,000" and insert "\$4,900,000"; and on page 312, line 3, after the word "amended", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That necessary expenses of inspections of projects financed through loans to educational institutions authorized by title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be compensated by such institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative, and for the purpose of providing such inspections, the Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such institutions or the Administrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such charges have been made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subheading "Public Housing Administration," on page 312, line 20, after "(42 U. S. C. 1410)", to strike out "\$7,500,000" and insert "\$9,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 313, line 15, after the word "Administration", to strike out "\$8,750,000" and insert "\$11,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission," on page 314, line 13, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$9,889,600" and insert "\$10,002,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 315, line 10, after "(28 U. S. C. 2672)", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,016,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 315, line 19, after "(28 U. S. C. 2672)", to strike out "\$700,000" and insert "\$718,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Motor Carrier Claims Commission—Salaries and expenses," on page 316, line 12, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$175,000" and insert "\$227,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics," on page 317, line 4, after the word "all", to strike out "\$40,890,630" and insert "\$44,225,630", and in line 11, after the word "reimbursement", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the operation of a field office outside the continental or territorial limits of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 317, line 24, after the word "of", to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$12,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Capital Housing Authority," on page 318, line 5, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$35,000" and insert "\$39,600", and in line 7, after the word "monthly", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, 81st Cong.) shall not be effective.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Philippine War Damage Commission," on page 320, line 18, after the word "Philippines", to insert "or, in the absence of such finding by such court, the Commission after hearing finds upon evidence that such person was guilty of such collaboration or act of disloyalty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Securities and Exchange Commission," on page 321, line 11, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$6,130,000" and insert "\$6,330,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Smithsonian Institution," on page 322, line 20, after the word "publications", to strike out "\$2,606,490" and insert "\$2,770,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 322, after line 20, to insert:

Paleontological investigations: For payments to non-Federal agencies for cooperative paleontological investigations in accordance with the act of August 15, 1949 (Pub. Law 228), to remain available until expended, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 323, line 25, after the word "proper", to strike out "\$1,158,000" and insert "\$1,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to go back for a moment to page 282 under the heading "Independent Offices," the item "American Battle Monuments Commission." I am satisfied that I know the answer to the question which I want to put to the chairman of the subcommittee, but I should like to make it a matter of record at the present time. My question is this: Is there anything in the section starting on page 282 dealing with the American Battle Monuments Commission that would in any way limit any agency of Government which has jurisdiction over existing battle monuments and battlefields to continue to maintain the battlefield at Balls Bluff, near Leesburg, Va.?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the operations under this appropriation are primarily those which are carried on as the result of World War No. 2. The cemetery to which the Senator refers is, I think, the subject of a bill which was introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYRINGS], the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, earlier in the year, and which has been favorably reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and is now on the calendar.

Mr. MORSE. What does it provide?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It provides for the elimination of certain cemeteries and the extension of others.

Mr. MORSE. Is there anything in this appropriation which would give the Government officials who have jurisdiction over the battlefield at Balls Bluff an excuse for not continuing to maintain that battlefield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no, there is nothing in this bill that would.

Mr. MORSE. I simply wanted to know that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The question the Senator from Oregon raises is wholly a question of legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to take a minute—half a minute, really, to state my position.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the bill which was reported favorably on Monday by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and it is possible that when that is reached upon the call of the calendar the Senator may wish to discuss it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall discuss it for half a minute now. I hope the bill which was reported by the Senator's committee does not provide for the elimination of the battlefield at Balls Bluff, because if it does the Senator from Oregon will oppose it. He is sure that he

will have support from very high Government officials outside the Senate. The battlefield of Balls Bluff happens to be the battlefield in which Oliver Wendell Holmes was first wounded in the Civil War, and it happens to be the battlefield on which Senator Baker, of Oregon, lost his life.

It is a very small battlefield, involving almost a nominal sum for support. I think it would be most unfortunate if the few hundred dollars it takes a year to maintain that great historic monument cannot be supplied by the Congress of the United States. I wish to make the RECORD now because, while information was given to me privately that this bill did not cover it, yet having found myself in controversy with some of the Government agencies over that battlefield, I wanted the RECORD to be perfectly clear that they could not hide behind any action we take this afternoon in the matter of continuing to maintain the Balls Bluff battlefield as a historic monument.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say that there is nothing in the world in the bill that affects that battlefield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tariff Commission," on page 324, line 8, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)" to strike out "\$1,290,700" and insert "\$1,340,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "The Tax Court of the United States," on page 325, line 4, after the word "services", to strike out "\$820,000" and insert "\$826,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States Maritime Commission," on page 325, line 17, after the figures "\$63,000,000", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used to start any new ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year, nor to start any new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construction and the Director shall submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, as used herein, the term "budget" includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates" and in lieu thereof to insert "Provided, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used (1) to start any new ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year or (2) to start any new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless, in either case, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construction and the Director shall submit forth-

with a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, as used herein, the term "budget" includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$64,875,000 of the funds and contract authority made available for new ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, shall continue to be available until December 31, 1950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 326, line 24, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$26,450,000" and insert "\$30,108,000", and on page 328, line 11, after the word "contracts", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for obligation, nor any obligation made, for the payment of an operating differential subsidy for any number of ships in excess of the number of ships which are entitled to receive an operating differential subsidy pursuant to provisions of any contract, authorization, commitment or obligation by the Commission in existence on January 1, 1950, including within said limitation as to number any ships being constructed or contracted for on said date under a construction-differential subsidy contract and including also any ships the operation of which may be authorized by the Commission under any contracts which may result from any formal applications filed with the Commission prior to January 1, 1950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 330, after line 2, to strike out:

Maritime training: For training personnel for the manning of merchant marine (including operation of training stations at Kings Point, N. Y.; Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.; Alameda, Calif., and the United States Maritime Service Institute), including not to exceed \$2,229,300 for administrative personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; printing and binding; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); not to exceed \$2,500 for contingencies for the Superintendent, United States Merchant Marine Academy, to be expended in his discretion; not to exceed \$77,000 for transfer to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for services rendered the Commission; \$3,342,660, including uniforms and textbooks for cadet midshipmen, to be provided in kind at an average yearly cost of not to exceed \$200 per cadet: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for compensation or allowances for trainees or cadets.

And in lieu thereof, to insert the following:

Maritime training: For training personnel for the manning of the merchant marine (including operation of training stations at Kings Point, N. Y.; Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.; Alameda, Calif., and the United States Maritime Service Institute), including not to exceed \$2,477,000 for administrative personal services (exclusive of pay of cadet midshipmen and other trainees) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles, for replacement

only; printing and binding; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); not to exceed \$2,500 for contingencies for the Superintendent, United States Merchant Marine Academy, to be expended in his discretion; not to exceed \$77,000 for transfer to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for services rendered the Commission; \$3,930,520, including the pay of cadet midshipmen and other trainees.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer. I am not sure of the page on which it comes, and I do not want action to be taken at the point at which my amendment should be offered. The amendment is at the desk and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 331, line 3, after the word "elsewhere" it is proposed to insert "which may be used to provide pay and allowances for personnel of the United States Maritime Service comparable to those of the Coast Guard as authorized by law (46 U. S. C. 1126, 14 F. R. 7707)".

On page 331, line 10, it is proposed to strike out \$3,930,520 and insert \$4,348,520.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this is an amendment which I have discussed with the senior Senator from Wyoming. It relates to the pay of the officers and personnel of the Maritime Training School. As I understand, these men have always been paid by law on the same basis as the Coast Guard is paid. The Coast Guard received an increase in pay by the act passed a year ago. By mistake in the committee the act did not include the same raise in pay for the maritime officers and men who are at this training school. Provision was made for pay for the cadets but the amount appropriated was not sufficient to cover an increase. If my amendment is not adopted, these men will have a decrease in their present pay rather than the increase to which they are entitled.

I believe the Senator from Wyoming is thoroughly informed with the situation and is in accord with the amendment I have just offered, but I should prefer to have him speak for himself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think I should say for the RECORD that the committee in its search for ways and means of reducing the appropriation to the lowest efficient amount cut \$418,000 from the appropriation for maritime training in the belief that the officers to whom the Senator from Massachusetts has referred were not entitled to the increase in pay which was granted to them by the administrative action of the Maritime Commission at the beginning of the year. We checked the pay-increase law of last year and found that it did not deal specifically with this group.

Later however, after the committee had acted upon the measure, my attention was called by the Senator from Massachusetts and by others to the fact that the law establishing this organization specifically provides that the officers in maritime training shall receive the pay which is provided for Coast Guard officers in similar grades. So it would be legislation for us to cut out the

appropriation, and I have no objection to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator consider it legislation if the amendment is allowed to be acted upon?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. But it would be legislation to attempt to cut it out, that is, to change the law which provides that the men in question shall receive the same pay as the others.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Inasmuch as the law provides that they shall receive the same pay as the officers of the Coast Guard, I think there is nothing we can do about it on an appropriation bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I inquire if the officers assigned to the maritime training schools are employed on the same basis as the officers of the Coast Guard? In other words, are they officers who have enlisted for a period of years or are they employed as instructors, as college and high school instructors are employed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They are employed on the same basis as other officers in the Coast Guard. That is true of the men also.

Mr. AIKEN. And they enlist for a period of years?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I simply wish to say that I believe the committee amendment is very definitely a proposal in the national defense. One of the largest of the merchant marine academies is situated in the State of New York, at King's Point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is discussing the committee amendment, to which there is no objection. The question now before the Senate is on agreeing to an amendment offered from the floor by the Senator from Massachusetts, to restore \$418,000, which was voted by the committee to be stricken out. In taking that action, the committee was under a misapprehension as to the existing law.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator for guiding me in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to the committee amendment on page 331, in line 3.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the second amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts to the committee amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. To the committee amendment beginning on page 330, after line 2, and ending on page 331 in line 11, the following amendment is proposed: On page 331, in line 10, strike out "\$3,930,520", and insert "\$4,348,520."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 331, after line 11, to strike out:

State marine schools: To reimburse the State of California, \$50,000; the State of Maine, \$50,000; the State of Massachusetts, \$50,000; and the State of New York, \$50,000; for expenses incurred in the maintenance and support of marine schools in such States as provided in the act authorizing the establishment of marine schools, and so forth, approved March 4, 1911, as amended (34 U. S. C. 1121-1123); \$153,000 for the maintenance and repair of vessels loaned by the United States to the said States for use in connection with such State marine schools, and \$340,000 for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence of cadets at an average yearly cost of not to exceed \$475 per cadet; \$668,000, together with not to exceed \$25,000 of the unobligated balance for this purpose contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

State marine schools: To reimburse the State of California, \$50,000; the State of Maine, \$50,000; the State of Massachusetts, \$50,000; and the State of New York, \$50,000; for expenses incurred in the maintenance and support of marine schools in such States as provided in the act authorizing the establishment of marine schools, and so forth, approved March 4, 1911, as amended (34 U. S. C. 1121-1123); \$153,000 for the maintenance and repair of vessels loaned by the United States to the said States for use in connection with such State marine schools, and \$749,050 for the pay of 710 cadet midshipmen at \$65 per month and \$275 per annum for the subsistence of each cadet midshipman; \$1,102,050.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 332, line 22, after the word "the", to strike out "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950" and insert "Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Veterans' Administration," on page 336, line 12, after the word "appliances", to strike out "\$875,847,795" and insert "\$887,621,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 340, line 1, after the word "application", to strike out "therefore" and insert "therefor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 342, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "4" and insert "6.7"; and on page 343, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "7" and insert "10."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Claims Commission—Ad-

ministrative expenses," on page 345, line 15, after the word "Commission", to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Independent offices—General provisions," on page 349, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 110. None of the sections under the head "Independent offices, General provisions" in this title shall apply to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Inland Waterways Corporation, or the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "Housing and Home Finance Agency," on page 353, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$17,724,000" and insert "\$17,524,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes chapter VIII of the bill.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment appearing in the next chapter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, have we passed from the portion of the bill dealing with independent-offices appropriations, and are we now considering the portion of the bill dealing with civil-functions appropriations?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Yesterday the Senator from Illinois was granted permission to offer any amendment he might wish to offer to the committee amendments from page 277 to page 283. Accordingly, the Senator from Illinois is recognized at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. At the close of consideration by us of the committee amendments in this chapter, it had been my intention to advert to a certain matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on page 304, beginning in line 19, is a section, referring to public works advanced planning. It reads as follows:

Public works advance planning: The unexpended balances on June 30, 1950, of funds made available for public works advance planning under title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 791), are hereby continued available for expenditure until June 30, 1951.

I have been checking into this matter since the conclusion of the consideration of this section of the bill by the committee; and I find that it will be possible to make a reduction there.

So I now move that on page 304, in line 19, the word "The" be stricken, and there be inserted in lieu thereof the words "Not to exceed \$4,000,000 of the," so that this action by the Senate will result in cutting out \$2,000,000 of the unexpended appropriation.

Then in line 24, after the—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may we act first on the amendment already stated by the Senator?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is all one amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is the Senator from Wyoming going to ask that all of it be handled as one amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. On what page does this amendment appear, Mr. President?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is on page 304.

Then, Mr. President, in line 24 on that page, after the numeral "1951", I move that the following be added:

The sum of \$2,000,000 carried in the said unexpended balance shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator offer that as a committee amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment just stated by the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yesterday the Senator from Illinois was granted permission to offer amendments to certain items, and he is recognized at this time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to ask the Senator in charge of this portion of the bill whether any provision is made in the bill for the stockpiling program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. MURRAY. On page 300, in line 19, I notice that the language stricken from the bill, as the bill is reported by the committee, seems to indicate that no provision is being made for a stockpiling program under which provision would be made to permit the purchase of materials for stockpiling in the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; the language which came over to us in the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives, I am sure, was a technical error. In line 19, on page 300, after stating the amount of the appropriation, it read as follows:

Of which not to exceed \$25,000,000 may be expended in accordance with the purposes of said act of July 23, 1946—

And so forth. That would have meant that there would have been a limitation upon the expenditures for stockpiling within the United States. However, I am sure that was not the intention of the House committee or of the House of Representatives when they acted upon this matter.

In the Senate committee we voted to strike all of it out, because the Stockpiling Act of July 23, 1946, in securing the passage of which the Senator from Montana was of such great help, provides specific authority for the purchase of strategic and critical materials within the United States. Indeed, that Act specifically encourages the development of such materials.

So I am sure that any difficulty can be straightened out in conference.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for that explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has been recog-

nized. Does he wish to offer an amendment at this time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I regret that I was not present when consideration of the appropriation bill was resumed today. I have been in my office, keeping somewhat close tab on the probabilities in regard to the time when consideration of the bill would be resumed.

At 5:10 p. m. this afternoon, I was informed that the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] was speaking, and that the probability was that he would speak for some time thereafter. Therefore, I did not think that the consideration of the appropriation bill would be resumed here so suddenly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the reservation made yesterday, the Senator from Illinois has received permission—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I understand about that, but I should like to make a further statement at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed, certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Continuing Mr. President, at 5:15, I received a telephone message that the appropriation bill was again being considered by the Senate. So I hurried here, arriving here at 5:20 p. m. When I arrived, I found that in that space of 5 minutes the Senate had moved from the consideration of the committee amendments on page 283 to the consideration of the committee amendments on page 329, or 46 pages, in 5 minutes. So I wish to congratulate the reading clerk for the speed and celerity with which he moved through those complicated pages of the bill. Yesterday in open-eyed amazement, I saw him move from page 277 to page 283—some 6 pages—in 6 seconds. However, I was not certain that he could maintain that pace over a long period of time. [Laughter.]

Nevertheless, Mr. President, today I find that due to the great ability of the reading clerk, the Senate covered over 45 pages in 5 minutes. So I can say that the Senate's reading clerk not only is qualified as a dash man, he is not only a verbal Jesse Owens, but he is also qualified as a middle-distance runner, for in running the half-mile he has demonstrated that he can sprint all the way. At the appropriate time I am going to move that we award to the reading clerk a medal for the celerity with which he has helped us get through this measure. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, the result of this speed—almost exceeding as it did the velocity of light—is that I missed being on the floor of the Senate at the time when the Senate was considering the committee amendments from page 283 on. Accordingly, I must throw myself upon the mercy of the Senate in craving its indulgence and pardon for not having been here while the committee amendments on those pages were being read by the reading clerk and while the Senate deliberated at high speed upon them.

I believe that the Presiding Officer has ruled—and very properly—that because of the understanding arrived at on yesterday, I am privileged to request the

reconsideration of the items up to page 283. However, I think I should now serve notice that I am going to request the reconsideration of a number of items from page 283 on. Whether the Senate will permit those items to be reconsidered, of course, is a matter for the Senate itself to determine.

Mr. President, on page 280, in line 9, in the item dealing with appropriations for the Bureau of the Budget, let me say that I hope we do not grant the \$26,000 increase, but, instead, hold to the amount voted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Illinois that the House of Representatives cut this appropriation by \$100,000. In its report the House committee explains that it was intended to deny funds to open a new central office in the field. However, upon examination of the figures it was discovered that only \$76,000 had been allocated to that purpose. The Senate committee agreed that the new field station should not be opened, but the additional \$26,000 reduction above the \$74,000 which was intended to be cut out would, in the opinion of the committee, be a matter for the Bureau of the Budget, which actually has served a perfectly splendid purpose in cutting down the budget estimates.

I am glad to be able to tell the Senator that we went into the matter of the budget estimates at great length. The estimates which have come to the Congress on this bill were, by reason of the action of the Bureau of the Budget, some \$3,000,000,000 less than the requests made by the various bureaus and agencies. I think it would not be a wise reduction to cut that additional \$26,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to thank the Senator from Wyoming for his very clear and, of course, very accurate statement of the amounts to be appropriated for the Budget Bureau, which the Budget Bureau itself proposed. But I should like to point out that the House figure was \$86,000 above the amount for last year. The Senate figure will be \$112,000 above the amount for last year. Mr. President, we are in a situation where we must cut virtually every bureau, in order to release energies for the war. The Budget Bureau is a very fine organization, but like most other governmental agencies it should absorb some reductions. There is fat in the Budget Bureau. They will deny it, but there is certainly some fat there, as elsewhere. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but I hope we can save \$26,000 and reject the committee amendment. I move that we reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote may be reconsidered, but that the argument of the Senator from Illinois be denied, and the committee amendment be again approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to is reconsidered. The question now is upon agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now move that on page 281, line 6, the Senate reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to which substituted \$215,500 for \$160,000 on the appropriation for the Philippine Alien Property Administration. I hope we may hold to the smaller House figure of \$160,000.

Mr. President, the work of this organization has diminished.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to ask unanimous consent that we reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to, in order that the Senator may make his argument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator may now proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amount appropriated by the House was \$160,000. The committee increased this by \$55,000, bringing the total to \$215,000. The House committee, in its report, on page 201, states that the bulk of the \$55,000 cut which it imposed, as compared to the budget request, was for funds requested for terminal leave. In the judgment of the House committee, these funds can be absorbed in the 1950-51 funds, and therefore they put into effect their cut below the budget estimate. The Senate committee has restored this figure, but, in view of the diminished work which the Philippine Alien Property Administration is carrying on, I hope that we shall reconsider the committee amendment and will not approve it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like merely to say that the committee restored the budget estimate, and upon this estimate, after having examined the members of the Philippine Alien Property Administration, and in the belief that providing the budget estimate, that is to say, by increasing the amount that the House had cut, we would expedite the completion of the work. War claims have dragged out in past instances to a great period. This, I think, will expedite the disposal of all the work of this commission, and will be decidedly in the public interest. In any event, it will be clearly before the Congress. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I must now throw myself on the mercy of the Senate, from now on, because the pages 283 to 329 were covered in the 5 minutes between the time I left my office and the time I arrived on the floor of the Senate. I may say that I am going to ask reconsideration of appropriations as follows:

Page 288, line 4: This is an item for salaries and expenses of the Civil Service Commission. We should reject the committee increase of \$500,000 because the House committee report on page 204 pointed out the degree of overstaffing in this agency which was borne out in the House hearings, especially on pages 1459

and 1460. By rejecting the committee amendment we would save \$500,000.

Page 303, line 19: This is an item for advance planning of public works by the General Services Administration. I hope we may reconsider this item so that I may offer an amendment to reduce the amount to \$17,000,000, which would leave this program at last year's level. I do not believe we should increase these funds at the present time since this program was designed to get works planned in case of a depression and since, under the old program, we still have \$2,000,000,000 in works already planned not counting those for rivers, harbors, flood control, reclamation, and a host of others. If my amendment is adopted we will save \$10,000,000.

Page 307, line 12: This is an item for operating expenses of the General Services Administration. This new category of expenditures should be able to absorb the 7 percent cut provided for by the House. If we reject the committee amendment we will save \$6,225,000.

Page 314, line 13: An item for general expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The House has already increased last year's appropriation by \$290,000. I see no reason for giving this agency its full budget request, as the committee has done, when we have not done so for most agencies. I hope we can reject the committee's amendment and save \$113,000.

Page 321, line 11: An item for salaries and expenses of the Securities and Exchange Commission. The House figure has already allowed an increase of \$380,000 for this Commission over funds expended last year should be enough. By rejecting the committee amendment we can save \$200,000.

Page 322, line 20: Salaries and expenses of the Smithsonian Institution—another case of allowing the full budget request while we have not done so in most agencies. We should reject the committee amendment and save \$163,510.

Page 325, line 17: If we accept the amendment which I shall offer, for reasons I hope to develop, we will save \$41,000,000.

Page 326, line 24: I hope we will reject this amendment and save \$3,658,000.

The sum total of these amendments which I hope will be adopted would save approximately \$60,000,000 in funds and contract authorizations I now move that the Senate reconsider the action by which it has approved these items, and that we take them up one by one.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hope that I am not indulging in an excess of optimism in what I am about to say in my appeal to the Senator from Illinois. I hold in my hand the volume of the hearings by this committee on this chapter of the bill. It contains 1,136 pages of printed testimony. I assure the Senator that the members of the committee went into these items with the greatest care, and with the purpose of cutting appropriations wherever there was a possibility of cutting them. We had new estimates which were not before the House. Nevertheless, we have reported to the Senate a bill which is

below the amount appropriated by the House.

The very unusual aspect of this chapter, different from any other chapter which is before the Senate, is that of the total amount of cash carried in the bill, 90 percent is for war-connected expenditures, and with respect to contract authorizations, 93 percent is for war-connected expenditures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The amendments I am proposing do not deal with war-connected expenditures, unless we can take the Maritime Commission expenditures to be of that nature. The proposals I am now making are largely for a reduction of administrative costs.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may suggest that the Maritime Commission certainly is war-connected. There are many vessels in storage which may very shortly be used. I think it would be very unwise at this moment, when we are engaged in transporting men and materials across the Pacific Ocean because of what is going on in Korea, to cut the appropriation for the Maritime Commission below that which is provided for in the bill.

I am quite sincere in saying to the Senator that I am confident that in asking for the reconsideration of these various items, he is asking the Senate to reject the considered opinion of the members of the subcommittee on independent offices who carefully and judiciously, if I may say so, examined every one of the appropriations for the purpose of cutting wherever we could cut.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that, of course, we all respect him and we also respect the work of his committee, and one of the things which has always endeared him to the other Members of the Senate has been his constant willingness to listen to points that are made both on and off the floor, and to preserve an open mind regarding matters in dispute.

I want to make it clear that I do not pretend to omniscience. I make many mistakes, myself. It is quite possible that I am in error regarding some of the amendments which I am going to propose. But I should be grateful if the Senator from Wyoming, with his usual courtesy and gentleness, would at least allow me briefly to make my proposals for economy, and then he, doubtless, will be able to refute my arguments; and I am sure he probably has the votes to support him, no matter what may happen in the course of the argument itself.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Illinois feels that way, to conserve time would the Senator mind making his motion to reconsider all the amendments en bloc, and then if to any one of them the Senator wants to move an amendment, that may be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That would permit my proposals to be killed all at once,

rather than their dying a slow death one by one. I had been hoping that one or two of my suggestions might appeal to the Members of the Senate and that my efforts would not be entirely unavailing. I am not merely trying to make a record, Mr. President; I am hoping to save some money. I can promise the Senator from Wyoming that I shall try to be brief in discussing each one of the items, with the exception of the Maritime Commission. In that case there are enormous sums of money involved and both the General Accounting Office and a subcommittee of the House have indicated gross waste, negligence, or even worse in the payment of the construction and operation subsidies.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Chair kindly state the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion made by the Senator from Illinois to reconsider the vote by which the amendments which he has mentioned were adopted. His motion was to reconsider them en bloc.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question, but before I yield may I say that if unanimous consent is going to be refused, I should like to have an opportunity to make an argument on the largest item, which is that for the Maritime Commission. So, before the guillotine falls, I shall be glad to yield to my good friend, the gentle and able Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank my distinguished friend for his customary courtesy.

I am interested in an item involving the maritime program, at page 330 of the bill, and it well may be that I would approach the subject from a little different angle, because I should like to add an item rather than to subtract one. Nevertheless, since we have an identity of geographic interest in this bill, I should like to concur with him in the hope that he might let it be open for consideration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad the able Senator from Florida finds his interest coinciding with mine in the desire to reconsider this item, although, unfortunately, I regret that he is trying to increase the amount in the bill and is not joining in an effort to diminish it.

Mr. PEPPER. I propose construction rather than subtraction.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may I suggest that we eliminate that one item, and vote on the others?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think that is a very constructive suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider the action by which the amendments have been adopted, with the exception stated by the Senator from Arizona. [Putting the question.] The "noes" have it, and the motion is not agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider the action of the Senate in

adopting the amendment relating to the Maritime Commission.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to have the Members of the Senate turn to pages 324, 325, and 326 of the bill which is before us. It will be noticed that line 17 on page 325 carries an appropriation of \$63,000,000 for new ship construction, which was made by the House and continued by the Senate.

If Senators will turn to page 326 they will note that on line 17 there is a further authorization of \$64,875,000 made available, or a combined total of \$127,875,000. The figure of \$64,875,000 is, presumably, merely to carry over previous authorizations which have been made. But, Mr. President, we are, putting at the disposal of the Maritime Commission a total sum of more than \$127,000,000 for subsidies on new ship construction. It should be realized that these sums are not all directly connected with any immediate war effort. They were put into the budget and inserted by the committee prior to the war situation. They were designed to carry out a permanent merchant-marine and not to meet any sudden need for shipping in connection with the Korean war. If additional maritime shipping is needed in connection with hostilities, it can be covered in any war appropriations bill which is introduced.

So that the issue before us, Mr. President, deals really with the long time merchant-marine policy of the Nation.

The Members of this body are aware of the investigations of the Maritime Commission which have been made by the General Accounting Office under the direction of Mr. Lindsay Warren, and also, on two occasions, by a House subcommittee headed by Representative Porter Hardy of Virginia. We are all acquainted with the head of the General Accounting Office, Mr. Lindsay Warren, of North Carolina, a fellow North Carolinian of the distinguished Senator who is presiding at the moment. He is a man of great integrity, a man of great ability, and is a noble public servant.

Mr. Warren has found that the Maritime Commission made gross overpayments in connection with construction subsidies and in connection with operating subsidies, and these charges by the head of the General Accounting Office, the Comptroller General of the United States, were investigated by the House committee headed, as I have said, by Representative HARDY of Virginia.

Representative HARDY comes from a district close to the great shipbuilding center of Norfolk. Therefore certainly he is not a man who would be prejudiced against the shipbuilding interests.

Yet on two occasions, last year and this year, the House committee, I believe, unanimously made its report saying that excessive operating and excessive construction subsidies had been paid by the Maritime Commission apparently involving many of these same items that are included in the appropriation bill.

It will be remembered that last year the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] mentioned a similar item

in the appropriation bill for that year, involving the ships *Mariposa* and the *Monterey*. We had a long colloquy on that subject on the floor of the Senate.

I have gone into this matter in some detail and some weeks ago I addressed a letter to the Acting Administrator of the Maritime Administration, because, as we know, the organization has changed somewhat in the last few weeks. I wrote to Mr. John T. Koehler, and in the letter I asked four questions concerning the \$63,000,000 item for construction subsidies:

1. What are the vessels to be covered by the contract authority?
2. Have formal applications been filed by the companies which would benefit from this contract authority?
3. According to present calculations, is it reasonable to assume that these contracts will be let before June 30, 1951?
4. What is the status in detail of these negotiations?

On July 18, Mr. Koehler replied to my letter. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks a copy of my letter to Mr. Koehler and his reply be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 29, 1950.

MR. JOHN T. KOEHLER,
Administrator of Maritime Administration,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KOEHLER: In my studies of the pending appropriations bill I find an item of \$63,000,000 in contract authority for maritime subsidies. This has raised four questions in my mind and I would be grateful for the answers to the following questions:

1. What are the vessels to be covered by this contract authority?
2. Have formal applications been filed by the companies who would benefit from this contract authority?
3. According to present calculations is it reasonable to assume that these contracts will be let before June 30, 1951?
4. What is the status in detail of these negotiations?

I would very much appreciate a reply to this letter as early as possible.

Sincerely,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 18, 1950.

The Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Reference is made to your letter of June 29, 1950, concerning an item of \$63,000,000 in the 1951 appropriation bill.

Our 1951 construction budget as submitted to Congress after approval by the Bureau of the Budget called for contract authority of \$75,000,000, made up as follows:

1 prototype naval auxiliary vessel.....	\$10,000,000
2 passenger vessels for New York and east coast South America service.....	65,000,000
Total	75,000,000

The cash required with respect to the above was estimated at \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1951. The remaining contract authority balance of \$70,000,000 was reduced to \$63,000,000 by the House, which represents a straight 10 percent reduction.

We shall endeavor to answer your questions in the order listed by you.

"1. What are the vessels to be covered by the contract authority?"

There is now being operated on Trade Route No. 1, between New York and ports on the east coast of South America, under bareboat charter to Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., the Government-owned "Good Neighbor Fleet" (comprised of the steamships *Argentina*, *Brazil*, and *Uruguay*). The vessels included in our 1951 budget as listed above would replace the "Good Neighbor Fleet," all three vessels in this fleet having already become 20 years old.

"2. Have formal applications been filed by the companies who would benefit from this contract authority?"

No formal applications have been filed for the construction of passenger vessels by any company or companies for operation on Trade Route No. 1. Further in this connection see answer to question No. 4 hereinafter.

"3. According to present calculations is it reasonable to assume that these contracts will be let before June 30, 1951?"

At the time our 1951 budget was filed, it was believed that it would be possible to execute contracts for the construction and sale to a private company of the necessary passenger-carrying vessels to replace the "Good Neighbor Fleet." Our latest and very recent estimate is that contracts with respect to such new vessels cannot be awarded until about November 1, 1951. Further in connection with this question see answer to No. 4 hereinafter.

"4. What is the status in detail of these negotiations?"

The former Maritime Commission having been unsuccessful in effecting an agreement with the present charterers of the "Good Neighbor Fleet" whereby they, prior to the expiration of their current charter, would agree to purchase new vessels for this service, the Maritime Administration is preparing to send out an invitation for bids with respect to the charter of the "Good Neighbor Fleet" after the expiration of the current charter, which charter, as recently extended, will expire not later than June 30, 1951. The invitation for bids, will also require that each bidder submit such replacement program as will, in its opinion, adequately replace the "Good Neighbor Fleet." The three vessels have a total passenger capacity of 1,557. As each bidder will be given some leeway as to the general characteristics of the replacement vessels, it is possible that the successful bidder will be required to build anywhere from two to four vessels. However, the amount requested for this project appears to represent as close an estimate, as can be made at this juncture, of the total construction cost of all of the vessels to be constructed for Trade Route No. 1. The delay in getting out bids for a new charter of the "Good Neighbor Fleet" and thereby extending the possible date for letting a contract for replacements has been due to a combination of circumstances not foreseen when the budget in question was prepared, which delay is the reason why we now estimate that it is not likely that the replacements will be contracted for during the fiscal year 1951.

H. R. 7786 as it passed the House carries the following proviso with respect to the \$63,000,000 item: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used to start any new ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year, nor to start any new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless the director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approved the start of such ship construction and the director shall submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Ap-

propriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, as used herein, the term budget includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates."

Some of the 1949 appropriation authority was earmarked for the construction of a combination vessel for account of the Mississippi Shipping Co. estimated to cost \$16,000,000. However, the 1949 appropriation authority lapsed before a construction contract could be executed.

In the 1950 Appropriation Act, the following contract authority also lapsed as of June 30, 1950:

2 combination passenger vessels for Grace Line Inc. for operation in New York to Caribbean service.....	\$31,500,000
2 trailerships for the Pacific Coast Steamship Co. for operation in the United States west coast intercoastal service.....	22,000,000
Design for national defense vessels.....	3,900,000
Miscellaneous betterments.....	875,000
Total.....	58,275,000

We have applications on file with respect to the construction of the trailerships, without construction subsidy, as listed above and also applications from the Arnold Bernstein Line for the purchase of war-built vessels, the *General Pope* and *General Weigel*, and for a construction-differential allowance with respect to the conversion of these two vessels for commercial operation, the total cost of such conversion having been estimated at a maximum of \$9,500,000. While Grace Line Inc. has indicated a strong interest in the construction of two combination vessels, with the aid of a construction-differential, for its Caribbean service, no formal application with respect thereto has been filed as yet. The American President Lines, Ltd., under date of April 13, 1950, filed applications for construction-differential aid in the construction of four combination vessels for operation in its round-the-world service.

It is our understanding that, subject to the prior approval of the Bureau of the Budget, the provision in H. R. 7786, quoted above would make it possible to use any or all of the \$63,000,000 with respect to the construction or improvement of vessels not listed in the 1951 budget should it develop, as it now appears, that no contract authority will be utilized in connection with the vessels for replacing the "Good Neighbor Fleet" until after the close of the fiscal year 1951.

Based on the latest estimates of our staff, it does not now appear possible to award contracts with respect to any of the vessels mentioned herein prior to July 1, 1951, except contracts applicable to vessels for the Pacific Coast Steamship Co., the Arnold Bernstein Line and the construction (\$10,000,000) and design (\$2,500,000) of the Navy prototype vessel. However, since contract authority cannot be used until and unless there are properly executed contracts and as it is more satisfactory to consider and dispose of applications for new construction on their merit under the 1936 act where the contract authority is available, we suggest that it would be desirable not to reduce the \$63,000,000 contract authority now in the 1951 appropriation bill. Moreover, by not reducing same it would give us more leeway in dealing with new applications, if any, that may be filed in the meantime and also in meeting the situation, should it develop that a better schedule can be met, than we now contemplate, for executing contracts with respect to applications now pending.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. KOEHLER,
Acting Administrator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to say that I think Mr. Koehler is to be commended

for his frankness and for his cooperation in helping to provide Congress with information which is necessary for our purposes.

He stated that the \$63,000,000 in contract authorizations—and that is the amount provided by the House—were to be used to replace Government-owned "Good Neighbor Fleet" operated by the Moore-McCormack Line between New York and South America. However, no further applications have been filed for this program. While at the time the 1951 budget was filed the Maritime Commission thought it could execute these contracts, the present estimates of the Maritime Administration are that they cannot be awarded until about November 1, 1951. This means that all of the \$63,000,000 authorization provided by the House cannot possibly be reached during the ensuing fiscal year for the purpose for which it is provided. It should therefore be eliminated. However, we can now deal with the matter in part by continuing the House appropriation and cutting down on the additional contract authorizations provided in the Senate amendment.

Subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget the provisions of the bill would allow the Maritime Commission to use \$63,000,000 in authorizations for other contracts. According to the last paragraph of Mr. Koehler's letter it does not now appear possible to award before July 1, 1951, any contracts presently under consideration except the following: \$22,000,000 for the Pacific Coast Steamship Co. for trailer ships on the west coast. Now note the next item in the case of the Arnold Bernstein Line: Conversion of two war-built troop vessels for commercial use—\$9,500,000 for that. Not for the conversion of commercial ships to troop use, but conversion of troop ships to commercial use.

Construction of Navy prototype vessels, \$10,000,000. Design of Navy prototype vessels, \$2,500,000.

Mr. President, the total amount that can possibly be awarded for the fiscal year 1950-51 on the basis of contracts under consideration is \$44,000,000, not \$63,000,000. The pending Arnold Bernstein contract calls for the conversion of two troop ships, the *General Pope* and the *General Weigel*, to commercial use.

In the face of the present world situation I cannot believe that the Maritime Administration would permit the conversion of troop transports into commercial vessels. So it seems that the total amount of \$44,000,000 could be reduced by the further amount of \$9,500,000, leaving \$34,500,000 for contracts now pending, and about which information is now available. Furthermore \$6,600,000 of the \$64,875,000 extension allowed by the committee has already been awarded, so that will not be needed. This is a total of \$41,100,000 not needed.

Mr. President, I therefore intend to offer an amendment to the committee amendment striking the figure of \$64,875,000 and inserting in lieu thereof the figure of \$23,775,000.

I think that explains a somewhat complicated situation in as few words as it

is possible for me to explain it. It would effect a saving of \$41,100,000.

I now move to strike out "\$63,875,000," and to insert instead "\$23,775,000."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to support the amendments of the Senator from Illinois. With the possible exception of the RFC, the operation of the Maritime Commission has been probably the greatest scandal of government in the last 10 years. I believe it is due to the fact that those who have profited by the misspending, wastefulness, and looting of the appropriations for the Maritime Commission have been in effect running the Commission. I do not think any more temptation than is necessary should be put in their way. When Congress approved the reorganization plan of the President transferring the operation and functions of the Maritime Commission to the Commerce Department, it was made possible for the President to correct the very unsavory situation in the Maritime Commission. It is my belief that the President has failed to take advantage of the opportunity to perform this duty. I feel that we are going to see a continuation of the same wasteful and illegal—according to the Comptroller General—manipulations of the maritime affairs that we have seen over the past 10 years. It is safe to say that the Maritime Commission expenditures have cost hundreds of millions of dollars, and perhaps even billions of dollars, to the taxpayers. Through their manipulations we have put the merchant marine in a state of absolute dependency on Government so that very few ship lines will go on the high seas and attempt to operate a shipping business as it should be operated. There are a few notable exceptions.

Mr. President, I do not know whether we are in an emergency. I understood the President to ask for emergency war powers, but he has not proclaimed any emergency. If there is an emergency, as the Senator from Illinois says, then the amount provided here will in the long run be only a drop in the bucket, and might as well not be considered at all. I believe the President should tell the people of the country whether there is an emergency or whether there is not, and proclaim one if there is.

I believe that here is a chance to save forty or fifty million dollars from a peacetime program and which will have a great deal of labor and material for the war effort.

I think the Senate should support the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, and I for one would like to see a record vote on it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I sympathize completely with everything that can be said for congressional action to prevent waste. I submit that it is perfectly clear that the action of the President in sending a reorganization plan to the Congress for the Maritime Commission was a step which was intended to inject a very much higher degree of efficiency and care in the administration of the funds appropriated for the activities carried on formerly by the Maritime Commission, and now to be

carried on under Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950, which became effective on May 24, 1950.

The committee in examining the appropriations for the Maritime Commission had in mind the fact that we did have a legislative reorganization, and the committee felt that while scrutinizing these expenditures and these estimates it should not undertake to destroy the effectiveness of the agency of the Government which, under the reorganization plan, the President and the Congress are trying to reform.

I say to the Senator from Illinois that the committee reported an appropriation which was \$63,000,000 below the estimates. There was no charge of waste leveled before our committee with respect to the current administration. No representation was made to us, except through our own examination of the witnesses, which prompted us to make cuts. We are dealing here with a program which extends over a period of years. It is impossible to build an ocean lines in a month, or 2 months, or 6 months, or a year. Sometimes the operation takes several years, because the building of a modern liner which plies the ocean is a great engineering undertaking.

In providing cash, we had a program of \$13,700,000 to pay for obligations for the years 1947 and 1948. No one had charged that there was anything wrong about those obligations.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Did the obligations include any payment to the owners of the *Mariposa* or the *Monterey*?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; not a penny. We went into that question, I will say to the Senator from Vermont.

The bill also provides cash for the 1949 program. The House reduced the cash appropriation, to which the Senator from Illinois referred, from \$70,000,000 to \$63,000,000, as I recall the figures.

So, I say to the Members of the Senate, let us not condemn the program and the new administrators of the program upon the basis of charges which were made against a commission which no longer exists.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask to what new administrators of the program the Senator refers. The President has appointed the old administrator, whom the House committee roundly condemned for failing to carry out his work properly for the last 2 years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reorganization plan divided the functions into the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration. Of course, General Fleming has been reappointed to a position of importance in the new organization, but General Fleming was not in the other administration for a long time.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand General Fleming was the chairman of the Maritime Commission.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. For scarcely a year.

Mr. AIKEN. I like General Fleming personally. I did not have the heart to vote against his confirmation even

though I did not consider him qualified for the post. But the Senator must be familiar with the House report on maritime affairs, which cited case after case in which money was wasted, squandered, spent illegally under the General's administration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I point out to the Senator that those cases all took place before General Fleming was appointed.

Mr. AIKEN. According to the House committee, they continued at an accelerated rate even after he took over the chairmanship.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not ready to acknowledge that to be a fact. I would say to the Senator from Vermont that the members of the subcommittee who heard the testimony this year and last year, feel I am sure, as the Senator from Vermont has just said he feels, that General Fleming is a man of character and ability. The Senator from Vermont, though he did a very excellent piece of work in the criticisms he voiced upon the floor of the Senate with respect to the administration of the Maritime Commission in times past, was unwilling to condemn General Fleming by voting against his nomination. All I am saying now is, do not deprive the reorganized group of the funds which they need to carry on the work which the legislative authority of the Government has directed them to do. If there is any change of policy, to be made it should be made, not in the appropriation bill, but by proceeding before the legislative committee in charge.

I will say to the Senator from Vermont and to the Senator from Illinois that if I am correctly advised an opportunity will be presented to them before we are through with this appropriation bill to give their views and exercise their right to oppose amendments which, if agreed to, will greatly increase the expenditures.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I would first like to say that I hold President Truman wholly responsible for the work of the Maritime Commission from now on. It is his appointees that will have this work to do. What I want to ask the Senator from Wyoming—and I ask him this question as chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report—Does the Senator from Wyoming believe that this Nation is in a state of emergency at the present time, and is that emergency likely to last until the next Congress convenes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Indeed I do believe it is in a state of emergency, and I think the emergency will last throughout the life of the next Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe it would be good business to start the construction of ocean liners, which scarcely can be completed for years, in competition with the war effort, which may require all the men and materials which otherwise would be used in starting the construction of these long-range projects?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If this emergency develops, as every indication would suggest, we will certainly need the vessels which are authorized in this program.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator then believe that we are in for a permanent emergency?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is merely bandying words when he asks that question.

Mr. AIKEN. Considering the length of time it takes to build a liner I would say that that is probably the Senator's assumption.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if there is going to be a prolonged discussion of this particular amendment, may I suggest that we pass it over and come back to it later?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not know whether there will be prolonged discussion. I have finished speaking.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to point out one feature. The total of \$127,875,000 which will be provided for the Maritime Administration by these two amendments is vastly in excess of the amounts which the Maritime Administration itself says it can spend during this period. It is approximately \$41,000,000 more than the Maritime Administration can spend.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KERR. Do I understand the Senator to say that it is that much in excess of either what the Commission can spend during the 12 months, or contract to spend at a later date under contracts made within that period?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The Senator from Oklahoma has put the situation very well.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to ask whether the amounts set forth in the appropriation bill, \$63,000,000 and \$64,000,000 are earmarked for specific purposes? In other words, must the amounts be used for the construction or repair or reconstruction of specifically named vessels, or can the amounts be used for the construction of an entirely different set of vessels?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that the \$63,000,000 was to be used to replace the "Good Neighbor Fleet" operated by the Moore-McCormack Line, but that no formal applications have been filed for the program; and the present estimate of the Maritime Commission is that it cannot award such contracts until about November 1, 1951, or after the expiration of the current fiscal year for which we are appropriating. In effect, these two appropriations and authorizations would give to the Maritime Commission \$41,000,000 which they could use for any purpose that they personally see fit without proposing any program to Congress for approval. And carrying out the point made by the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I want to say that I do not believe that the record of the Maritime Administration personnel is such that we should give them \$41,000,000 of blank checks with which they can carry out further subsidies beyond those which they themselves now say they can implement.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may point out that the management of the maritime operations of the country has not been changed materially by the recent transfer. The most striking change has been the firing of Commissioner McKeough, of Illinois, who over the years has been struggling against odds to maintain some degree of integrity and efficiency in the Maritime Commission, and he has fought against overwhelming odds to do that. Yet when the time came when the President could revamp the Maritime Commission in accordance with the desires of the Congress, he fired Commissioner McKeough and left most of those responsible for the sins of the past in a position to continue to commit those sins in the future.

I had hoped that Secretary Sawyer, if he remained in the Cabinet, would be able to exercise some degree of control over the operations of this ex-commission. But I understand that whenever the Director or the Under Secretary in charge of transportation matters is in Washington, Secretary Sawyer will have very little to say about it. It is only when the Director is away that an Assistant Director, who is appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, will have some control over the situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall yield to the Senator from Massachusetts in a moment. First I want to comment on the remarks of the eminent senior Senator from Vermont. No one regretted more than I did the dropping of Commissioner McKeough from the Maritime Commission. We in Illinois are very proud of him because of the courageous fight he made to eliminate unnecessary and even illegal subsidies. We regret very much that he was dropped. In justice to the President it ought to be said, however, that the other members of the Commission, with the exception of the chairman, General Fleming, were also dropped. General Fleming was made Assistant Secretary of Commerce in general charge of transportation. My feeling is very similar to that of the Senator from Vermont. The general had given good service prior to the time he went on the Maritime Commission, and I personally did not have the heart to vote against confirmation of his nomination although I did not approve of his policies on the Maritime Commission.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may add that most of those in charge of operations in the past have been continued in the new set-up, except some of those who tried their best to assist Commissioner McKeough in maintaining, as I said, some degree of integrity and efficiency in the Commission, have been demoted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is precisely the point to which I was coming, that although some good men have been put in at the top of the new Maritime Administration, the personnel down below is in

the main the same personnel that operated under the Maritime Commission, and whose work was accompanied by the gross scandals which Mr. Lindsay Warren and the House committee said existed. It is in view of that fact, as well as the need for economy. I do not want to see the United States giving them a check for \$127,000,000, when the new administrator says that about all that he can possibly spend under existing proposals will be about \$81,000,000. I do not think the record of the personnel of the Maritime Administration group is such that we should put into their hands these great powers to spend additional sums of money for purposes not at present contemplated. I feel that these sums would probably be spent but also probably not for the right purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I have stated on the floor of the Senate on a number of occasions, I am going to vote against the construction of public works so far as it is possible to do so, whether such public works are flood control, rivers and harbors, or construction of buildings. I shall vote deep cuts in those appropriations. But, as I have also stated, I am unwilling to vote against anything that is a defense measure.

Even though it may not be possible for some months to use these moneys under the schedules that have been read by the Senator from Illinois, nevertheless, in view of the fact that the appropriation is not limited to the particular projects set forth in the language of the bill, it would appear to me that this is a defense measure pure and simple, and it is my opinion further that we are going to be required to spend a great deal more money, vastly larger sums, for the development of our merchant marine during the emergency.

I wonder why the Senator from Illinois should be opposed to a measure which to me looks like a defense measure, regardless of the fact that the particular projects, or the particular purposes enunciated in the bill may not be carried out, because there is no limitation with regard to the purposes which these sums can be used for in this emergency as a part of our defense mechanism.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from New York that this proposal did not originate as a defense measure when these items were inserted in the bill, which was before the Korean situation developed, so that the original purpose was not keyed to any national emergency. It was keyed to ordinary peacetime cold war needs. My amendment would not cut any defense programs.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I may finish, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Fundamentally, I suppose what it boils down to—and this is a hard thing to say—is that I simply do not sufficiently trust the personnel running the Maritime

Commission to be willing to give them a blank check for \$41,000,000, in excess of the amounts required for the ships which are under consideration, for them to do with as they wish. Their past record is not such as to justify any such public trust.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is not it true that, instead of being a defense measure, a goodly portion of this proposed appropriation is exactly the reverse, in that it proposes that some millions of dollars be used to convert into commercial ships some ships which now are troop ships, and are qualified for the moving of troops, and were built for that purpose?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is entirely correct as to that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, first let me reply to the Senator from Florida.

The Senator from Florida is completely correct in his suggestion that, as I said originally, this is a proposal in the case of the Arnold Bernstein Line, that two troop ships, the *General Pope* and the *General Weigel*, be converted for commercial purposes, as the Senator from Florida has pointed out. So part of this program is one for national defense in reverse.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I should first yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, and I do so now.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I was going to ask the Senator from Illinois if he would yield to me for the purpose of permitting me to make a very brief statement, and then perhaps I shall end up by asking a question of the Senator from Wyoming, who is in charge of the committee's report on this portion of the bill.

I sat on the subcommittee which listened to a great deal of the testimony regarding this portion of the bill. As I understand, the program for 1947 through 1952 calls for estimated obligations in the amount of \$321,737,830, and there have been cash appropriations of \$141,878,685, leaving unfinanced obligations of \$179,859,145.

What we are appropriating this year, if we carry through with the program, will cut down the unfinanced obligations by the amount of the cash appropriations made now, and reduce delay on work already started. On that point we do not have much to say.

But, as I understand the matter, this item calls for the building of two new passenger ships and one Navy prototype vessel. I do not recall just what that vessel is to be. However, the two passenger ships are for the South American and Caribbean trade, if I recall correctly.

My question is this: If we adopt the committee recommendation, there will be nothing to be taken to conference in regard to this item, because the figures

as reported by our committee are the same as those voted by the House of Representatives.

However, if we adopt an amendment to this item, then in the conference it will be considered, and at that time there will be a question as to whether the construction of the two passenger vessels should be begun at the present time or whether the program should be changed.

Under those circumstances, would it not be advisable to accept an amendment—I do not say that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is the correct one—in order that there may be something in connection with this item to be considered by the conference committee, so as to give it an opportunity to determine what should be done in this matter, and thus giving the Senate another opportunity to act and to see whether the present proposal is the correct one, in view of the situation which has developed since the committee considered this item?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to speak now, let me say that the Senator from Massachusetts has always been a most persuasive member of my subcommittee in dealing with these matters. Of course, the program is based on the premise that maritime construction is in the interest of the national defense.

As the Senator from Massachusetts has said, it is true that the plan calls for the construction of two passenger vessels and a prototype naval vessel. I should like to read the first paragraph of the material which we obtained in support of this item:

In the interest of national defense and a well-balanced American merchant marine, it is proposed to contract in fiscal year 1951 for the construction under title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, two or three passenger-carrying vessels and for the construction, under title VII, of a prototype craft which, in an emergency, may be massed-produced as naval auxiliaries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Wyoming referring to the possibility of replacing with new vessels the ships in the so-called "good neighbor fleet?"

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is a part of the matter, yes. However, I was about to say—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming has a copy of the letter from Mr. Koehler, I believe, in which Mr. Koehler says that he does not believe those contracts can possibly be executed during the ensuing year. Does not the Senator have a copy of that letter? I ask that question because the letter which Mr. Koehler addressed to me had a notation to the effect that a copy was being sent to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. It was understood, of course, that the House made some reduction.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not true, as I have stated, that in the use of these funds the Maritime Commission is not limited to using them for any specific projects?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not unless a contract is made.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes. But in these matters it is not limited to using these funds for the good neighbor fleet or for the Arnold Bernstein vessels or for ships of the character of those to which the Senator from Massachusetts has referred. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. But the Commission can use these funds for the development of vessels or for the construction of vessels in the national defense; is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. Let me say that I think it is extremely unwise to reduce this appropriation, because I believe that at the present moment the United States is in a position in which it must maintain an adequate merchant marine. If, unfortunately, we should find ourselves compelled to transport more men and more materials for military purposes, then vessels will be of great value.

However, when Senators on this side of the aisle and Senators, such as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], on the other side of the aisle rise and ask, "Why should we build a passenger vessel at this time?" I am moved to reply that I would be quite willing to take an amendment of this kind to conference, so that in the conference we may determine whether to construct the passenger vessels.

So, Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Illinois, if I may do so, how he obtained the figure of \$34,500,000 which he offers in his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, that is the amount that can be awarded during the applicable fiscal year. It is taken from the letter written by Mr. Koehler. If the Senator from Wyoming has a copy of the letter with him, he will find this statement appearing on page 3 of that letter—and I refer now to the final paragraph, as follows:

Except contracts applicable to vessels for the Pacific Coast Steamship Co., the Arnold Bernstein Line and the construction (\$10,000,000) and design (\$2,500,000) of the Navy prototype vessel.

Those totals, including contracts in regard to the Arnold Bernstein Line, come to \$44,000,000.

However, I could not believe that at this time any of us would vote to carry through the Arnold Bernstein project for the conversion of troop ships into commercial ships.

So if from the \$44,000,000, we eliminate \$9,500,000, that will leave \$34,500,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I call for a vote on this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Was the amount reported by the committee in contemplation of the building of the vessels to which the Koehler letter refers?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We allowed the measure in this respect to stand in exactly the same way it stood when the House passed it. The Koehler letter itself was not before our committee. It has been written since then, and I have not had an opportunity to examine it. But I feel very strongly that we should not at this time suspend the funds for the construction of vessels which we may certainly need upon the seas within the next couple of years.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator think that authorizations should be made for an amount of money which the agency itself says cannot be spent within the period of time for which the authorizations are made?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is a very pertinent question, I may say to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 325, line 17, was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask that Senators seconding the request for the yeas and nays be asked to rise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators desiring to second the demand for the yeas and nays will rise.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may I suggest that this amendment go over to the end, and that we proceed with the other committee amendments?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no reconsideration involved. The Senator from Illinois is moving to amend the figure in the bill, which was not touched by any Senate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, This is a parliamentary question. The Senator from Illinois made a motion to reconsider a number of amendments, and omitted from the motion the amendment relating to the Maritime Commission. The Senate voted against reconsideration of the other amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois then moved to reconsider the vote by which this amendment was agreed to, because it has to be reconsidered, if the Senator from Illinois is to be permitted to offer his amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I may be in error, but I have before me the printed amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say, Mr. President, that the amendment which I offered from the floor differs from the printed amendment. The amendment I have just offered is directed to page 326, and it proposes to strike out \$64,875,000 and to substitute \$23,775,000, and thus to effect a saving of \$41,100,000, the amount in excess of the sums which the Maritime Administration has committed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois relates to the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that this amendment be passed over for the time being, and that we proceed to less controversial matters.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I understand this is the only amendment which remains in this chapter.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask what would be gained by passing it over? When would the vote be taken? The Senator from Vermont must be absent from the Senate one day and was hoping this amendment would be taken up today.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest that we proceed with the other amendments, and then if the Senator insists on taking up this amendment this evening we can return to it later on.

Mr. AIKEN. May I inquire what the other amendments are which are more important than this? And if this concludes one chapter of the bill, why not finish it now?

Mr. McFARLAND. I did not say that the other amendments were more important than this. I said "less controversial."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it seems to me we are ready to vote on the question, and if it is delayed some Senator may have a happy thought and enter into another argument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider the vote by which the Senate adopted the committee amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then if we are going to vote, I am going to have to suggest the absence of a quorum. That is what I wanted to avoid at this time. I thought we could proceed with other amendments and then return to this a little later, if the Senate insists upon that being done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is the only remaining amendment in this chapter.

Mr. McFARLAND. I know it is the only remaining amendment in this chapter, but there are three or four other chapters.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming accept the amendment which has been suggested and take it to conference? It is an entirely new amendment on the part of the Senate, and will be in controversy.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, one of the best subcommittees in the Appropriations Committee considered this chapter of the bill. They heard the proof. They took the evidence. They have gone through weeks of hearings, and I say that I am unwilling to agree

to take the amendment to conference. In my opinion, it would not be right to do so. I should be opposed to it, and so, probably, would most of the other Senators. If the amendment were taken to conference and not retained we would then be put in a false position. Someone would say, "We are not treating the Senate fairly, because the Senate voted to include it in the bill." If Senators agree to the amendment, very well, but I oppose it.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not true that the hearings on this peacetime program were held by the committee before the start of the Korean war, or the Korean police action?

Mr. McKELLAR. That made it all the more necessary that the committee amendment be agreed to. Those ships are vitally needed in the defense, not of Korea, but of the United States. Senators are voting against the United States, when they vote for what is now proposed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I resent that statement. The Senator from Tennessee knows that these ships cannot be finished for 3 years. Does the Senator think it will take 3 or 4 years to put an end to the Korean invasion? That is a silly thing to say, and it is an unkind thing, too.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is also a very improper thing for one Senator to rise and say that another Senator is acting silly or talking in a silly manner.

Mr. AIKEN. It is no more appropriate for the Senator from Tennessee to say that the Senator from Vermont is working against the United States than it is for the Senator from Vermont to say the same thing about the Senator from Tennessee, and to say that he is trying to force an unnecessary burden on the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if that is the attitude of the Senator from Vermont, and if that is the way he feels about it, I refuse to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion, as the Chair stated it. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Maybank
Anderson	Holland	Morse
Bricker	Humphrey	Mundt
Bridges	Hunt	Myers
Byrd	Ives	Neely
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chavez	Kem	Russell
Darby	Kerr	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Lehman	Sparkman
Ferguson	Lodge	Stennis
Frear	McCarran	Taft
Graham	McCarthy	Thye
Green	McClellan	Tobey
Gurney	McFarland	Tydings
Hayden	McKellar	Watkins
Hendrickson	McMahon	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Malone	Williams
Hill	Martin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment appearing on page 326 was adopted. On this motion the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, does the proviso on page 326 apply to the amount involved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a part of the committee amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—34

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bridges	Holland	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Kem	Stennis
Darby	Kerr	Taft
Donnell	Langer	Thye
Douglas	Lodge	Tobey
Eastland	McCarthy	Watkins
Ecton	Malone	Wiley
Ferguson	Martin	Williams
Gurney	Mundt	
Hendrickson	Saltonstall	

NAYS—32

Anderson	Chapman	Frear
Bricker	Chavez	Graham

Green	Knowland	Myers
Hayden	Lehman	Neely
Hill	McCarran	O'Mahoney
Hoey	McClellan	Pepper
Humphrey	McFarland	Russell
Hunt	McKellar	Sparkman
Johnson, Colo.	McMahon	Tydings
Johnson, Tex.	Maybank	Young
Kilgore	Morse	

NOT VOTING—30

Benton	Fulbright	Millikin
Brewster	George	Murray
Butler	Gillette	O'Connor
Cain	Jenner	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Cordon	Kefauver	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Leahy	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	Long	Vandenberg
Ellender	Lucas	Wherry
Flanders	Magnuson	Withers

So Mr. DOUGLAS' motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move on page 326, line 17, to strike out "\$64,875,000" and to substitute in lieu thereof "\$23,775,000", making a saving of \$41,100,000 and giving the Maritime Commission along with the \$63,000,000 provided on page 325, a total of \$86,775,000 with which they can carry out all the construction for which they have made commitments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. [Putting the question.] The yeas have it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I insist that the yeas and nays were demanded before the result of the vote was announced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have the question stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment, on page 326, line 17, to strike out "\$64,875,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$23,775,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the Chair had announced the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair had announced it, but it was brought to the attention of the Chair that the demand for the yeas and nays had been made before the announcement was made, and the Chair wants to be fair to every Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. Does not the Chair think that was a figment of the imagination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would not pass on that.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the amendment about to be voted on is most important. The appropriation recommended should not be eliminated at this time, when the United States needs ships for both troops and supplies. I insist

that a vote in favor of this reduction in the appropriation would be a vote against the defense of the United States of America.

Senators may say what they care to about 3 or 4 years being required to build these ships; suppose it takes 5 or 6 years. We may need them 5 or 6 years from now more than we need them today.

Merely because some of us might not have liked the work of the Maritime Commission is no excuse for the Senate to take action which will adversely affect the defense of the United States. If Senators want to do that—and I do not believe they do—then they will cast their votes in favor of the proposed reduction.

To say that this appropriation was placed in the bill before the Korean war broke out is not a valid argument. If the appropriation was needed at the time the bill was drawn, it is needed threefold today, and I plead with the Senate not to vote against the defense of the country, not to vote against giving supplies which are needed by the boys who are fighting in Korea.

Mr. President, we hear question raised as to whether the President has declared an emergency. That is immaterial. We know that the United States is in a period of emergency. There is no dispute about that. There is no dispute that the boys of the Nation are dying on the battle front, and I say for the United States Senate to vote to cut down appropriations with which to build ships and furnish supplies is to vote against the defense of the Nation, to vote against those who are fighting for us in Korea.

Mr. President, I plead with my colleagues with all the power at my command to stand by the committee which heard the evidence. There are many items which could be cut with more reason than this one. The people will be looking at this vote. They are going to look to see whether the Senate is willing to support the boys on the battle front. I hope the item will not be cut.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the reduction in the appropriation for a completely different reason from that referred to by the Senator from Arizona. I am just as strongly in favor of providing adequate defense as he is—and we all are for that. But the situation is simply this: Since 1947 there has been for ship construction an estimated obligation of approximately \$321,000,000. I am speaking from memory, and these figures may be somewhat out of line. All that we have paid in cash is about \$141,000,000, leaving approximately \$179,000,000 still to pay.

For new ship construction this year there is appropriated, approximately, in contract authority, \$63,000,000 and \$5,000,000 cash. That money is for two new passenger ships to go into the South American and Caribbean trade; a third ship, to cost \$10,000,000, is a Navy prototype ship. I believe that is a ship that is an experiment, intended to go from San Francisco to Los Angeles. It will take on trailer trucks in San Francisco, and put new mules on the trailers in Los Angeles. I may not be correct in that, but I believe I am.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me complete a very brief statement. The amounts agreed upon by the House and the Senate committee are the same. I believe we should send this matter to conference, not necessarily with the idea of ultimately cutting down the appropriation, but of keeping control of the situation so that we can see what is going to be built in this time of crisis. The Senate committee approved these ships prior to the Korean crisis. If we put this matter into conference by this reduction, we can work out the question of what kind of ships should be built, and keep control of it in Congress.

If my understanding is correct, and we approve the committee action, as I did approve it in the subcommittee, we will have no more control over what ships shall be built, we will leave it entirely to the Maritime Commission and the administration to decide.

Mr. President, I believe we should keep our control on this subject up to the last minute.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. O'MAHONEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, and then I will yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to ask whether or not the evidence shows that the contracts have been let on the two South American vessels for the South American service?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is sure these vessels are not for our war effort, is he?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If my memory of the testimony is correct, they are newer, faster passenger ships, for the trade with South America.

Mr. FERGUSON. The one vessel that was to carry trailers from Los Angeles to San Francisco, and back and forth, would not be considered a defense vessel, would it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It might be considered a defense vessel. It could be used for carrying tanks, and that sort of thing, if a war came. As I understand, they take the trailer aboard in San Francisco, and put a new mule on it in Los Angeles.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would it not be used for shipments to and from San Francisco? It is for the local traffic, is it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is for local traffic, but it could be used in time of war by being taken over by the Navy. That is my understanding, but I may be wrong.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator is mistaken in his idea of the amendment which is under consideration. We would be taking this matter out of the hands of the conferees by supporting the amendment. We are

dealing with the language which appears in italics on page 326, line 17. Of the amount there, \$5,500,000 has already been obligated for certain cargo prototype ships, and \$1,100,000 has been assigned to some other work. Of course, there are the two trailer ships to be run by the Pacific Coast Steamship Co. This appropriation was carried in last year's appropriation bill at a very much larger sum, but the committee in approving it did so with the purpose of taking the matter to conference, where we could then decide exactly how much was needed.

I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that in voting to reject the committee amendment he would merely be voting to deprive the Senate and the Congress of the opportunity to examine the whole matter in conference, as we had intended to do. The vessels of which the Senator spoke to me earlier in the evening are covered in an appropriation item on the previous page. So this is evidence that we are legislating by guesswork, and I suggest to Members of the Senate that it is much better and much wiser to accept the judgment of the committee, and work the matter out in conference.

The argument here would seem to convey the impression that the members of the committee were not concerned with saving money for the United States; that they were concerned only in making appropriations which could be wasted by a Maritime Commission no longer in existence, which has been reorganized out of existence. Whereas the committee was motivated solely by the idea of providing the funds by which the United States should acquire the maritime fleet necessary in the judgment of the legislative committees for the national defense.

The amendment should be defeated.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. No Member of this body has a higher regard for the great Committee on Appropriations than I have, and no Member of this body has any deeper consciousness of the need for every provision for the national defense. As I understand, we are voting on a motion to reduce the amount of an authorization in the bill, and we are doing so after the evidence has been brought before us that the agency to which the authorization is being made has told a Member of the body that they are unable to commit the \$64,000,000 either within the 12 months for which the appropriation is made, or to give the committee or the Senate information as to what they would do with it if the money were made available to them.

The Senator from Oklahoma asked the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] if that was correct, and if information was before him that this amount was in excess of that which the agency had advised him they were either able to spend or to contract within the fiscal period. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee replied that that was a very pertinent question, for which he complimented the Senator, and then he ignored

it. I see no reason, Mr. President, to vote for an authorization with reference to which the agency to which it is authorized is unable to spend it or commit it in the period for which it is made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that when he asked me that question, for which I complimented him, he was talking about an altogether different section of the bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee may have misunderstood the Senator from Oklahoma, but his statement just made has to be either a misunderstanding or a statement based on the wrong impression.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the great Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator spoke of the amendment as an authorization. It is not an authorization at all. It is an appropriation of cash.

Mr. KERR. Then the answer goes to the amount of the cash, because the agency has said it can neither spend it nor contract for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator from Oklahoma know that our shipping capacity today is less than it was at the beginning of World War II after Pearl Harbor? Does the Senator realize the deplorable condition of our shipping? How does the Senator figure that we can raise more troops, spend more money, prepare for war across many seas, over great distances, and neglect the important point of shipping? How can the Senator reconcile those great differences?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma does not understand the wisdom either of authorizing or appropriating money to an agency which says it can neither spend it nor contract for it within the period for which it is made. With reference to its being an appropriation or an authorization, as I read the language of the bill, it is:

That not to exceed \$64,875,000 of the funds and contract authority—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator read the testimony which has been furnished him to the effect that the agency will not use this money? There was no such testimony before the committee. I am wondering where the Senator obtained the testimony.

Mr. KERR. I believe the Senator was on the floor when the letter was read, and if it was inaccurate, the chairman of the committee has not so advised the Senate or the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield the floor, and the Senator from Wyoming may claim it in his own right.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that a few moments ago I told the Senator that he was

talking about a different amendment from that about which he was talking when he addressed his inquiry to me.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma is probably the best judge of what he had in his mind both when he addressed the question to the Senator from Wyoming and when he addressed his remarks to the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am not altogether certain about that matter.

Mr. KERR. Then let me assure the Senator from Wyoming that I accord him the privilege of telling this body what is in his mind, and I reserve the privilege of telling the Senate what is in my mind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question or two: Did he address an inquiry to me which was based upon the letter of Mr. Koehler, which was read by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KERR. It was related to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have a copy of it in my hand now and I will read from the letter:

Reference is made to your letter of June 29, 1950, concerning an item of \$63,000,000 in the 1951 appropriation bill.

The Senator is talking about an item of \$64,875,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The two items have to be considered together, the authorization for \$63,000,000 made by the House, and the additional authorization of \$64,875,000 made by the Senate committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That might be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or a total of \$127,875,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very good.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the total possible appropriations for ships which the Maritime Commission, according to its own statement, can consider, would be \$86,000,000, or \$41,000,000 less than the sum total in these two features.

Since we at present are considering only committee amendments, and it is not appropriate at this time to consider House language, my amendment strikes out the committee authorization by reducing it by \$41,100,000 in order to bring the global or total sum provided on pages 325 and 326 to the maximum amount which the Maritime Administration, according to its own statement, says it can spend, namely \$86,775,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that is precisely the point to which I am addressing myself. It is highly technical. It indicates the difficulty of coming to an understanding about matters of this kind in a hectic debate upon the floor of the Senate. But the issue arose here: "Where is the evidence that the money is not to be expended?" The evidence was the letter of Mr. Koehler. That is the evidence that was cited by the Senator from Illinois. All in the world I am saying is that the Senator's inquiry to Mr. Koehler, and Mr. Koehler's reply refer solely to an item on page 325, whereas we are now discussing an amendment on page 326.

It might be advisable to cut appropriations. I am not discussing that question now. But I am merely pointing out the confusion to which the debate has led. I cite that confusion as evidence of the fact that in my judgment the Senate would do much better to trust the judgment of its committee and take this matter to conference than merely to cut the appropriation on the basis of an argument which is obviously not based on evidence.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The statement by the Senator from Wyoming respecting the amount of page 326 is entirely correct. I thought we were dealing with page 325, and that this item will be taken to conference, will be considered in conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy to have the Senator say that. So I say let us vote down the amendment, and take the matter to conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amount in line 17, page 326, is a carry-over. It is a carry-over of both kinds of funds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would prefer to say "extension."

Mr. FERGUSON. At any rate, the money is now committed for that purpose, and they have the money.

I think the Senator from Illinois is correct in saying that if we cut that figure, our action will be the same as cutting the figure on page 325.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. We thus reduce somewhat the total amount.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, we reduce somewhat the total amount.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think the testimony on page 180 indicates that these contracts are not let at the present time, because Mr. Marshall said:

The budget presentation, Mr. Chairman, was to provide for the construction of either two or three combination passenger-cargo vessels for use in the North Atlantic, East Coast, South American trade, to be purchased by Moore-McCormack Lines with a construction differential subsidy.

They are not even sure whether the Moore-McCormack Lines will purchase them, at the present time. Certainly they will have no connection with the war effort at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment on page 326, in line 17.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, of course there is some point to the remarks made by the Senator from Wyoming to the effect that there are two items here, one in line 17, on page 325, in the amount of \$63,000,000, which should be a new appropriation for the construction of new commercial ships, not defense ships, but new commercial ships for passenger traffic, in the main; and one of the next page, page 326, where there is an almost equal item—in the amount of \$64,875,000—that being a lim-

itation on the amounts previously appropriated in the 1950 act to be permitted to be expended for a particular subject, namely, the construction of new ships, including reconditioning, betterment, and so forth.

The Senator from Illinois has addressed his amendment to a proposed reduction which certainly is justified on the basis of the specific statement of the Acting Administrator of the Maritime Commission. The amendment is certainly justified by that statement. The Senator has addressed his amendment to the latter amount, rather than to the former one.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, if the Senator from Tennessee will not permit me to make my statement on this matter without interruption.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senator's attention to the proviso on page 326, to which reference has been made. Objection has been made on the ground that these ships will not be built because the appropriation will expire at the end of the fiscal year.

However, the language there is:

Provided further, That not to exceed \$64,875,000 of the funds and contract authority made available for new ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, shall continue to be available until December 31, 1950.

So that extends the time, and therefore the ships can be built.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator has said that these ships are to be used for commercial purposes. However, does the Senator think for a moment that every ship needed for the transportation of troops or for other military purposes will not be converted, if conversion is necessary, just as was done in World War I and in World War II? Does the Senator think that the ships needed for such purpose will be used for other purposes?

As was well pointed out by the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who has given careful consideration to this matter, our supply of ships now is smaller than it was at the beginning of World War II.

So I simply cannot understand the Senator's argument that these ships would not be available and valuable for national-defense purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Arizona. If he were correct in his understanding—but he is not—that this appropriation would be used for defense shipping, I would be in there pitching with him. However, the Senator from Arizona is incorrect in his understanding. No mere statement on the floor of Senate that this particular appropriation is a defense appropriation makes it so. This is not by any manner or means a defense appropriation.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the Senator

from Illinois to the committee amendment is addressed to a carry-over from an appropriation made in 1950. It could more properly have been addressed to the appropriation of \$63,000,000 proposed to be made this year. In either case, it would not have been a defense appropriation, because in either case it was an appropriation for the building or the reconditioning of merchant vessels; and instead of being a defense appropriation, I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that it is crystal clear from the statement of the Acting Administrator that some of this item is actually defense in reverse, as was stated by the Senator from Illinois, because it is proposed to spend \$9,500,000 in converting ships now available for troop transportation, ships which were built for use as troop transports, and to convert them into use as commercial liners. So instead of having accomplished something in the national defense, we would have gone in reverse, away from national defense.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to say again to the Senate—because I think every Senator wishes to support defense appropriations and defense spending and planning—that this particular appropriation is not a defense appropriation. In making this statement, I address myself again to the distinguished Senator from Colorado. This appropriation is one addressed to the last amount mentioned, which is a carry over from 1950, or to the first amount mentioned—the amount of \$63,000,000. In either case the appropriation is not a defense appropriation. To the contrary, it is an appropriation for the construction of commercial vessels or for the conversion of troop ships into commercial ships.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me ask whether he is referring to the construction of the vessels *General Pope* and *General Weigel*.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe that is what is involved. I do not believe the Senator was present when this matter was first discussed.

Let me say that I do not believe this is an occasion for heat; and if I appear to be heated, certainly I do not mean to be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. However, the Senator from Illinois tells me that this item relates to the *General Pope* and *General Weigel*.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, they represent a part of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But those ships have been ordered out.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the fact is that this has to do with two items, one appropriated in 1950—and certainly it was not a defense appropriation—and the other proposed to be appropriated this year, on the basis of a budget submitted last fall, and certainly that item is not a defense appropriation.

The best proof of the fact that it is not a defense appropriation is the letter obtained by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] specifically answering special questions with reference to what was proposed to be done with the \$63,000,000 item of newly requested funds under the

appropriation bill to go into effect at the beginning of the coming fiscal year.

Mr. President, I shall not weary the Senate by rereading each of those provisions. However, it will be found that in answering the questions, the Acting Administrator stated to the Senator from Illinois that the vessels which were to be covered by the contract authority, under the \$63,000,000, were new vessels for the "Good Neighbor Fleet" vessels to replace some vessels now 20 years old, operating along the east coast of South America.

The second question was:

Have any formal applications been filed by the companies who would benefit from this contract authority?

The answer was:

No formal applications have been filed for the construction of passenger vessels by any company or companies for operation on Trade Route No. 1. Further in this connection, see answer to question No. "4," appearing hereinafter.

Mr. President, under those first two questions, the plan is to construct two new ships for the "Good Neighbor Fleet," to operate along the east coast of South America, in the Atlantic Ocean; and it is said that up to the time of the writing of that letter on July, no application for replacement ships had been filed by any of the companies which now are using the 20-year old ships. So this item is proposed in connection with looking a good long way ahead.

The next question was:

According to present calculations, is it reasonable to assume that these contracts will be let before June 30, 1951?

In other words, before the end of the fiscal year for which the appropriation bill now before the Senate is to be passed. I particularly call this matter to the attention of Senators, Mr. President.

The answer was:

At the time our 1951 budget was filed, it was believed that it would be possible to execute contracts for the construction and sale to a private company of the necessary passenger-carrying vessels to replace the "Good Neighbor Fleet." Our latest and very recent estimate is that contracts with respect to such new vessels cannot be awarded until about November 1, 1951.

That is after this fiscal year has passed and the fall of next fiscal year is at hand.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. What is the date of the letter containing that statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. The date of the letter is July 18, 1950, and it is written by the Acting Administrator of the Maritime Commission to the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois, replying to specific questions; and those questions were designed to bring out—I call this to the attention of the Senate—whether this was defense construction; if so, how soon it could be gotten under way; and, if it was not defense construction, then what type it was, and how soon they would expect to get that under way. If there ever was a clear showing of the fact that this is not defense construction but is a construction project for the future, and some of it for the very remote

future, a construction of commercial liners, not at all designed to take part in the defense effort, of course, this letter is crystal clear on both those points.

I shall not continue to read the rest of the information that is in the letter. It is perfectly clear, at least to the junior Senator from Florida, that the wise thing to do is to lay the predicate for a real conference on the amount—I emphasize, on the amount—between the House and the Senate.

So far as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, if by the time this bill is in conference there are items of proposed defense construction or proposed defense conversion reminding Senators again that the conversion here is nondefense, it is away from defense—but if there are specific items which can be approved by the conference committee in its judgment, of course the Senate I am sure will want to approve them, and the entire Congress will want to approve them.

We are being asked here to approve the extension of a large number of peacetime appropriations made last year, for the fiscal year 1950, and a great deal of new appropriation proposed to be made this year for peacetime construction and peacetime conversion. I say to the Senate that instead of being a defense measure, this is operating in reverse, exactly as the Senator from Illinois has said, and that it seems to me that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has indeed put his finger on the real prospect of getting something constructive out of this; that is, to take this amendment to conference and insist upon there working out a defense program for Maritime Commission conversion, and, if necessary, construction.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield first to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I may say that if the amendment of the Senator from Illinois goes to conference, the \$64,000,000 item will not then be in conference. The only thing that will be in conference will be the \$23,000,000; and the House has already fixed it at that sum. The conference will be able to do nothing with it. The Senator is just not familiar with it. The members of the committee who had in in charge were familiar with it. They worked hard on it. They gave their best judgment to the matter, and the full committee, regardless of whether they were Democrats or Republicans, overwhelmingly voted to report the committee amendment; and now we find Senators who voted in committee to report the bill, with this amount, now opposing it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I share the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee. I may say, however, I think some Senators on this floor know a little more about this appropriation than the distinguished Senator seems to think. We know that the 1950 appropriation was a peacetime

appropriation for peacetime work, and we know that the budget submitted last year for appropriation this year was again a peacetime budget for peacetime construction. We also know the letter which is before the Senate, and the facts in it are within the knowledge of every Senator. Every Senator in his own conscience must have knowledge that this program is a peacetime program, that it is a civilian program, and that, so far as defense is concerned, it operates in reverse.

We have an official statement from the Acting Administrator to the effect that a large part of this appropriation cannot be employed, the contracts cannot even be made until November 1951, and other large parts of it, parts relating to conversion, have to do with conversion in reverse, from troop ships into commercial carriers. We also know, Mr. President and Senators, that if we are in a critical defense situation—and certainly we have many reasons to make us think so—any construction of large peacetime liners is not going to be permitted; they are not going to be laid down; they are not going to be constructed, because the shipyards are going to be utilized in repairing, rehabilitating, reconditioning, and converting the large number of ships laid up and available but not now of course ready to be used overnight.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida to turn to page 326 of the bill, where in line 17, he will see the item to which the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is directed. The Senator will observe that that item is in italics. All that item, from line 4 down to line 21, will be in conference, and by any amendment that the Senate now makes with respect to that figure, we shall be reducing the area of the conference. The Senator from Massachusetts was of the opinion that we were dealing with a provision which the House had passed, but when I called his attention to the fact, he saw that it was an amendment added by the Senate committee, and that the elimination of this amendment would be removing the matter from conference.

Now, I can understand a Senator's voting to reduce an appropriation; I can understand arguments that may be made for that. But I want to assure the Senator from Florida, and all who have listened to his very eloquent argument, that if, as he said a moment ago, it is a constructive thing to take this matter to conference, then the only way to do it is to allow the amount reported by the Senate committee to remain in the bill.

Of course, if it is reduced—I must be quite frank, then the amount that may be allowed will remain in conference. But if Senators think we are wasting money, or trying to waste money, I should like to read some of the other

language of this amendment: Beginning in line 4 I read:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used (1) to start any new ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year or (2) to start any new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless, in either case, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construction and the Director shall submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

I am pointing that out because I want the Senate to realize that its committee has been endeavoring to protect the Treasury.

I do not pretend, Mr. President, that we are building warships. When I read the showing with respect to defense, I was not pretending we were building troopships. But I say to the Senator from Florida, and to every other Senator, that by the degree we build up communication by sea with other areas and other lands, we shall be serving the interests of the United States. The fund which would be provided by the \$64,875,000 would cover the following items: Some passenger vessels for the Caribbean service; two trailer ships for the Pacific coast.

The Senator from California pointed out to us that with respect to those trailer ships for the Pacific coast, through no fault of the shipowners, the contracts were delayed, and they asked specific action by the committee not to make it available for 12 months, but to make it available until December 31, 1950.

So, Mr. President, we can act wisely and intelligently only by a parliamentary method. Arguments may be made for the reduction of an appropriation which the House approved and the Senate did not touch but such an amendment would go to conference, of course, and would fall into an utterly different category from that of this amendment; and if we strike it out, we deprive the conferees of the opportunity of determining whether the money should be spent for those vessels.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator has fallen into error, and if he will follow me I believe he will see that I am correct.

The House bill does not end with the \$63,000,000 figure on line 17, but has itself a proviso somewhat of the same nature, covering the same subject matter of the committee amendment down to line 17. But on line 17, the Senate committee, and I think it was very wise, began to treat as one great, going matter the business of the Nation, with the hold-over or carry-over appropriation from last year with the proposed new one for this year. There is, of course, some change in the proviso, and I should not want to be considered as saying that there is not. There is some change in the first part of the amendment over the House provision, but the second part of the amendment is entirely new matter, so far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The result of making this reduction would be to cut down the amount of the carry-over, or that part of it which would be applied to new construction, by the amount which is so clearly shown by the letter of the acting administrator to be not needed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And the Senate would be taking that much commerce from the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. It seems clear to the junior Senator from Florida that while that amendment could very properly have been addressed to the \$63,000,000, and while, in his judgment, as he stated a while ago, that would have been the preferable place to apply it, at the same time, that was not pending. The matter pending was the adoption of a proposed committee amendment which, if it were adopted and the House provision left undisturbed, would have provided for \$63,000,000 plus a carry-over of \$64,875,000 for new construction, which is not, by any stretch of the imagination, defense construction.

It seems clear that the item which the letter from the acting administrator says is not needed, which does not apply to defense, and will not be used because the contracts cannot be let, according to his letter, until 1951, should be omitted. So there are left in the lap of the conference committee two things: First, what the specific provision shall be as to the limitations based on the \$63,000,000; and, second, how much of the preceding carry-over appropriation shall be left available for new construction. It seems to me there is no question about that, and, so far as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, without further debate he is perfectly willing to vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator says that by no stretch of the imagination can this appropriation be considered a defense measure. All the ships as they are constructed must, in every case, be approved by the Navy. I am sure that if the Secretary of the Navy were here tonight and were permitted to testify on the floor, he would say to the Senate, "These are the kinds of ships we need—fast, new, modern ships, which can be converted to the carriage of troops." I am sure that is exactly what he would say. I do not believe he would agree with the Senator from Florida that by no stretch of the imagination can they be considered defense ships. They are certainly defense ships. They are approved by the Navy in each case, and they cannot be constructed unless the Navy approves them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, despite the desire of Senators to vote, I should like to have some information. The purpose is to provide for the reconditioning and repair of vessels, in other

words, the so-called Liberty ships. I should like to know whether this amount of money is for new construction or whether all or a part of it is to be used for the purpose of repair or renovation of ships now lying in dock and which are not in a good state of repair.

Mr. HOLLAND. In reply to the Senator, I would say that the portion of the construction provided for under the 1950 appropriation act, which is stated in the letter to which I have referred, does not touch the item the Senator has mentioned, but, instead, relates to various passenger vessels for the Grace Line and trailer ships for the Pacific coast. It has no relation whatever to the subject matter which he mentions.

I think the Senator has put his finger on exactly the same question on which the Senator from Massachusetts put his finger, namely, that by adopting this amendment we can leave it in the discretion of the conference committee, with the guidance which it will have from the Maritime Commission and the Navy, to convert the program, in as great an amount as it can be converted, into a defense program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what the Senator from Minnesota wanted to know.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator by reading the law. The Senator will not take my opinion; he will take the law. The trouble with this debate is that we talk without facts and do not depend upon the law. The amendment which is before the Senate is as follows:

Provided further, That not to exceed \$64,875,000 of the funds and contract authority made available for new ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, shall continue to be available until December 31, 1950.

I have in my hand Public Law 266, Eighty-first Congress, and I read from it as follows:

New ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, as authorized by title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (except for construction of two prototype vessels under title VII of said act), \$26,875,000, of which \$12,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority granted under this head in the Supplemental Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, to enter into contracts for new ship construction an amount not to exceed \$75,000,000; and in addition, the Commission is authorized to enter into contracts for new ship construction in an amount not to exceed \$50,000,000.

So the amendment now before the Senate would provide the authority for \$14,000,000 for reconditioning and betterment, and \$50,000,000 for new construction. That can be any sort of construction the Government may deem essential in the present crisis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the Senator is saying that we can use \$14,000,000 of the \$64,000,000 for the purpose of repairing the Naval Reserve ships.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or \$14,000,000 of the \$23,000,000, which would be provided under my amendment. So the reconditioning of ships would be taken care of under

my amendment as well as under the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And \$50,000,000 for new construction, which may be very essential.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I invite the attention of the Presiding Officer to page 326, line 17, to the figure "\$64,875,000." If the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is agreed to, and \$23,775,000 is substituted for the \$64,875,000, what amount would go to conference?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the conferees could not consider a greater amount than is included in the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, if adopted by the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out, in the light of the question asked by the Senator from Minnesota, that the Reserve Fleet is covered on page 330, line 1:

Reserve Fleet expenses, \$8,978,600.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment on page 326, line 17. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—30

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Schaeppel
Bridges	Holland	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Humphrey	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Kem	Stennis
Douglas	Kerr	Taft
Eastland	McCarthy	Thye
Eaton	Malone	Tobey
Ferguson	Martin	Watkins
Gurney	Mundt	Wiley
Hendrickson	Robertson	Williams

NAYS—37

Anderson	Ives	Maybank
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Chavez	Kilgore	Neely
Darby	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Langer	Pepper
Frear	Lehman	Russell
Graham	Lodge	Saltonstall
Green	McCarran	Sparkman
Hayden	McClellan	Tydings
Hill	McFarland	Young
Hoey	McKellar	
Hunt	McMahon	

NOT VOTING—29

Benton	Fulbright	Millikin
Brewster	George	Murray
Butler	Gillette	O'Connor
Cain	Jenner	Taylor
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Kefauver	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Leahy	Vandenberg
Dworshak	Long	Wherry
Ellender	Lucas	Withers
Flanders	Magnuson	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to inquire of the Chair whether the amendment which I offered to the provision on page 326, line 17, has been rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to inquire whether it would be appropriate, after the consideration of committee amendments has been concluded, to offer the same amendment to the House appropriation of \$63,000,000 on line 17, page 325, of the House text?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That language would be open to amendment after the committee amendments have all been completed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall offer the amendment at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 326, line 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, does that complete the committee amendments in this chapter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the amendments in this chapter, and up to page 358.

INVITATION TO SENATORS TO VISIT WILLIAMSBURG

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the executive vice president of the Jamestown Corp., Mr. Allan R. Matthews, in which he extends a very cor-

dial invitation to all Members of the Senate to come to Williamsburg next Sunday, July 30, at the fourth annual Legislative Day, to be the guests of the corporation for the beautiful historic pageant, The Common Glory. Each Senator who can go will be furnished with two free tickets to the pageant. The letter states that ample accommodations can be secured for those who wish to spend the night in Williamsburg. Any Senator who wishes to take advantage of this offer should let me know, so that I can make reservations for the tickets to the pageant.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JAMESTOWN CORP.,

Williamsburg, Va., July 24, 1950.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: On July 30, 1950, the Jamestown Corp., in cooperation with the Governor of Virginia, will be host at its fourth annual legislative day, a day which commemorates the date on which the Virginia House of Burgesses, the first freely elected governing body on the North American Continent came into existence.

In observance of the day, the General Assembly of Virginia will hold a commemorative session at the Old Jamestown Church at Jamestown Island, site of the first permanent English colony on this continent. Speakers will include Vice Admiral J. Leslie Hall, former Commandant of the Fifth Naval District, and Virginia's Governor Battle.

After that meeting, members of the general assembly and other guests will participate in a picnic-box supper on the grounds at Jamestown, and at 8:15 p. m., that day, the same group will be guests of the Jamestown Corp. at a performance of Paul Green's historical drama, The Common Glory, which tells the story of American Colonies' fight for independence.

In view of the nature of the observance and of the significance at this time of the drama's message, the Jamestown Corp. will be happy if you will invite your colleagues in the United States Senate to attend both the commemorative session and the performance of the play and we earnestly hope many of them will be able to be present. We should like to hear from those who plan to come in order that arrangements may be made for their suppers. Two complimentary tickets to The Common Glory will be set aside at our box office for each Senator who is able to be here.

For your information, I am notified that sufficient space is available at the Williamsburg Inn on Sunday to accommodate those who would like to remain over night in Williamsburg.

Looking forward to having you with us on Sunday, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN R. MATTHEWS,

Executive Vice President.

MISSION OF STANLEY EARL TO KOREA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to ask to have an editorial inserted in the RECORD, and have a minute or two to explain the insertion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks in the body of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Portland Oregonian of July 21, 1950, entitled "Mr. Earl's Mission."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. EARL'S MISSION

It has been inevitable that Stanley Earl, of Portland, returning from his duties with the Economic Cooperation Administration in Korea and speaking out with admirable frankness on the conditions which have existed in South Korea and which have abetted Communist penetration, should be quoted and misquoted in the Communist press of the United States and the world.

This page also, having pointed out in a number of editorials that all was not well below the thirty-eighth parallel, has been quoted and misquoted by the rats among us who lie in wait for such opportunity.

Mr. Earl's position seems to be exactly the position which this page has taken—that the laboratory test of war has shown that we had neglected reform during our period of Korean occupancy and that consequently there was no loyalty for us among the masses of the people. Those people had, and have, no desire for communism. Generally speaking, they appear to detest it. But they have been under a police state from which American occupancy had failed to release them, and apathy has been the result.

This is unsavory stuff, but it is material that all of us need to assimilate, and particularly our Government. We have to make the decision as to whether, when we go back into command of Korea, we are going to make democracy a true force for reform. Or is it to be a repetition of our lending ourselves to what Mr. Earl has described as a police state.

Mr. Earl has been called to Washington. We hope he continues to tell the facts as he sees them. It is a mission of the highest patriotism.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say, in regard to this editorial, that Mr. Earl, an Oregonian, was appointed some months ago as the representative of ECA in behalf of the labor mission of ECA in Korea.

Mr. Earl found conditions in South Korea very unsatisfactory so far as the free-labor movement was concerned, and upon his return to the United States some days ago he made some statements in an interview with a newspaper correspondent of the Portland Oregonian concerning conditions in South Korea as he found them to be. The Daily Worker picked up Mr. Earl's comments and gave widespread publicity to them, seeking, of course, to give the impression that Mr. Earl was in effect a witness for the Communist position in Korea. This editorial of the Portland Oregonian goes to that question.

Mr. President, I desire to say that I have known Mr. Stanley Earl for a great many years. He is an avowed enemy of everything communistic. He has fought the Communists in the CIO, both in Oregon and in the country generally. He is known as a labor leader within the right wing of the CIO. I happen to know that his appointment as a labor representative for the labor mission in Korea by ECA had the support of the A. F. of L. and of the CIO, and when he spoke in South Korea he spoke for the American labor movement, the CIO, the A. F. of L., the brotherhoods, indeed, the entire American labor movement.

Any criticism of Mr. Earl because of any statement he has made in regard to conditions as he found them in South Korea is not justified on the basis of any ground that Mr. Earl in any sense is the least bit sympathetic to communism. It is true that as we read his in-

President has so aptly said, between our country and Japan.

Beyond that, Mr. President, it seems to me that Japan today, with its new approach to world conditions, its new attempt to find out what is going on in the world, and the place it has in the world very significantly symbolizes what I found when I was in the Far East, namely, a yearning for freedom and a yearning for peace. War is not wanted, but roads to peace are what the people seek.

The people of the Far East desire to express their individuality, they wish to express the ability of the people to take care of themselves, the idea of having people free, not under the control of a dictatorship, not under the control of colonialism or imperialism, but imbued with a spirit of freedom. Here we have a group representing those ideals and entertaining the earnest desire to explore what is going on in the world.

The first stop of this group in their trip from Tokyo was in Switzerland, where they attended the Moral Rearmament Assembly at Caux and got a picture of the spiritual foundations of and the spiritual approach to world peace.

They went from there to Germany, where they studied conditions in Germany itself, a country in many ways comparable with their own, which had been at war with us, and where the people also are trying to find peace.

They went from Germany to France and England, and then came to the United States. They visited the United Nations, where Ambassador Austin received them at Lake Success. The Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Trygve Lie, also received them, and they had an opportunity to see the United Nations at work.

It is very fitting, therefore, that we should open our hearts in welcome to them, as they come here to discover in what way the world can be reorganized and established in the ways of permanent peace.

Mr. President, I am very happy indeed to be able on this occasion to say this word of welcome to these distinguished guests. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I cordially associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the Vice President and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. We are very happy to have with us the distinguished members of the Japanese Diet, and the prominent citizens and representatives of industry, labor, education, and other activities of Japan.

It will be recalled that about 100 years ago the United States was instrumental in aiding the people of Japan to form contacts with the outside world. That was the beginning of her great advance and career as a powerful and industrial nation playing an important part in the economy not only of the East but of the world.

It is true that we have recently been involved in a bitter and terrible war. I pray God that the people of Japan, like the people of America, will want peace and will strive for it; that they will want to do away with the rule of the materialists and of military masters, and will

desire to set up and maintain governments devoted to democracy and to the rule of the people. I have great hope that Japan will heartily and in entire earnestness turn her attention toward democratic government, toward government controlled by the people, toward freedom and toward enlightened international cooperation, to the end that in the future wars may be prevented and the course of the nation may be charted along the roadway of peace, and thus contribute to the welfare and happiness of all the people of the world. It was that particular idea I wanted to leave with our distinguished visitors on this occasion.

We hope the people of Japan will realize that the United States in the last war had no ambitions for territory, no desire for conquest, no wish to conquer other peoples to bring them under the rule of the United States. We had no materialistic desires. We never dreamed of imperialism. We fought simply to defend the things for which we have stood since the United States was first established, for democracy, for peace, for all the fine attributes that go with peaceful, democratic ways of life.

We are happy to have you visit us. We are glad you have visited other countries. We feel sure that your contacts on your journey will enable you to return to Japan with new concepts of the life of the world, and with the firm belief that the United States wants nothing from you except justice and fairness and cooperation in the world's efforts to achieve peace and to live under peaceful conditions. We welcome you. We wish your country well. We hope you can rehabilitate your broken enterprises and turn them all into the pathway of cooperation and peace in behalf of all the peoples of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to join in the words of welcome to our friends from Japan. It particularly interests me that they have been concerning themselves with the spiritual basis of peace. That is a field which we have not yet fully explored. It is something which it is necessary that we should explore.

It is a conviction of mine that wars, civil tumults, and all the ills which afflict mankind come from disobedience to the moral laws of the universe. We in America have to examine ourselves, you in Japan have to examine yourselves, all the nations of the world have to examine themselves, to see whether they are working in accordance with the moral laws of the universe, under which alone can peace be attained and maintained.

I am particularly glad that you ladies and gentlemen from across the Pacific Ocean have been concerning yourselves with the troubles in which the world today finds itself.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, some months ago we were honored by a visit of distinguished representatives of the Parliament of West Germany. On that occasion the Senate extended to our visitors a warm and cordial welcome.

It gives me pleasure today to join my colleagues in extending the same kind of

welcome to these distinguished representatives of Japan. I hope that as they leave here they will feel that this welcome on our part is a sincere one.

We told our friends from western Germany that we welcomed them as allies in our present efforts to preserve the peace of the world. We welcome the people of Japan in the same world-wide effort.

When I visited Japan in 1935, I met a number of outstanding Japanese who expressed warm friendship for the American people and for the United States of America. On that visit I also met some of the war lords, who were not friendly toward the United States. I think it is only fair to say that, in my opinion, events have proved that they were not friendly to their own people. They believed in a caste system; they believed in imperialism; and they had no objection at all to seeing the rank and file of the Japanese people occupy the status of peasants.

Since General MacArthur has been in Japan, I think the Japanese people have come to realize that our chief aim in the present occupation there is to protect the Japanese people from the type of government which led them into war and kept down the average man from achieving the status in life to which we feel every citizen should be entitled.

Mr. President, we are very happy to know that the Japanese people have adopted a constitution which gives more rights to the working people and gives more rights to the women of that country and gives more self-government to the people of Japan.

This delegation comes to us at a critical period, but we are very glad they are here.

Mr. President, I simply wish that the parliament of Russia would send a delegation here and would give us a chance to address them. As a matter of fact, if they did not wish to do that, I wish they would invite us to go over there. If they would do that, I believe every Member of the Senate would accept the invitation provided they would promise that each one of us would be permitted to speak for as long as 5 minutes to the Russian people and let them know what our real aims are.

Again, Mr. President, I wish to assure our friends from Japan that we are sincere in telling them that we believe in the brotherhood of man, that we wish to cooperate with all friendly and peace-loving people of the world in striving to avoid another conflict which might destroy civilization, and that we wish to join with all other peoples in building up the nations of the world to the point where all may have a better opportunity to enjoy the kind of liberty and freedom which we in this country have been privileged to enjoy for many years.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. After these expressions by Members of the Senate of their feeling of good will and their greetings to this distinguished delegation, the Chair wishes to state that he has been advised that one of the members of the delegation from the Japanese Diet, who is a member of the Liberal

Party of Japan, a close friend and associate of Prime Minister Yoshida, and a representative of the Government of Japan on this mission around the world, desires to express briefly a response to the generous welcome which has been accorded to them.

By unanimous consent, the Chair will recognize the Honorable Chojiro Kuriyama, a member of the Diet of Japan, to express his sentiments.

(Applause. Senators rising.)

Mr. KURIYAMA. Mr. President, honorable Members of the United States Senate: We are deeply grateful for the courtesy extended us today by the United States Senate. It is our sincere regret that Japan has broken almost a century-old friendship between the two countries. In spite of this big mistake on our part, the magnanimous forgiveness and generosity of America not only have allowed Japan to survive, but are helping her recovery.

It is gratifying to know that the leadership of America is rooted in Christianity.

The lawless aggression in Korea is again involving America in terrible sacrifices. We Japanese wholeheartedly support the action taken by the United Nations; and if you will permit us to do so, we pay highest respect to the courageous leadership of President Truman in this matter. [Applause.] I hope that Japan will be shown ways in which she can be of assistance in cooperation with the United States.

Mr. President, as some of the distinguished Members of this Senate have said, we went to Caux, Switzerland, in search of the true content of democracy. We found the ideology which will feed democracy in Japan, and at the same time which is the powerful answer to communism.

Now here we are to study the true heritage of great America. I feel that it will be a source of the greatest happiness to the people in Japan if we Japanese can rebuild and reconstruct our nation on the same principles that you in America have followed.

Although we have many things for which to thank America and Americans, on this occasion we just briefly express our sincere gratitude to the United States of America for its help and guidance.

Mr. President, honorable Members of the United States Senate, thank you again for your courtesy and kindness.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say to the six members of the Japanese Diet who have been received on the Senate floor, that they are welcome to remain here as long as their convenience may dictate.

The Senate will now resume the consideration of legislative business.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on July 11 the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for

the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which is the unfinished business of the Senate. I realize that a number of important extraneous matters were necessarily submitted to the Senate, and that long debates have taken place thereon. However, it seems to me that we ought to expedite consideration of the appropriation bill. As I understand, there remain practically only two or three amendments which are highly controversial. We are almost through reading the bill itself for committee amendments, and I should hope we might proceed to the point where we could vote, perhaps this afternoon, on at least one of these controversial amendments.

Everyone knows that with the new one-package approach to the annual appropriations, sometime will be required in conference before the conferees agree. The quicker we get the appropriation bill into conference, the sooner we may be able to take at least some 3-day recesses for the benefit of the Senate as a whole. I sincerely hope that we shall expedite the appropriation bill, stay on the bill itself, and eliminate, so far as possible, speeches dealing with matters other than the appropriation bill. If we do that, and if we remain in session rather late this evening, until, say, 7 or 8 or 9 o'clock, we may accomplish quite a little in connection with the bill. I appeal to Senators on both sides of the aisle to cooperate to the end that we may get along with the bill as rapidly as possible.

I am not blaming anyone for the delay, at all. I am only attempting to make a very sincere appeal for the expedition of business, in order that the appropriation bill may go to conference as soon as possible.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to call the attention of the distinguished majority leader to the fact that the Banking and Currency Committee hope to have the new defense production bill ready for action on the floor of the Senate next Monday. We plan to work all of today and tomorrow, and we hope to finish it by tomorrow evening or tomorrow night.

The majority leader, of course, knows that there will be many items of difference between the House and Senate in regard to the appropriation bill, which, in its omnibus form, represents a new procedure, and that we do not yet know just how the conferees will be appointed and how they will act, whether there will be subcommittee conferees, and whether the various parts will then have to be consolidated. But in any event it will be quite a task to reach an agreement on this bill.

The majority leader knows there will be controversial matters in the defense production bill, he knows we have got to pass a tax bill, and he knows that everyone would like to get out of here by Labor Day. So it seems to me that, since we have been on the appropriation bill for so long and have spent so much time on

extraneous and irrelevant matters, we could well afford to consider the three items that are before us now, which come under the head of general military measures. Certainly there will not be any amendment seriously pressed to cut down the appropriation for the Defense Department. We shall then have ECA and several other matters, including the point 4 program and the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment, which will have to be considered. All those matters could be handled today, if each Senator who wishes to speak on an amendment would confine himself to the amendments and try to condense his remarks to not exceeding 10 minutes.

I hope very much that the Senate will cooperate with the plea of the majority leader to finish consideration of the pending bill either today or in a night session tonight.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Virginia for the statement he has made, especially in view of the fact that he advises the Senate that the Committee on Banking and Currency will work tomorrow in order to expedite consideration of the measure now before them dealing with the war situation which exists in Korea. I am also glad that he agrees that we should move along.

I do not want it understood that I am saying that the Senate of the United States or the Congress is anxious to adjourn. We are going to stay here as long as there is anything important to do, and we are going to do whatever is necessary with respect to the implementation of the effort dealing with the unusual Korean situation. However, it seems to me that probably after we move along with the appropriation bill, the conference reports upon social security and other matters, as well as the legislation implementing our effort to deal with the Korean situation, we may at that time be able to take recesses of 3 days at a time, always ready to return at a moment's notice if the President or the Congress so desires. There is not a Member of the Senate who cannot be here within from 24 to 48 hours, irrespective of where he may be in the United States.

RESUMPTION OF WORK ON THE SENATE CHAMBER

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the majority leader, I conclude, as chairman of the committee of the Senate which has charge of the remodeling of the Senate Chamber, that we might as well notify the interested parties that, so far as this particular year is concerned, the Senate will be here possibly every third day—and I would agree to that.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think the Senator's conclusion is correct. I have not discussed this other than in a cursory way, with certain Members of the Senate, but I do not believe anyone wants to move back into the old Supreme Court Chamber.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would not want the work on remodeling the Senate Chamber resumed, I may say to the Senator from Illinois, unless it were expected that we would be gone for a substantial length of time. On the other hand, I should not want to interfere with the work of the

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, July 17, 1950.
Hon. EVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: Reference is made to your letter of July 13, 1950, in which you inquire whether the funds contained in the omnibus appropriation bill recently reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee are sufficient to provide for the survey of the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and other streams in New England as authorized in section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1950, Public Law 516, Eighty-first Congress.

As provided in section 205 of the 1950 Flood Control Act, the survey of the New England rivers is to be financed from the regular appropriations made to the Corps of Engineers for carrying on authorized preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control and allied purposes. The amount which can be made available for the New England investigation will be allocated from the total amount contained in our appropriations for preliminary examinations and surveys. The budget estimate for preliminary examinations and surveys for fiscal year 1951 was \$6,500,000. The appropriation passed by the House of Representatives reduced this amount to \$3,500,000. The Senate committee action restored the item to the full amount of \$6,500,000 as shown on page 264 of the Senate Committee Report No. 1941.

I can assure you that the Corps of Engineers will allocate funds to this investigation from whatever appropriation is provided in the act as finally enacted. The exact amount will depend, of course, upon the amount finally appropriated inasmuch as all of the preliminary examinations and surveys throughout the country must be financed from this item. If the amount recommended by the Senate committee is appropriated, good progress can be made on the New England investigation. If the appropriation is substantially less than the \$6,500,000 recommended by the Senate committee, the progress of the investigation will necessarily be somewhat limited; but even in that event, we will make every effort to proceed as rapidly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

J. S. BRAGDON,
Brigadier General, Acting Chief
of Engineers.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, when page 364 of the pending bill was reached late in the afternoon, I was necessarily absent from the floor. I had pending an amendment, which I wanted to call up at that time, to reduce the appropriation provided for in line 2, page 364, by \$100,000. The committee amendment provides the sum of \$221,244,500 for civil functions of the Corps of Engineers. The purpose of my amendment is to reduce that amount by \$100,000, and to eliminate the item for planning the Dover Dam, which is found in the committee report at page 237, as follows:

Dover Lock and Dam, Cumberland River..... \$100,000

Mr. President, I think my amendment should be agreed to, and I hope it may be

considered at this time. There are now pending in the Senate and in the House of Representatives bills to include the development of the Cumberland River in the TVA system. The matter has not been brought up for consideration at this session, because the TVA is making a report, upon instructions of the President. In addition, certain information will have to be furnished by the Corps of Engineers. These reports will all be in before the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress, so early in the next session we should be able to get action one way or another to determine whether the Cumberland River will be further developed by the TVA or by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. President, it is usually conceded that if the lower part of the Cumberland River is developed by the Tennessee Valley Authority, it would not build the dam which this \$100,000 would be used to plan. Below Nashville, between the Cheatham locks and the mouth of the Cumberland River near its confluence with the Ohio River, the Corps of Engineers originally planned one high dam, but later changed the plan so as to have two low dams: the Dover Dam, and a dam near the mouth of the Cumberland River. The TVA plan would follow the original intention of the Corps of Engineers with only one dam near the mouth of the Cumberland. The Dover Dam would be between the Cheatham lock and the mouth of the Cumberland. That dam would not be built if the development were taken over by the TVA. This \$100,000 is for planning. The dam could not be constructed within the next 3 or 4 years, at least in the present emergency. There would be no substantial delay if Congress decided that the Corps of Engineers should build the Dover Dam; and I feel that the spending of this money should be delayed in order to give us an opportunity in the next session of Congress to act upon the bill to determine whether the further development of the Cumberland River should be undertaken by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

That is all I have to say in explanation, Mr. President. We can save \$100,000 until the determination can be made, or we can run the risk of wasting \$100,000 for plans which may never be used.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered in order that I may offer the amendment for consideration and action by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am obliged to object. The matter came up yesterday and it was voted to continue the plan now established by which the engineers build the dam on the Cumberland River and the TVA distributes the power. In my judgment, that has been found to be a very excellent way of building up the valley. Several dams have already been constructed and TVA transmission lines have been built and the power is being distributed within the area.

I hope the Senator will withdraw his amendment because it would interfere

with the plans which have been carried out for many years. I have been living with the matter for 25 or 30 years. It started with the building of the dam at Muscle Shoals and it has progressed very well.

My friend from Tennessee has a plan to turn the building of the dams on the Cumberland over to the TVA. TVA would have to start an entirely new program. It would be very much more costly to the American people. It would not be so efficiently done by the TVA as it would be done by the Corps of Engineers, who have done it so well in the past. In addition to that, this item has already been passed upon, and the Senator's motion is not in order.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to say that my motion would not be determinative. Is it not correct to say that whether this dam is to be built by the TVA or the Corps of Engineers would be determined in the bill itself? In other words, would we not merely be delaying the matter of the expenditure of the money until the next appropriation bill? Is not that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee passed on the matter at least 2 months ago. They are familiar with it. They reported it to the Senate. Now, on the floor of the Senate, like my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] yesterday, my friend from Tennessee has a plan of his own which he wants to work out. Why should a new proposal of this kind be started? That is something I cannot understand. I really cannot understand the reason or motive for it. What is the reason? Does the Senator from Tennessee object because of his antipathy, if I may so express it, to the Corps of Engineers? Have the engineers failed, in the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course I have no antipathy toward the Corps of Engineers. I have always supported the Corps of Engineers, as the senior Senator from Tennessee well knows.

Mr. McKELLAR. But the Senator does not want the Corps of Engineers to continue with this particular work.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have very high respect for the Corps of Engineers. Since the electricity which is generated at the dams on the Cumberland is sold to the TVA, which has charge of the distribution of it, and the two rivers run almost parallel and both empty into the Ohio no more than 10 miles apart; therefore, from the viewpoint of flood control, the development of that section of the South, and the operation of our electrical systems, greater efficiency in operation would be gained if one organization operated both. That is no reflection or criticism on the Corps of Engineers. However, that issue would have to be settled when the pending bill is considered on the basis of the reports of the Corps of Engineers, the TVA, and also other evidence which will be brought before the committee. All I am asking in this amendment is that

the expenditure of \$100,000 for the planning of a dam, which the Corps of Engineers did not want to build, under the first report years ago, and which would not be built if the Cumberland is turned over to the TVA, be delayed until we have had an opportunity to have the other bill considered. That is no reflection upon the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. McKELLAR. This matter affects Tennessee, Kentucky, and the adjoining States of Alabama, Mississippi, and possibly also Georgia. It seems to me to be a very expensive route to take. It seems to be an experiment, whereas the present situation by which the engineers build a dam and then turn it over to the TVA to sell the power and collect the money and put it in the Treasury of the United States is a very much better way of handling the matter. It has been quite a successful method, and I hope it will not be interfered with. It is true that one of our newspapers is very much in favor of making the change, although I have not been able to ascertain the reason for it. The Senate voted on the amendment yesterday. The Senator had ample opportunity. He was not taken by surprise. It was considered yesterday. He was present in the Chamber all day except at the time the vote was taken. I see no reason why we should give unanimous consent now. I shall object to the unanimous consent being given, and I hope the Chair will sustain my objection that the motion is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Tennessee objects to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which it agreed to the amendment on page 364, line 2, in order that I may offer an amendment to reduce the appropriation by \$100,000 for the purposes which I have stated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the motion of the Senator in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider is in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well. Does the Senator wish to make a statement?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have made my statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I appeal to the Members of the Senate not to interfere with this provision of the bill, which has already been passed. It has been reported by a committee which heard all the evidence with reference to the matter. Every opportunity was given to be heard on the matter. I hope the Senate will stand by the committee and by what has been done heretofore by the Senate. The Corps of Engineers is one of our best organizations. I do not see why we should turn them down because someone has another plan which he thinks is better than the plan now in existence.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	Hayden	Maybank
Bricker	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler	Hill	Myers
Byrd	Hoey	Neely
Capehart	Holland	O'Connor
Chapman	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Hunt	Pepper
Connally	Ives	Robertson
Cordon	Jenner	Russell
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Dworschak	Kefauver	Sparkman
Eastland	Kem	Stennis
Eaton	Langer	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lodge	Thye
Flanders	Lucas	Tydings
Frear	McCarran	Watkins
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wherry
George	McClellan	Wiley
Gillette	McFarland	Williams
Graham	McKellar	Young
Green	Magnuson	
Guernsey	Malone	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 364, line 2, was adopted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, for the benefit of any Members of the Senate who were not present when the original colloquy occurred with reference to this matter, let me say that the purpose of the motion to reconsider is to permit me to offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 364, in line 2, so as to reduce the figure "\$221,244,500" by the sum of \$100,000. The \$100,000 has to do with funds appropriated for planning for the building of Dover lock and dam on the Cumberland River.

Mr. President, there has been considerable agitation in regard to this matter. Originally the Corps of Engineers wanted to build one dam on the Cumberland River, near where it empties into the Ohio River. That would have been a rather high dam. There was some objection to the building of the dam, because of some bottom land which might be flooded. Thereupon the Corps of Engineers changed its plan, and decided that instead of building the one high dam near the junction of the Ohio and Cumberland Rivers, to build a comparatively low dam there, and also to build a dam between the Cheatham lock and dam and the dam near the Ohio. Of course, we do not know whether the Corps of Engineers will again change its plans in that regard.

It is obvious that the \$100,000 for the planning of the dam may never be used, because the dam may never be built. Even if the right to make the decision remains with the Corps of Engineers, it may return to the original plan, because there is a greater need for electricity. The one high dam would furnish more electricity than could be developed at the two low dams.

There has been quite a change in sentiment, in my opinion, among the people of the Cumberland Valley and among the people of Tennessee and Kentucky in regard to this matter. In my opinion, the great majority of the people who are interested in it wish to have only the one high dam built, and they wish to have

the Cumberland developed by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. President, there is now pending in the House and also in the Senate a bill for the inclusion of the Cumberland Basin in the TVA system. The President of the United States has asked the Tennessee Valley Authority for a report in regard to the development of the Cumberland. An interim report has already been submitted; and within the next 6 weeks or 2 months we expect the final report to be submitted.

It is anticipated and generally stated that the TVA will recommend that, instead of building the two low dams, only the one high dam be built, as originally planned by the Corps of Engineers. If that is done, this \$100,000 for planning would be utterly wasted, because it would represent money for plans for a dam which would never be built.

The reason for the change of attitude on the part of the business people and the citizens of this area is that with the industrial development of this section; with the development of the Arnold air-engineering development center at Tullahoma, on the former site of Camp Forrest; and the development of other defense plants, a great amount of electricity must be developed on the Cumberland. The industrialization of that section of the country requires more electricity, and these defense plants require adequate amounts of electricity.

Even Mr. Harry Dyer, who is chairman of the Nashville Chamber of Commerce's Cumberland River committee, and who formerly favored the building of the two low dams by the Corps of Engineers, now has made a speech in which he has said that he favors the inclusion of this project in the Tennessee Valley Authority system. The sentiment has developed all through that section in like manner.

Mr. President, this matter was submitted by the Secretary of the Interior, in a letter dated July 14, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. The Secretary of the Interior recommends that the proposed legislation be approved and that the Cumberland be developed by the TVA. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of his letter may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., July 14, 1950.
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
United States Senate, Washington,
D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: This is in response to your request for a report on S. 338, Eighty-first Congress, first session, entitled: "A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, so as to include thereunder the Cumberland River and Cumberland River Basin."

I recommend the passage of the bill with the following amendments:

1. To insert the following language at the end of section 2 of the bill:

"All reservoir projects constructed, under construction, or authorized to be constructed in the Cumberland River Basin by or on be-

half of the United States, and all use, control, and operation of such projects, together with all property, books, papers, data, contracts, equipment, and unexpended balances of appropriations, appertaining to these projects, and their appurtenant works, shall be transferred to the corporation, together with such personnel as may be agreeable to the Corporation and to the Secretary of the Army."

2. To strike sections 4 and 5 of the bill.

The following is in explanation of these recommendations:

1. The transfer of the Cumberland Basin projects to the Tennessee Valley Authority would eliminate unnecessary expense and insure continuity in the operation of the projects and the sale of low-cost power to ultimate consumers.

(a) By prior acts of Congress, eight reservoir projects have been authorized to be constructed in the Cumberland River Basin. Of these, one reservoir project (Dale Hollow) has already been constructed and is in operation; two projects (Center Hill and Wolf Creek) are still under construction; the construction of the remaining five projects (Three Islands, Stewart's Ferry, Old Hickory, Carthage, and Celina) has not yet started.

Under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 897, 890; 16 U. S. C. 825), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell or dispose of "electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the Department of the Army and in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army not required in the operation of such projects." The statute requires that, in the sale of such surplus power, preference be given to public bodies and cooperatives; that the power be sold at rates fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, and approved and confirmed by the Federal Power Commission, which would have regard to the recovery of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including the amortization of the investment allocated to power over a reasonable number of years; and that the transmission or disposition of the surplus power shall be in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles.

(b) Acting pursuant to these directions, the Secretary of the Interior entered into negotiations with the Tennessee Valley Authority for the sale of the surplus power from the Dale Hollow, Center Hill, and Wolf Creek projects, and in anticipation of this sale the Tennessee Valley Authority constructed a transmission line which made possible the sale of Dale Hollow power at the bus bar and will provide such facilities as the other plants begin operation. This was the most practicable way of disposing of the surplus power to be generated at the Cumberland projects in conformity with the requirements above stated, especially since (1) approximately 70 percent of the Cumberland River Basin lies within the area now served with electricity produced at TVA plants, (2) approximately 80 percent of the electric-power requirements of the Cumberland Basin is being supplied by TVA, and (3) in its resource development program, which includes the widespread distribution of power at low cost to consumers, TVA needs additional sources of electric power in order to supply adequately the growing needs for electricity in its existing area, including that portion of the service area which lies within the Cumberland Basin.

Because of the geographic position of TVA's power system, both the Department of the Interior and the Tennessee Valley Authority considered that the existing Cumberland projects and any additional projects to be constructed in the Cumberland Basin would contribute most effectively to the purposes of the Flood Control Act of 1944, if the entire power output of these projects were sold to the Tennessee Valley Authority and mar-

keted over its system. Thus, the sale of power from Dale Hollow, Center Hill, and Wolf Creek was intended as the initial step in the development of arrangements for the sale of power by the Department to the TVA. It was contemplated that, as additional projects would be constructed in the Cumberland Basin, the Department and the TVA would work out such amendments to the presently negotiated agreement as might be required to include the sale of power from such additional projects.

(c) In conformity with the requirement that the disposition of power shall be such that the ultimate consumers might benefit by the lowest possible rates "consistent with sound business principles," the Department has taken the view that all matters leading up to the disposition of the power be conducted in accordance with sound business principles and practices. Accordingly the negotiations with the TVA were conducted, so far as practicable, at arms' length, and with due regard to the statutory standards, with the consequent expenditure of such time and effort as would be warranted by a transaction involving a sale of power at an average amount of \$3,500,000 per year over a period of 20 years, or a total of \$70,000,000. The rates arrived at were based on the full utilization of an unregulated annual stream flow; the average of \$3,500,000 for the entire power output of the projects, with a total installed capacity of 441,000 kilowatts, was based upon the normal or average flow as indicated by the long-time stream-flow records; and the variations in the annual payments were based upon deviations from the average stream flow. Prior to the execution of the contract these rates were informally submitted to the Federal Power Commission for confirmation and approval, and considerable attention was given to these rates by the Federal Power Commission, as well as by the staff in the Department of the Interior.

(d) The reason for the informal submission of the rates to the Federal Power Commission, and also the reason for the delay in the execution of the contract between the TVA and the Department was that the agreement was conditioned upon a satisfactory arrangement or operating agreement to be entered into between the TVA and the Department of the Army for the scheduling operations of these projects. This latter agreement has been completed. Without a satisfactory operating agreement, the contract for the sale of power would have had to be terminated, thus leaving the Department with a great amount of generating capacity to be disposed of otherwise, and leaving the TVA with a costly transmission line, but without the power and energy to be transmitted from these projects.

(e) In the last analysis, all the work done by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Interior, the Federal Power Commission, and the TVA in the sale or disposition of the surplus power from the Cumberland projects, centered about a bookkeeping transaction, in which the United States, through one of its agencies, generates power which is turned over to a second agency which delivers the power to a third agency at rates to be approved by a fourth agency, which power is to be accounted for by the third to the second agency, and by the second to a fifth agency, the Treasury of the United States. All this labor and consequent expense would have been avoided, and any future labor and expense will be avoided, if the power from the Cumberland projects is made available to the TVA to be accounted for in accordance with the provisions of the TVA Act.

(f) It is the view of this Department that further economies and greater benefits can be effected, if not only the surplus power but also the projects were turned over to the Tennessee Valley Authority, especially since

this agency is in a position and is qualified to operate the projects for navigation and flood control, as well as for power purposes, under the policies of the TVA Act which are fully adequate to protect the public interest. If this is done there will be no division of authority between the TVA and the Army, and no need for operating agreements the requirements for which may from time to time introduce uncertainty concerning the success of the entire undertaking. In addition, the people of the Cumberland River Basin would be in a position to benefit from all the activities of the TVA in the same manner as the people in the basin of the Tennessee River and its tributaries.

(g) The transfer of these projects to the TVA is undoubtedly intended by this bill (S. 338). I recommend, however, that this intention be expressly stated, and therefore suggest the above stated amendment to section 2, although upon the enactment of this provision without the suggested amendment, the President may, under section 7 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (48 Stat. 63, 16 U. S. C. 831f) exercises his authority to transfer this property to the corporation.

2. It is not necessary to increase the board from three to five members, and there is no need for a saving clause in this bill.

(a) I believe that the functions and undertakings of the corporation have been carried out in a most commendable and efficient manner by the three-man board of directors. I do not see that anything would be gained by an increase of the board by two additional members. Therefore I suggest that section 4 of the bill be eliminated.

(b) An examination of the bill suggests that there is no likelihood of any substantial constitutional questions arising out of this enactment, and therefore there is no need of a saving clause. This is especially so, since this bill would merely amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and the provisions would become part of the more comprehensive statute which already has a saving clause. Therefore, of I recommend that the bill be further amended by eliminating section 5 thereof.

I am informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report to your committee. However, the Bureau of the Budget also informs me that pending a further report, to be submitted by the Tennessee Valley Authority, bringing up to date its previous report on the relationship between the Tennessee and the Cumberland Rivers (H. Doc. No. 107, 79th Cong., 1st sess.), it is not in a position to inform me on the relationship of the proposed legislation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the report of the Secretary of the Interior points out that at least 70 percent of the area of the Cumberland Basin is served by the TVA; that the electricity is sold by the Corps of Engineers at the bus bar to the Department of the Interior; and that the Department of the Interior, in turn, negotiations with the TVA for the sale of the power. So the negotiations go through that circuitous and wasteful route.

The Secretary of the Interior points out—and it is quite generally conceded—that in operations for flood-control purposes, and for the development of the greatest possible amount of electricity, these two river basins should be operated as a unit. Water can be stored for flood-control purposes in the Cumberland Basin at the same time that water is

needed for hydroelectric purposes in the Tennessee Basin. As both these rivers are in the same electrical system, more prime power can be produced if both rivers are operated as a unit.

The elimination of this \$100,000 would not decide the issue as to which agency will have charge of the further development of the Cumberland. The Eighty-second Congress will have to decide that question on the merits of and in line with the recommendations of the various agencies.

All that the amendment which I propose to offer would do would be to defer the spending of this \$100,000 for planning until the next appropriation bill comes along, by which time we hope this issue will be decided.

Mr. President, I find that this item of \$100,000 was not included in the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives. It is true that it is covered in the table which appears on page 237 of the report made by the Appropriations Committee to the Senate. However, in examining the testimony which has been presented to the Appropriations Committee, I find that even the representative of the Corps of Engineers, when he appeared before the committee, failed to request the money for the planning of the Dover Dam at this time. Colonel Potter testified before the committee, but he did not refer to the Dover Lock and Dam or to the \$100,000 here involved.

So it appears that even the Corps of Engineers would not be greatly upset if this matter were deferred until this larger issue can be determined. Colonel Potter's testimony is to be found at page 770 of the report on the civil functions appropriations, Department of the Army.

Of course, Mr. President, we are looking for places where we can economize. It is true that the amount which is the subject of the amendment I wish to propose is not a comparatively large amount, but if the Corps of Engineers changes its mind in regard to whether to build one high dam, instead of two low dams, then this \$100,000 will be wasted. If the Cumberland is to be developed by the Tennessee Valley Authority—in other words, if the bill which we hope will be brought up at the next session is passed—this \$100,000 will be wasted, thrown away, and I do not want to throw away \$100,000 of the taxpayers' money if I can prevent it.

This item was not included in the bill by the House of Representatives. So far as I can find from the testimony, the Corps of Engineers have not said they need this sum, or at least have not urged the appropriation of any money for the planning of the Dover Dam.

The President has asked all the agencies involved to submit a report in the interest of the orderly development of the Cumberland to assure that the water power potential of the Cumberland, particularly in respect to the development of hydroelectric power, is made available most fully for the greatest benefit of that area and of the Nation.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that my motion for the reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment on page 364 in line 2

was adopted should be agreed to, and that the item of \$100,000 should be eliminated and not subject to the risk of wanton waste.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator have in mind extending the jurisdiction of TVA to the Cumberland Valley? Is that the plan favored by the Senator?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the purpose of my bill which is now pending before the Public Works Committee.

Mr. KEM. And is that the purpose of the Senator's motion?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No. The purpose of the motion is to defer this \$100,000 for planning until the next session of Congress, when it can be brought up in the next appropriation bill, to give Congress an opportunity to decide how it wants the Cumberland developed. This is no decision, one way or other, on how it is going to be developed in my motion.

Mr. KEM. But the extension of the jurisdiction of TVA to the Cumberland Valley is the ultimate objective which the Senator has in mind, is it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is such a bill pending. The objective we have in mind now is to see that the Cumberland is properly developed. The TVA does not want the job particularly; its directors have not asked for it. Our first objective is to see that the Cumberland is developed properly. The Corps of Engineers originally in its plan did not want to build this project. It wanted to build only one dam, to be located near the point at which the Cumberland empties into the Ohio. It has changed its plans.

In view of the great need of and increased demand for electricity, it is entirely reasonable that they may again change their plans. In any event, if either that contingency happens or if it were turned over to the TVA, this money would of course be wasted. I can see no harm to be done by delaying the planning of this dam or by delaying the appropriation of money for the dam, until the next appropriation bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that as a general policy the Corps of Army Engineers in building dams tends to favor low dams which do not generate much power?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That, I understand, has been the general policy in the past. I think that more recently the engineers have been building dams for the purpose of generating more electricity than they did heretofore. It is everywhere recognized that the building of the one dam, instead of two, would furnish a great deal more electricity for a section of the country which is growing rapidly, and which has several very important defense projects, including the Arnold Air

Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma. Huge amounts of electricity are needed there. I think if Congress decides this river is to be developed by the Army Corps of Engineers, it may later decide to build only the one dam, and not the Dover Dam. I am reasonably sure Dover Dam will not be built if the TVA should be authorized to develop the Cumberland.

Mr. President, I hope the motion will be agreed to and that this amendment may be adopted. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 364, line 2, was agreed to. Upon that question the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, was the request for the yeas and nays not sufficiently seconded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was not. It requires 10, and there were but 5. The demand was not sufficiently seconded. The question now is upon agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to reconsider.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Has any amendment been agreed to as yet in chapter X of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No amendment has as yet been agreed to in chapter X.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I offer an amendment to the first committee amendment, on page 374, and ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 374, line 19, after the word "diem", the committee proposes to insert "and contracts with not to exceed 23 such individuals may be renewed for 1 year."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma desire to offer an amendment to that committee amendment?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I offer a clarifying amendment to the committee amendment on page 374, line 19, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 374, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "such individuals" and insert "temporary or part-time employees."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, just a word generally about the bill before I discuss the amendment. Chapter X was considered by the House before the Korean crisis developed. The bill then came to the Senate. The Sen-

ate committee considered the bill, chapter X, before the crisis in Korea became acute. So it may be said that what the Senate committee did was to prepare this bill for peacetime activities. More recently, the military authorities have submitted to the Senate a supplemental budget. That budget was cut to fit the bill as recommended by the Senate committee. So when the military authorities considered this chapter, they submitted three clarifying amendments, and they then submitted their supplemental budget to fit the remainder of the bill. Therefore, if the Senate should see fit to pass the bill as reported by the committee, it would be exactly as the authorities expect the bill to be passed by the Congress.

Their supplemental budget would then fit into this bill. The first amendment, the one I have suggested, was requested by the military authorities and was authorized by the committee.

This amendment will follow the intent of the committee in its amendment in allowing for the renewal of contracts with temporary or part-time employees for 1 year and at the same time will allow the National Security Resources Board to continue to hire intermittent employees in accordance with present law.

There are approximately 23 temporary and 75 intermittent employees working for the Board. As the amendment is presented the words "such individuals" applies to both temporary and intermittent employees. Since the renewal of contracts has application to temporary employees, the corrective amendment is needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment is agreed to, and without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 375, line 11, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$3,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

FURTHER TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as we all know, the pending appropriation bill cannot become the law by the 1st of August. We have already had to pass a continuing joint resolution in order to keep the Government going during the month of July. The House has passed a further continuing joint resolution for the month of August, and yesterday it was referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, which today ordered it reported. From the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 512) making further temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes, and I submit in connection therewith a report (No. 2183).

I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 512) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of Defense—Office of the Secretary of Defense—Salaries and expenses," on page 376, line 2, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "\$11,000,000" and insert "\$11,300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Department of the Army—Office of the Secretary of the Army—Contingencies of the Army," on page 378, line 2, after the word "purposes", to strike out "\$51,978,000" and insert "\$51,878,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Staff Corps—Field exercises," on page 378, line 16, after the word "property", to strike out "\$5,500,000" and insert "\$5,350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Finance Department—Finance Service, Army—Pay of the Army," on page 380, line 7, after the word "enlistment", to strike out "\$1,448,660,000" and insert "\$1,447,660,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Travel of the Army," on page 381, line 23, after the word "personnel", to strike out "\$75,000,000" and insert "\$76,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Finance Service," on page 382, line 22, after "(61 Stat. 493)", to strike out "\$28,410,000" and insert "\$29,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps—Quartermaster Service, Army—Welfare of enlisted men," on page 383, line 16, after the word "personnel", to strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$8,362,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Subsistence of the Army," on page 385, line 6, after the word "prices", to insert "and without unduly increasing future United States market prices"; and in line 9, after the word "of", to insert "highly."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Regular Supplies of the Army," on page 386, line 5, after the word "irrigation", to strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$107,247,258."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Clothing and equipage," on page 387, line 8, after the word "internment", to strike out "\$90,000,000" and insert "\$93,853,365."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Incidental expenses of the Army," on page 388, line 3, after the word "sites", to strike out "\$95,000,000" and insert "\$101,998,313."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation Corps—Transportation Service, Army," on page 388, line 17, after the word "activities", to strike out "\$290,000,000" and insert "\$289,960,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Signal Corps—Signal Service of the Army," on page 391, line 3, after the word "thereof", to strike out "\$157,500,000" and insert "\$158,248,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical Department—Medical and Hospital Department," on page 392, line 19, after the word "institutions", to strike out "\$54,913,000" and insert "\$54,883,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Corps of Engineers—Engineer Service, Army," on page 393, line 20, after the word "for" to strike out "\$300,176,000" and insert "\$304,187,500"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That the sum of \$2,000,000 of the appropriation 'Engineer Service, Army,' fiscal year 1947, shall remain available until June 30, 1951, for the payment of obligations incurred under contracts executed thereunder prior to July 1, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 394, to insert:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Army, as authorized by the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$95,318,585, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$661,400 of the funds appropriated under this head in the Military Functions Appropriations Act, 1949, are hereby made available for construction authorized by the act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 414).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Department—Ordnance Service and supplies, Army," on page 395, line 8, after the word "Office", to strike out "\$621,559,000" and insert "\$647,327,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Chemical Corps—Chemical Service, Army," on page 396, line 10, after the word "ranges", to strike out "\$36,000,000" and insert "\$37,300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Army training," on page 396,

line 21, after the word "for", to strike out "\$7,930,000" and insert "\$7,830,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United States Military Academy—Maintenance and operation," on page 398, line 4, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$5,200,000" and insert "\$5,120,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civilian components—Army National Guard," on page 400, line 3, after the word "supplies", to strike out "\$212,400,000" and insert "\$210,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Organized Reserves," on page 401, line 11, after the word "stocks", to strike out "\$115,000,000" and insert "\$114,525,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps," on page 402, line 14, after the numerals "1952", to strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$24,900,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Departmental salaries and expenses—Salaries, Department of the Army," on page 405, line 8, after the word "services", to strike out "\$3,265,000" and insert "\$3,368,271."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 9, after "Office of Chief of Staff", to strike out "\$6,354,700" and insert "\$6,576,203."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 10, after "Adjutant General's Office", to strike out "\$9,477,400" and insert "\$9,777,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 11, after "Office of Inspector General", to strike out "\$197,600" and insert "\$203,880."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 12, after "Office of the Judge Advocate General", to strike out "\$577,100" and insert "\$595,375."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 14, after "Office of the Chief of Finance", to strike out "\$1,437,800" and insert "\$1,483,202."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 15, after "Office of the Quartermaster General", to strike out "\$6,767,400" and insert "\$6,981,504."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 17, after "Office of the Chief of Transportation", to strike out "\$2,850,000" and insert "\$2,940,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 19, after "Office of the Chief Signal Officer", to strike out "\$2,379,600" and insert "\$2,455,821."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 21, after "Office of Chief of Special Services", to strike out "\$56,800" and insert "\$58,636."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 22, after "Office of the Provost Marshal General", to strike out "\$112,500" and insert "\$116,038."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 24, after "Office of the Surgeon General", to strike out "\$2,400,000" and insert "\$2,475,873."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 25, after "Office of Chief of Engineers", to strike out "\$3,636,200" and insert "\$3,751,026."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 406, line 1, after "Office of Chief of Ordnance", to strike out "\$3,776,400" and insert "\$4,137,696."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 406, line 2, after "Office of Chief, Chemical Corps", to strike out "\$792,700" and insert "\$817,707."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 406, line 3, after "Office of Chief of Chaplains", to strike out "\$131,100" and insert "\$128,478."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses, Department of the Army," on page 406, line 6, after "government", to strike out "\$9,000,000" and insert "\$9,970,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—Department of the Navy—Navy Personnel, general expenses," on page 407, line 24, after the word "salaries", to strike out "\$60,000,000" and insert "\$60,533,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Military personnel, Marine Corps," on page 408, line 8, after the word "training", to strike out "\$200,301,700" and insert "\$200,923,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marine Corps troops and facilities," on page 409, line 6, after the word "salaries", to strike out "\$80,699,000" and insert "\$82,354,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Aircraft and facilities," on page 409, line 17, after the word "salaries", to strike out "\$536,226,000" and insert "\$532,226,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ships and facilities," on page 411, line 14, after the word "salaries", to strike out "\$415,282,000" and insert "\$411,782,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance and facilities," on page 412, line 16, after the word "salaries", to strike out "\$177,088,000" and insert "\$181,665,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical care," on page 413, line 24, after the word "salaries", to strike out "\$38,212,000" and insert "\$37,862,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil engineering," on page

414, line 10, after the word "salaries", to strike out "\$35,178,000" and insert "\$34,778,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 414, after line 11, to insert:

PUBLIC WORKS

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy, as authorized by the act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459), and the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.); major repairs and improvements to the Davisville pier, Naval Base, Newport, R. I.; furniture for public quarters; personnel in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; and engineering and architectural services as authorized by section 3 of the act of April 25, 1939 (34 U. S. C. 556); \$62,928,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 414, line 24, after the word "expended" and before the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "Provided, That the funds appropriated by the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1027), for construction of two new storehouses at Adak, Alaska, may be used for the conversion of existing facilities, if the Secretary of the Navy determines such action would result in a savings to the Government."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I am informed that this amendment will save the Government over \$4,500,000. Public Law 653 of the Eightieth Congress authorized the Navy to construct two storehouses at a cost of \$6,000,000. The first increment of \$1,300,000 has been appropriated. Since then it has been determined that surplus Army transit sheds could be converted to provide the needed storehouses. The Facilities Review Board and the Comptroller General indicated that additional authorization would be required for the Navy to utilize its funds for the conversion of the sheds. The amendment would do this. The Navy estimates that the \$1,300,000 already appropriated would be sufficient to take care of the entire matter, making a saving of \$4,500,000 in estimated costs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Research," on page 415, line 11, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$43,383,000" and insert "\$43,083,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Service-wide supply and finance," on page 416, line 8, after the word "salaries", to strike out "\$200,000,-000" and insert "\$209,292,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Service-wide operations," on page 417, line 1, after the word "salaries", to strike out "\$94,261,000" and insert "\$100,281,000."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated, and I also have an amendment to offer to the next committee amendment. After action on the amendments I shall explain their effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 417, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "\$100,-281,000" and insert "\$99,281,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Island governments," on page 417, line 6, after the word "Islands", to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$785,-000."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, to that amendment I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 417, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "\$785,-000", and insert "\$1,785,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the effect of the two amendments to the committee amendments just agreed to is to reduce the appropriations for service-wide operations by \$1,000,000, and to increase the appropriations for island governments by the same amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—Department of the Air Force—Acquisition and construction of real property," on page 419, after line 12, to strike out:

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head in the "Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950," or authorized to be transferred to this head by the "National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950," to remain available until expended, \$25,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 419, after line 18, to insert:

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the act of March 30, 1949 (Public Law 30, 81st Cong.), the act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 415, 81st Cong.), the act of May 11, 1949 (Public

Law 60, 81st Cong.), and the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, to remain available until expended, \$164,784,000, of which \$25,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, or authorized to be transferred to this head by the National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maintenance and operations," on page 422, line 4, after the word "otherwise", to strike out "\$1,010,000,000" and insert "\$1,027,662,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Air National Guard," on page 426, line 16, after the word "owned", to insert "or State-owned"; in line 17, after the word "any", to strike out "State or"; and in the same line, after the word "subdivision", to strike out "thereof" and insert "of a State."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, administration," on page 427, line 18, after the word "station", to strike out "\$55,-620,000" and insert "\$58,545,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title I—General provisions," on page 441, after line 23, to strike out:

SEC. 626. No payment shall be made from appropriations in this chapter to any officer on the retired lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Air Force, who for himself, or for others is engaged in the selling of, or contracting for the sale of, or negotiating for the sale of, to any agency of the Department of Defense, any war materials or supplies.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 442, line 6, to change the section number from "627" to "626."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 442, line 10, to change the section number from "628" to "627."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 442, line 22, to change the section number from "629" to "628."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 443, line 3, to change the section number from "630" to "629."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we have now finished; I think, the chapter which we have been considering this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was the last committee amendment in chapter X.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe most people will agree that the best way to reduce expenditures is to reduce individual items. A general across-the-board percentage cut hits all agencies affected equally even though there is bound to be more fat in some agencies than in others. This method is called a meat-ax approach because the cutting is

done with a broad blade and the actual severing is accomplished by brute force. You cannot trim off excess fat with a meat ax—it cuts in a straight line across the lean as well as the fat.

CUTTING APPROPRIATIONS SHOULD BE DONE CAREFULLY—WITH A SURGEON'S KNIFE

Trimming selected items more closely resembles the use of a surgeon's knife. A surgeon's knife is extremely sharp and fat can be trimmed neatly without cutting into the lean. Thus the fat in an individual bureau can be cut back without harming the bureau itself.

The surgeon's knife method is the one I have been trying to use. In trying to be selective, I have made 68 separate proposals for reductions so far. The amounts of these cuts have ranged from \$1 to \$263,483,000. When added together they would have made a total reduction of three-fourths of a billion dollars below the amounts in the bill before us and nearly a billion below the budget. I have not finished these efforts to make selective cuts. I will have a great many more proposals before we finish this bill. And yet almost every time I start to apply the knife, sharp and delicate though it is, the Senate has gently but no less definitely placed a sheath over the blade. "Put that thing down," they say, "you're liable to hurt somebody."

First, may I say that I blame myself most of all for my failure to get the Senate to accept the many selective cuts which I have proposed. The cause, I think, has been a good one but there has apparently been something in my manner and methods which has offended many of my colleagues. If I have shown any smug self-righteousness, may I assure the Senate that it was unintentional and I most sincerely beg the pardon of my colleagues. I happen to dislike self-righteousness most of all, because it shuts off the possibility of growth and is essentially uncharitable to others and if I have sinned in this respect, as some of my colleagues obviously think, I shall try to rid myself of this fault in the future.

I can only wish that abler, better, more conciliatory, and more experienced men than I had taken up this battle who could have carried it through with greater success and who would not have aroused the hard feelings which I apparently have done. There are very many such men in the Senate, but, unfortunately, they have not come forward in this instance. As is too often the case, the team has had to depend on a scrub and second-rater who has failed to do justice to the cause which he tried to represent. I only hope that the burden will be assumed next year by better men and then I shall be glad to step back and let them take the lead and serve myself only as a dishwasher and possibly a factual hodge-carrier for their efforts. I would do this all the more gladly because it has been extremely unpleasant for me to get up again and again to move a reduction in appropriations and to feel that I was incurring the displeasure of colleagues whom I respect.

But while I wish to take my full share of the blame for the failure of our body to make selective economies, I am in-

clined to believe that the causes for this failure lie far deeper than my own personal faults, real though these are.

ORGANIZATION OF SENATE MAKES SELECTIVE CUTS DIFFICULT

In the first place, it is clear that the very organization of the Senate makes selective economies difficult, if not impossible. For the members of the Appropriations Committee, having thrashed these issues out and having arrived at a recommendation, feel bound in loyalty to each other to defend the items for which big appropriations are being asked. We have seen many times ranking minority members of the Appropriations Subcommittees rising to defend specific figures and insisting that the appropriations cannot be cut by a single dollar. Then I have also noticed that the Senators who are interested in the appropriations under a given chapter in the bill are generally on the floor in force when that chapter is up for consideration. Thus, the Senators from the farming States were present in large numbers when the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, chapter VI, came up and overwhelmingly defeated my proposal to reduce these appropriations. I was similarly bowled over as I tried to reduce specific items for roads by \$100,000,000 in this time of great stress. Similarly, when the appropriations for the Interior Department, chapter VII, were under consideration and I tried to cut \$90,000,000 for reclamation and reduce other items, I saw large numbers of Senators on the floor from the mountain and semiarid States who naturally resisted these cuts. When the rivers and harbors section, chapter IX, which is euphoniouly referred to as the civil functions of the Army appropriation came up, I looked about me and saw the serried ranks of the Senators from

the regions of the Gulf, the lower Mississippi, the Missouri, and the Arkansas Rivers. These men believe in all good faith in the projects which would benefit their communities and were strong in their support of the recommended appropriations.

On the other hand, the Senators whose interests were not immediately involved in the making of the specific appropriations, and whose interests were only general in that they primarily represented taxpayers tended not to be on the floor—with many honorable exceptions, of course—when these items came up for consideration. This was perfectly natural, excusable, and perhaps inevitable. For them to have stayed on the floor and joined in the fight item by item would have required not only many hours but actually may days of dull, dreary work, besides the weeks of study and preparation required. In the meantime, they would have had to miss many vital committee meetings, fall behind on their heavy correspondence, arouse the ire of constituents by not seeing them when they called, and go through a very unpleasant process to no apparent avail. The special interests were therefore concentrated and determined, while the general interests were scattered, diffused, and unorganized. It is small wonder, therefore, that no cuts were made.

Secondly, our procedures in the Senate make it very difficult for us to consider an appropriations bill intelligently on the floor. For again and again, while we were considering specific chapters, Senators would rise and speak at length for hours on some perfectly extraneous subject. This wore out and discouraged many who were anxious to take part. I would humbly suggest—and as a new Member I do so humbly—that we would make more progress if

we were to accept a rule of germaneness so that up to a given hour, say 5 o'clock, we would only consider and speak upon the subject before the House and then after that hour, let any Senator speak on any subject about which he felt a concern, whether that question be sex perverts in the Government, Formosa, Kamchatka, or Timbuctoo. We would get infinitely more work done under such a rule and yet Senators would still have the right of free and unlimited debate.

Finally—and I say this with timidity—I have come to suspect that those who urge the superiority of selective cuts to the meat-ax method of general cuts tend to lose some of their enthusiasm for the selective method when it is actually employed. The suspicion occurs to me also that possibly one reason why some Senators prefer the method of general cuts is because if they vote for specific cuts, they incur the wrath of special interest groups while if they vote for general cuts, they get popular credit for standing for economy and thus compel the President and the executive departments to bear the popular opprobrium of making the specific economies to carry out the broad sweeping and indefinite reductions of 10 percent, 15 percent, or 20 percent, for which the swingers of the meat ax have voted. If I am uncharitable in these surmises, I hope that my colleagues and the public will pardon me.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a list of the proposals for reductions which I have proposed, their amounts, and references to their explanations.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Itemized reductions in omnibus appropriations bill (H. R. 7786) proposed by Senator Douglas

Department, agency, and purpose of funds	Appropriation for fiscal year 1950	Amount voted by House	Amount in Senate bill	Budget estimate	Proposed reduction		For reasons see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. No. —
					Below Senate bill	Below budget	
Legislative branch: New Senate Office Bldg.....	None	None	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	10096
Department of State:							
Salaries and expenses.....	\$78,152,000	\$77,300,000	78,300,000	78,731,000	1,000,000	1,431,000	(C)
Institute of Inter-American Affairs:							
Expenses:							
Cash.....	4,751,600	5,500,000	5,000,000	6,500,000	500,000	2,000,000	10221
Contract authorization.....	None	None	7,000,000	14,000,000	2,000,000	9,000,000	10221
Department of Commerce:							
Civil Aeronautics Administration: Salaries, expenses...	94,402,000	97,000,000	99,775,000	104,250,000	2,775,000	7,250,000	10222
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	3,620,500	3,400,000	4,000,000	4,323,000	600,000	923,000	10223
Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce: Salaries and expenses.....	4,923,500	5,000,000	5,300,000	5,620,000	300,000	620,000	10224
Field Office Service.....	2,079,500	2,050,000	2,155,000	2,155,000	105,000	105,000	10224
Patent Office: Salaries and expenses.....	10,825,000	11,300,000	11,530,000	11,760,000	230,000	460,000	10224
Bureau of Public Roads: Postwar highways.....	385,000,000	405,000,000	385,000,000	426,000,000	100,000,000	141,000,000	10225
Weather Bureau: Salaries and expenses.....	24,179,000	24,447,000	24,897,000	26,100,000	450,000	1,653,000	10234
Department of Treasury:							
Office of Administrative Services: Salaries.....	1,150,000	1,160,000	1,207,000	1,207,000	47,000	47,000	10298
Bureau of Accounts: Salaries and expenses.....	1,725,000	1,875,000	2,029,000	2,029,000	154,000	334,000	10299
Bureau of Customs: Salaries and expenses.....	35,150,000	36,500,000	36,806,360	36,973,000	306,360	473,300	10299
Bureau of Narcotics: Salaries and expenses.....	1,610,000	1,750,000	1,908,000	1,933,000	158,000	183,000	10299
Bureau of Engraving and Printing: Salaries and expenses.....	15,660,000	15,500,000	16,835,000	16,935,000	1,335,000	1,435,000	10300
Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Salaries and expenses.....	25,775,000	26,000,000	26,700,000	27,100,000	6,700,000	7,100,000	10323
Federal Security Agency, Office of Education: Salaries and expenses.....	1,900,000	1,900,000	2,023,420	2,168,600	123,420	268,600	11012
Public Health Service, Hospital Construction Service: Salaries and expenses.....	1,132,257	1,357,000	2,107,000	2,807,000	750,000	1,450,000	11013
Bureau of Federal Credit Union: General fund appropriation.....	200,000	200,000	300,000	375,000	100,000	175,000	11013
General Counsel: Salaries and expenses.....	455,068	511,100	535,100	567,100	24,000	56,000	11014

Footnotes at end of table.

Itemized reductions in omnibus appropriations bill (H. R. 7786) proposed by Senator Douglas—Continued

Department, agency, and purpose of funds	Appropriation for fiscal year 1950	Amount voted by House	Amount in Senate bill	Budget estimate	Proposed reduction		For reasons see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. No. —
					Below Senate bill	Below budget	
Department of Agriculture:							
Bureau of Agriculture Economics (economy investigation)	\$2,621,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,720,000	\$2,915,600	\$120,000	\$315,600	10534
Crop and livestock estimate and data on farm construction	2,817,000	2,725,000	2,904,000	3,378,000	179,000	653,000	10534
Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics: Salaries and expenses	1,749,200	1,500,000	1,763,200	2,217,200	263,200	717,200	10536
Bureau of Animal Husbandry: Salaries and expenses	2,248,200	2,250,000	2,319,000	2,519,700	69,000	269,700	10536
Bureau of Dairy Industry	1,613,300	1,600,000	1,735,000	1,899,300	185,000	289,300	10538
Bureau of Agriculture and Industrial Chemistry	8,395,625	7,750,000	8,500,000	8,818,800	750,000	1,038,800	10539
Forest development: Roads and trails	10,348,000	10,348,000	12,000,000	12,465,000	6,000,000	8,475,000	10541
Flood control	9,500,000	10,750,000	9,820,000	11,700,000	1,070,000	2,870,000	10541
Sugar Act	60,000,000	60,000,000	63,750,000	67,500,000	3,750,000	7,500,000	10542
Bureau of Plant Industry: Field crops	3,446,800	3,400,000	3,475,000	3,638,300	75,000	238,300	10539
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine: Insect and plant disease control	4,651,000	4,185,900	4,651,000	4,752,000	465,100	566,100	(1)
Forest Service: Protection and management	26,300,000	26,890,000	29,320,500	30,270,500	2,420,500	3,380,500	(1)
Forest Service: Acquisition of land	401,000	100,000	401,000	700,000	301,000	600,000	(1)
Marketing Service: News service	1,900,000	2,050,000	2,187,000	2,274,300	137,000	224,300	(1)
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Operating and administrative expenses	5,054,000	6,854,000	7,204,000	7,450,000	350,000	500,000	(1)
Commodity Credit Corporation: Administrative expenses	15,000,000	16,000,000	16,350,000	16,750,000	350,000	750,000	(1)
Farmers Home Administration: Salaries and expenses	26,149,000	27,700,000	29,000,000	30,000,000	1,200,000	2,300,000	10547
Office of Solicitor	2,364,000	2,450,000	2,675,000	3,070,000	225,000	620,000	10549
Department of Interior:							
Bureau of Land Management: Management of land	6,215,200	6,756,800	7,127,810	8,650,000	371,010	1,893,200	10665
Construction	2,200,000	600,000	800,000	1,000,000	200,000	3,200,000	10666
Bureau of Indian Affairs: Welfare	32,535,906	37,929,000	40,252,328	40,483,975	2,323,328	2,554,975	10667
Bureau of Reclamation: General investigations	4,950,000	5,150,000	6,500,000	7,800,000	2,150,000	3,500,000	10732F.
Construction	4,333,961,638	297,467,000	294,713,000	325,966,500	90,713,000	121,966,500	10737F.
Bureau of Reclamation: General administrative expenses	4,300,000	7,000,000	7,400,000	7,800,000	400,000	800,000	11008
National Park Service: Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	6,990,262	7,250,000	7,448,100	7,470,000	198,100	220,000	11009
Construction	14,595,813	20,542,000	19,667,000	22,767,000	4,667,000	7,767,000	11009
Fish and Wildlife Service: Investigation of resources	3,324,200	3,900,000	4,125,000	3,900,000	800,000	575,000	11009
Construction	1,797,100	2,401,000	2,423,450	2,370,000	623,450	576,000	11010
Executive Office, Bureau of Budget: Salaries and expenses	3,300,000	3,386,000	3,412,000	3,486,000	26,000	110,000	11159
Philippine Alien Property Administration: Salaries and expenses	250,000	160,000	215,000	215,000	55,000	55,000	11159
Civil Service Commission: Salaries and expenses	16,000,000	15,261,913	15,761,913	16,560,000	500,000	1,288,087	11159
General Services Administration:							
Advance, planning of public works, contract authority	17,000,000	32,000,000	27,000,000	40,000,000	10,000,000	23,000,000	11159
Operating expenses		76,500,000	82,725,000	84,725,000	6,225,000	8,225,000	11159
Interstate Commerce Commission: General expenses	9,600,000	9,889,600	10,002,600	10,002,600	113,000	113,000	11159
Securities and Exchange Commission: Salaries and expenses	5,750,000	6,130,000	6,330,000	6,425,000	200,000	295,000	11159
Smithsonian Institution: Salaries and expenses	2,300,000	2,606,499	2,770,000	2,770,000	163,510	163,510	11159
Maritime Commission: Ship-construction subsidies (contract authority)	(6)	(6)	64,875,000	(7)	41,100,000	41,000,000	11160
Operating differential subsidies		26,450,000	30,168,000	93,380,000	3,658,000	11,721,000	11159
Rivers, harbors, and flood control and navigation projects: Limitation on additional technical expenses	(7)	1,450,000	1,600,000	(7)	960,000	(7)	11360
Rivers and harbors projects	197,985,690	185,878,000	221,244,500	240,714,000	130,495,000	149,964,000	11336-11337 11359-11360 11363-11366
Flood control and navigation projects	366,406,400	341,055,000	436,933,000	478,447,000	263,483,000	304,997,000	11336-11337 11359-11360 11363-11366
Flood control:							
Mississippi River	67,000,000	65,000,000	66,778,000	72,000,000	40,078,000	45,300,000	11336-11337 11359-11360 11363-11366
Sacramento River	3,600,000	2,700,000	2,524,500	2,805,000	1,514,500	1,795,000	11336-11337 11359-11360 11363-11366

- 1 Motion for reconsideration pending.
 2 Contract authorization.
 3 Plus \$300,000 in contract authorizations.
 4 Plus \$8,339,700 in contract authorizations.
 5 Plus \$3,000,000 in contract authorizations.
 6 Extended contract authority.
 7 No comparable figure.
 8 Approximate—no comparable figure.
 9 Plus \$55,209,000 in reappropriations.

On other proposals for limitations, amounts cannot be computed. Total number of items, 68; total amount of proposed reductions below Senate committee recommendations, \$746,574,478. Total amount of proposed reductions below budget estimates, \$943,426,972.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now, Mr. President, I am well aware of the fact that knives are dangerous. But, with a deficit of \$5,000,000,000 facing us even before the Korean situation, a major surgical operation was even then in order. With the present international crisis, which is not a possibility but actually upon us, such an operation is already well under way and, while increasing taxes are needed, we simply must cut civilian expenses as well. For we are confronted with needs far greater than combatting inflation. Manpower and resources are needed for our very security, and if we

precommit ourselves to huge expenditures for nonessential items, what happens when we find we should have been using these resources to protect our own safety?

MAY HAVE TO RESORT TO A MEAT AX

For this reason, since I have not had what would be called marked success in my attempts to use a surgeons' knife, I shall probably be forced to resort to the good old meat ax.

In my office this morning I looked at a surgeons' scalpel and at a meat ax, and I debated for some time whether I should bring those two instruments to

the floor of the Senate. I decided that it would be somewhat undignified to do so. Therefore, following the example of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] I will say that I have them here in a suitcase. If anyone wishes to look at them, I shall be very happy to show them, and admission will be by ticket only.

The use of the surgeon's knife requires great care and I can certainly vouch for its being difficult and time consuming. The meat ax is easy. Just raise it above your head and come down on the bureaus with a resounding whack. But before doing this—being reluctantly

pushed into wielding an unscientific meat ax—

A "SHARP MEAT AX WIELDED WITH CARE"

I intend to try one more approach; namely, a very sharp meat ax wielded with care.

I send to the desk an amendment for myself and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] which I shall call "The sharp meat ax wielded with care." It is a substitute for the committee amendment striking out the Thomas-Taber features of the House bill.

Section 1001 of this amendment reads:

Reductions in appropriations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of \$1,000,000,000. Such reductions shall be made in the following manner:

I may say that the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes a reduction of \$800,000,000 across the board. Our amendment proposes a reduction of \$1,000,000,000, and orders those reductions to be made in selected areas.

This I quote from the first part of this amendment:

(a) Funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, for lands and structures, and for Federal aid postwar highways, shall be reduced by \$500,000,000; *Provided*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

FIVE-HUNDRED-MILLION-DOLLAR REDUCTION IN CONSTRUCTION ITEMS

Thus, the one-half of the reduction would be made on civilian construction. Most of it, of course, would have to be taken from rivers, harbors, navigation, flood control, reclamation projects, and highways, but not necessarily all of it. Throughout the bill we find a great many construction items which could be reduced. Furthermore, part of these reductions would be made from supplies and materials, most of which go for construction, but by no means all of it.

Paragraph (a) therefore specifically gives to the Bureau of the Budget the power to make these cuts, but it also specifies the areas whom which reductions are to be made. Paragraph (a) also charges the Budget Bureau with the responsibility to see that these cuts are made in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

The total amounts budgeted for construction—and on this point Members of the Senate should consult page 13 of Summary of Obligations by Objects, prepared by the Bureau of the Budget—for nonexempt items, the exemptions being listed in section 1002 of my amendment, is about \$1,040,000,000.

Total budgeted amounts for supplies and materials which are nonexempt in my amendment is about \$820,000,000. The total amount in the bill for Federal aid postwar highways will be between \$405,000,000 and \$385,000,000 depending on the final figure adopted in conference. This makes a total of about \$2,225,000,000 from which the \$500,000,000 reduction provided for in paragraph (a) would be drawn. This is a 22-percent reduction below the budget although since some reductions have already been made in the bill before us, the actual cut would amount to about 25 percent in this area.

FIVE-HUNDRED-MILLION-DOLLAR REDUCTION IN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE

The rest of the billion-dollar reduction or the other five hundred million is made in paragraph (b), which reads:

(b) Funds appropriated in this act for personal services, travel, transportation of things, communications services, rents and utilities, printing and reproduction, other contractual services, and equipment shall be reduced by \$500,000,000 which reduction shall be made among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government on a pro-rata basis: *Provided*, That reductions in personnel shall, where practicable, be made by eliminating a total of 5 percent of the personnel provided for in the President's budget and the filling of a total of not more than one-half of all vacancies which occur by reason of death, resignation, or otherwise; *Provided further*, That the reductions provided for in this subsection among the departments shall be made on a department-wide basis and the secretaries of the departments are empowered by means of transfer and adjustments, to keep the agencies within their respective departments at a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered, by means of transfers and adjustments to administer the reductions provided for in this subsection among the nondepartmental and independent agencies in such a manner as to provide for a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, that hereafter, the amount of annual leave for Government employees, including employees of the Postal Service, shall be at the rate of 20 days per year and the amount of sick leave shall be at the rate of 12 days per year for classified and wage-board employees (except that no annual leave nor sick leave shall be granted to any Government employee who has not been in continuous Government service for at least 1 calendar year).

This paragraph apportions a \$500,000,000 reduction among the departments and agencies on a pro-rata basis. But it specifies the areas where the reductions are to be made so that Congress would not be completely abdicating the power of appropriations.

Paragraph (b) would empower the secretaries of the various departments, however, to maintain a maximum of efficiency by means of transfers and adjustments between the various bureaus within the respective departments. The Bureau of the Budget would have this power with respect to the nondepartmental and independent agencies, some of which may be too small to completely absorb these cuts by themselves while others can absorb more than their pro-rated share.

The total amounts budgeted for those items in the nonexempt agencies in the categories from which reductions would be made are approximately as follows:

Personnel	\$3,560,000,000
Travel	128,000,000
Transportation of things...	42,000,000
Communications	35,000,000
Rent and utility services...	163,000,000
Printing and reproductions...	23,000,000
Other contractual services...	347,000,000
Equipment	298,000,000

Total..... 4,551,000,000

Thus, the \$500,000,000 reduction would amount to a cut of about 11 percent of the total amounts budgeted for these purposes. However, since the amounts provided for in the bill before us are somewhat less than the budgeted amounts the actual reduction would be closer to 12 or 12½ percent.

PERSONNEL REDUCTIONS

Reductions in personnel are to be made by eliminating 5 percent and then filling only one-half the vacancies to accomplish further reductions.

This amendment differs very sharply from the Thomas-Taber and the Jensen amendments, because the combination of the Thomas-Taber and Jensen amendments in the House provided for filling only one-tenth of the vacancies, with a cut of 10 percent superimposed upon this. This would mean a reduction in personnel of over 30 percent by the end of the year and an average cut for the year of over 20 percent. My proposal is for a cut of 5 percent, and then for filling only one-half of the vacancies.

I may say that my initial estimate of a cut of 5 percent is built up from two items, first, eliminating the 2 percent of Government employees who are the most inefficient; then, if we cut the leave of classified and wage-board employees from 26 working days to 20, or a cut of from five and a half calendar weeks to four calendar weeks, and reduce sick leave from 3 weeks to 2½ weeks, we effect a saving of around 3 percent in the number of governmental employees. So that by dismissing the most inefficient 2 percent, and reducing Government leave, which will save 3 percent, we can effect a personnel reduction of 5 percent, and, in addition to that, fill only half the vacancies which occur.

With increasing needs for manpower in the Defense Establishment and war production, I cannot believe this would work any great hardship on the workers themselves. The displaced workers would be able to find jobs elsewhere. They would be transferred from the departments which are overstaffed into agencies of the national defense or into private jobs which will be understaffed. The net result would be a transfer from places where the employees are less efficient into places where they are more efficient.

This is especially true since only 5 percent are to be subject to a reduction in force while other personnel reductions would be made by filling only one-half of the vacancies which occur because of

death, resignation, or otherwise. Personnel turn-over is about 26 percent so that filling one-half of the vacancies which occur during 1 year would amount to about 7 percent.

When this is combined with the 5 percent eliminated by a reduction in force we would have a total over-all reduction for the first year of 12 percent. The paragraph contains the qualifications "insofar as practicable" to allow for exceptional cases where turn-over is at an unusually high rate or where the provision would work a hardship on agencies in keeping staffed with key personnel. Meanwhile, personnel generally is only one of several categories where reductions would be made. It may be that some agencies would prefer to make greater cuts in travel or other categories and less in personnel. This flexibility would operate with respect to all the areas selected for reductions since the location of soft spots may vary from agency to agency.

REDUCE AND EQUALIZE ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE

While reductions in personnel would ordinarily be made to the extent of 12 percent, actual manpower would be reduced only about 10 percent. This is true because reducing the annual and sick leave of classified and wage-board employees to 20 days would mean that each employee so reduced would put in about 3 percent more actual working time. Since postal workers' leave would be increased, however, the net gain in actual hours worked per employee would be only about 2 percent, which can be subtracted from the cut of 12 percent to make a net manpower reduction in the civilian agencies of 10 percent. Furthermore, the leave provision would apply to all Government employees, whether they work for agencies in the exempt or non-exempt categories. This would increase the manpower in the Defense Establishment and other agencies which are doing work vital to national defense.

I have previously presented the case for setting annual leave at 20 days, and I will not burden the Senate with further arguments on this point. I will simply say that 20 working days, or 1 month with week ends, is long enough for a vacation, and is still very liberal in comparison with that given by private employers. This would still be better than the leave given by 99⁴⁴/₁₀₀ percent of private employers. The present 26 days of leave is excessive, because that number of days, on a basis of a 5-day week, is 5¹/₂ weeks. When there are added 15 days of sick leave, which makes 41 days, and 8 holidays, making 49 days, plus the other days of leave on the occasions of visits of Brazilian and other Presidents and when the weather is hot, the total leave given to Government workers is much larger than appears on its face. It is unjustified at any time, and certainly in the period which is close to a national emergency.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely wish to ask a question. I did not hear the beginning of the Senator's address. Is the pro-

posal the Senator is now speaking of a general over-all cut in the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I shall be glad to furnish the Senator a copy of my address.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have it. Does the distinguished Senator set out item by item what he intends to cut?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. In all the chapters?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no; it is a general cut, but it is to be applied to specific areas. In brief, it calls for a reduction of \$500,000,000 on construction, supplies, and materials, and \$500,000,000 on transportation, personal services, communications, and so forth. The cuts are divided in that manner. The total cut is \$1,000,000,000, or approximately \$200,000,000 greater than that provided in the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to belabor this matter. I am trying to get the picture. Would the proposed cut apply to all construction projects throughout all the chapters of the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. And the same is true with respect to transportation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Personnel and transportation and other areas. I hope the Senator will be given a copy of my address.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for one more question, please?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the cut to be made by the department heads, or does the Senator in his amendment provide for the cuts?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Within the departments the personnel and other cuts are to be made by the departments. For the nondepartmental and independent agencies the Bureau of the Budget will make the apportionment of the personnel and other cuts. The Bureau of the Budget will make the cuts for construction materials and supplies. But there are certain standards which we lay down which will direct them in doing this, namely, on the personnel item a 5 percent cut in the number of persons aided by a reduction in annual leave and then filling only one-half of the vacancies which occur.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for another question.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the head of the department be the one who can use his best judgment as to where the cut is to be applied?

Mr. DOUGLAS. On everything except construction.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I want to know. Does the Senator provide for the cut on construction by items then, or does the department head with respect to each chapter of the bill make the cuts?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Bureau of the Budget makes the construction cut of \$500,000,000. The Bureau is directed to cut materials, construction and supplies

for the nondefense and the nonexempt agencies \$500,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. So the Senator's amendment applies only to appropriations for construction outside of military needs?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, yes. As a matter of fact, the list of exemptions is very similar to that provided for in the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment, with one or two exceptions which I shall mention later.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the Senator's amendment provides for a cut of \$500,000,000 in construction, and so forth, and a cut of \$500,000,000 on transportation and personal services and so forth.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. So the amendment provides for a total cut of \$1,000,000,000?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank my genial friend from Nebraska for his inquiries.

Mr. President, as I said the present 26 days of leave is excessive, because it is not measured by calendar days but by work days. It amounts therefore to 5¹/₂ weeks. It should be lowered in normal times, but our manpower needs to maintain adequate defense make it especially imperative that we make this change immediately.

The leave provision also increases the postal workers from 15 to 20 days. In the future, the national manpower situation will force postal workers to work harder and I believe it worth while to give them a month's vacation. Leave provisions should be equalized anyway within the Government service.

CONGRESS WOULD DECIDE WHERE TO CUT WHILE ALLOWING ADMINISTRATIVE FLEXIBILITY

The reduction provided by paragraphs (a) and (b) of my amendment are made while providing two safeguards. First. The areas where the reductions are to be made are determined by Congress. Thus Congress determines where the reductions are to be made. It does not merely turn the problem over to the administrative agencies. Second. Flexibility to allow efficient administration is allowed. I do not assert that this is any final answer. Reducing expenditures should be carried out selectively item by item.

That is what I have been trying to do without much success, but to the best of my ability, during the past two weary weeks. But I assert that this amendment is preferable to an across-the-board percentage cut, and that, if it is a meat ax, it is a sharp meat ax wielded with care.

EXEMPTIONS

The exemptions provided are the obvious ones. They are similar to those provided for in the Bridges-Byrd amendment with a few important exceptions. Foreign aid, which is, in my judgment, a defense expenditure, is exempt. The Post Office is only exempt in its expenditures for railroad transportation of the mail. The Post Office is included ex-

cept for railway mail transportation. I shall, however, if others of my colleagues do not do so, offer a specific amendment on the question of railway mail transportation costs.

I would also exempt subsidies where the amounts paid are set by law. This will prevent agencies from making their reductions in subsidies and then coming back for deficiency appropriations. I would also exempt the Coast Guard, which is now an agency of war and national defense, and not merely an agency of domestic administration.

I have made no provisions for reducing loans. I am afraid that under the Bridges-Byrd amendment, a department might make its total 10 percent reduction by holding up 2 or 3 large loans such as those given by REA or the Farm Credit Administration. If this were done, no waste would be eliminated at all.

I would, however, urge that all loans be scrutinized very carefully and that only those which will be in the national interest be given.

The Thomas-Taber and Jensen amendments have been thoroughly discussed and I will not burden the Senate with further talk about them. They are both too inflexible and they would be administratively difficult.

In appealing to the Senate favorably to consider my amendment, I ask that Senators read the amendment. I have additional copies at my desk. I shall also be happy to talk to anyone who desires more information and will welcome all who care to join me in sponsoring it. Any Senator who wants to add his name to the amendment will be welcome.

In closing I will simply say that I have spent a great deal of time studying these appropriations, and while the surgeon's knife approach of carefully cutting individual items is best, I believe this amendment, which is a sharp meat ax wielded with care is preferable to a blunt meat ax of an across-the-board percentage cut.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered printed as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken on pages 444, 445, and 446 by the committee amendment, insert the following:

"CHAPTER X-A—GENERAL REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 1001. Reductions in appropriations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of \$1,000,000,000. Such reductions shall be made in the following manner:

"(a) Funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, for lands and structures, and for Federal aid postwar highways shall be reduced by \$500,000,000: *Provided*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

"(b) Funds appropriated in this act for personal services, travel, transportation of

things, communications services, rents and utilities, printing and reproduction, other contractual services, and equipment shall be reduced by \$500,000,000 which reduction shall be made among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government on a pro rata basis: *Provided*, That reductions in personnel shall, where practicable, be made by eliminating a total of 5 percent of the personnel provided for in the President's budget and the filling of a total of not more than one-half of all vacancies which occur by reason of death, resignation, or otherwise: *Provided further*, That the reductions provided for in this subsection among the departments shall be made on a department-wide basis and the secretaries of the departments are empowered, by means of transfers and adjustments, to keep the agencies within their respective departments at a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered, by means of transfers and adjustments to administer the reductions provided for in this subsection among the nondepartmental and independent agencies in such a manner as to provide for a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, That hereafter, the amount of annual leave for Government employees, including employees of the postal service, shall be at the rate of 20 days per year and the amount of sick leave shall be at the rate of 12 days per year for classified and wage-board employees (except that no annual leave nor sick leave shall be granted to any Government employee who has not been in continuous Government service for at least one calendar year).

"Sec. 1002. The reductions provided for in this chapter shall not apply to the following (except that the annual- and sick-leave provisions shall apply to all classified and wage-board employees and postal workers).

"(a) Chapter X, chapter X-B and the amount appropriated to the General Services Administration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of July 23, 1946;

"(b) Appropriations in title I of chapter VIII for the Executive Office of the President under the headlines "Compensation of the President," "The White House Office," "Emergency Fund for the President," and "Executive Mansion and Grounds."

"(c) Appropriations for the atomic-energy program;

"(d) Trust funds;

"(e) Funds of Government corporations excluding those made available in this act (1) for administrative expenses and (2) by appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury;

"(f) Amounts (other than under the Veterans' Administration) for furnishing medical and hospital services and domiciliary care, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, or clinic, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

"(g) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations;

"(h) Appropriations of, or measured by, receipts;

"(i) Amounts appropriated by this act for the operation of law-enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Customs, Immigration and Naturalization Services, and the Secret Service; or for the payment of compensation and expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and such other officers and employees of other agencies whose duties primarily pertain to intelligence operations (including funds transferred pursuant to section 6 (a) of the act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 211), or to the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted

of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States;

"(j) Amounts provided for any program of the Veterans' Administration, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, clinic, or facility, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

"(k) Grants (other than those for Federal-aid postwar highways), subsidies, and contributions where amounts are determined by laws;

"(l) Amounts provided to make payment of or contributions toward pensions, retirement and disability annuities and benefits, employee's death or injury benefits, or other items of a similar nature;

"(m) Appropriations for refunds, awards, and indemnities.

"(n) Appropriations for the Coast Guard, and

"(o) The amount appropriated to the Post Office Department for railroad transportation of the mail."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to insert in lieu of the matter stricken by the committee amendment on pages 444, 445, and 446, an amendment which I have sent to the desk, which I now ask to have read and made the order of business.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry first, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is unanimous consent required to have the amendment made the pending business in view of the fact that the amendment runs into another chapter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; it would be out of order to consider the amendment in its present form, because it relates both to the chapter which we are just finishing and the following chapter, which has not been stated and is not before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I have no objection to the amendment being printed and to have it lie on the table to be offered at the proper time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The proper time will come in just about a fraction of a second.

Mr. WHERRY. I make the point of order, Mr. President, that the amendment is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would not be in order as a portion of it relates to the next chapter, which is not now before the Senate.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. I should like to associate myself with what the Senator from Illinois has stated about the necessity of reducing the nonmilitary expenses of the Government. I have voted for most, if not all, of the selective amendments proposed by him. In my opinion, the Senator from Illinois has performed a fine public service in his effort to make a selective reduction in the appropriation bill. I think he has some qualms about the results to some of his colleagues of what he has done, but I wish to say that, in my judgment, the way in which he has used the scalpel has been so skillful that it has left no scars. I think there can be no doubt about that.

So I hope he will continue his efforts. I believe that time will show the great necessity for the Congress to do what the junior Senator from Illinois is seeking to have done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor; and in order that the Senator may propound a parliamentary inquiry, I have to yield first.

Mr. President, no chapter of the appropriations bill is now before the Senate at this time, I believe. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate pass over chapter X-A and proceed to the consideration of chapter X-B.

I shall be glad to yield now to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire why the Senator wishes to pass over chapter X-A, which logically would come before the Senate at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. I am merely asking that it be passed over temporarily.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not be well to consider chapter X-A now?

Mr. WHERRY. The reason why I think the subject matter of chapter X-A or the subject matter the Senator from Illinois, himself, has been discussing should properly be taken up by us at the end of the bill is that before an amendment such as the Bridges-Byrd amendment or the so-called Douglas amendment is considered by the Senate it seems to me the Senate should proceed to consider the foreign-aid section of the bill, and should see whether a cut is to be made in that section of the bill. Then we can consider as the last chapter, the one to which, really, either the so-called Douglas amendment or the Bridges-Byrd amendment would apply.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the foreign-aid section of the bill can be dealt with by means of amendments offered either to chapter X-A or chapter X-B.

I may say that I am very much pleased with what the Senator from Missouri has said. Unless I am abusing his compliments, I wish to say that I think the amendment should not be known solely as mine, but should be known as the Kem-Williams-Douglas amendment. Then we shall have awaiting our consideration both the Bridges-Byrd amendment and the Kem-Williams-Douglas amendment—thus indicating that a fine spirit of nonpartisanship urge for economy pervades this Chamber.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in that spirit, I ask unanimous consent that chapter X-A of the bill be passed over temporarily, for the reasons already stated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am not satisfied in my own mind that that would be

the proper course. It pains me very much to have to object, but I am afraid I shall have to object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think my request is an absolutely constructive one. There are many Members of the Senate who would like to have all the chapters of the bill considered before the amendment now known, as the Senator from Illinois has said, as the Douglas-Kem amendment or before the Bridges-Byrd amendment is considered and adopted, if one of them is adopted, depending upon whichever one is considered by the Senate to have merit.

It seems to me that the proper time to consider them is after the bill has been amended in all other respects, at which time we shall have before us the bill in its entirety, and then we can consider whether to make an over-all cut.

Mr. President, if I am not able to obtain unanimous consent for the purpose I have requested, I shall move that the Senate temporarily pass over chapter X-A of the bill, and proceed to the consideration of the chapter X-B. I suppose that I must include in the motion a date, so as to provide that chapter X-A be taken up at a time certain.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona, if he wishes to propose a modification of my request or make a motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois will not object to the request that we temporarily pass over chapter X-A of the bill, because before we pass upon the amendments calling for over-all reductions, I believe we should know just what other provisions the bill is going to contain.

So, Mr. President, personally I think we should take up the ECA chapter of the bill, and then should proceed to consider the amendment which the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has proposed, and should dispose of it. After having done that, and after we know what other provisions the bill is going to contain, we shall be better able to pass upon other amendments which may be offered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yielded to the Senator, did I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois, if I may do so without prejudice to my right to the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois is certainly welcome.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think I should state what is the real issue behind this parliamentary maneuvering: We are really jockeying to see whether the Bridges-Byrd amendment shall be acted on first or whether the Kem-Douglas amendment shall be acted on first.

I have no personal feeling about this matter, but I have going on within me a

real mental and ethical struggle, which I wish to have resolved in the easiest manner possible.

I regard the Bridges-Byrd amendment as the worst possible way in which to cut the budget. However, the need for cutting the budget is so great that if all other methods fail, then, with certain qualifications, I shall be compelled to vote for the Bridges-Byrd amendment. But I do not wish to do so unless first we have exhausted every other alternative.

I am approaching the Bridges-Byrd amendment with the same alacrity that a cat exhibits when it is grabbed by the tail and is pulled backward across a thick rug, at which it claws energetically, doing its utmost to resist. In short, as each amendment is defeated, I find myself nearer and nearer the rapids and nearer and nearer the Bridges-Byrd amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska permit me to continue?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator for not imposing the guillotine upon me; I thank him for his characteristic courtesy. The point I want to make is this: I have tried selective cuts and have not been successful. However, I think a blunt, meat-ax approach like the Bridges-Byrd amendment is wrong. With reservations, however, I will be forced to vote for it if we fail in all other attempts to reduce expenditures. But before voting for it I would like to present my general amendment which calls for a larger cut, and which specifies the areas where the cuts are to be made. That is why I wish to have my amendment called up first. I think it is a much better way for Congress to make reductions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state to the Senator from Illinois that if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will occupy exactly the same position which it will occupy otherwise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it be the first to be acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the first to be acted upon—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, that is the whole issue. If that is the case, I am satisfied.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order for the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to be first considered, the Senator from Illinois would have to be the first Senator to obtain the floor at that time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, that is a very important point. So the question will be which Senator obtains the floor first.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor, have I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. If my motion is acted upon favorably, that will mean that the Senate will proceed to take up the ECA

chapter of the bill. So the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will not be prejudiced in that case. In such event he will be just as well off at the time when he wishes to present his amendment as he is now. He does not have the floor now. If he agrees to the unanimous-consent request, then it will simply be a question of which amendment comes up first. If the Bridges-Byrd amendment is offered first, the Senator from Illinois can move to strike out the language of the amendment and insert the language of the Douglas-Kem amendment; or if the Douglas-Kem amendment is offered first, the Bridges-Byrd amendment could be offered as a substitute for it.

So, Mr. President, I hope the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois will not object to the requested unanimous-consent agreement, for he is always charitable and courteous, and wishes to go along in a good bipartisan spirit.

However, the motion already has been made to postpone until Wednesday of next week, for final consideration, chapter X-A of the bill.

So far as the handling of the amendments is concerned, that will depend on which Senator obtains the floor and which amendment prevails, either the so-called Douglas-Kem amendment or the Bridges-Byrd amendment.

Mr. President, I have made the motion.

Now I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the acting majority leader. Let me say now that if I may obtain unanimous consent, I shall withdraw the motion.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not wish to be classified as associated with any jockeying in favor of one side or another side, so far as the amendments are concerned. I did not have that in mind. I supported the course suggested by the Senator from Nebraska because I thought it was the most orderly way to proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Although I favor temporarily laying aside chapter X, I certainly would resist a motion to take it up at a definite time. I do not think that would be the proper procedure.

I think we should lay it aside temporarily, and then proceed.

Of course, the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois is just about as quick on the jump as is the minority leader—

Mr. WHERRY. He is better, Mr. President. [Laughter.]

Mr. MCFARLAND. In other words, the Senator from Illinois should be able to obtain the floor.

So, I hope the Senator from Illinois will agree to the request to temporarily lay aside this chapter of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to be very obliging. I have a very cooperative mood at all times, and particularly this afternoon.

If we can reach a unanimous-consent agreement that when we take up chapter X-A of the bill, my amendment will be

the first order of business, I shall be very glad, indeed, to agree to the requested unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. President, I believe I have the floor now—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor; I yielded for a question or, if there was no objection, for a comment. Do I not have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I wish to be fair—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to be fair to the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, why do not both Senators be fair to me, and yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield once again to the junior Senator from Illinois, providing I do not prejudice my rights to the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Washington for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As the Senator knows, there are two very important amendments pending.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As to those amendments, it was generally understood we would finish the committee amendments and would then consider the two amendments because they are in the nature of new matter. They are probably the two most important amendments, and I was wondering whether, under this arrangement, we would go on with the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, certainly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And finish the committee amendments?

Mr. WHERRY. My motion is to temporarily pass over chapter X-A, and I feel that the majority leader should then bring up the so-called Douglas-Kem amendment, at the conclusion of the bill, for the reasons I have already stated—that if cuts are made in the ECA items, it will then be necessary to adjust the so-called over-all cut amendment, whichever one prevails.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It makes a difference.

Mr. WHERRY. The only time that could be done would be following the conclusion of the bill, at which time each and every Senator will have his right to the floor. I have to make a motion, however, to postpone it to a day certain. I did so Wednesday. I should like to modify that motion to, say, Monday, and when Monday comes, if we are not ready for it, we shall have to modify it, I presume, and extend it for a longer period. I do not want to delay passage of the pending bill, but the motion necessitates a day certain. I shall make the motion on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator first want to let the Chair put the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois objected to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I desire to be thoroughly obliging, thoroughly cooperative in all respects on these matters, and I am willing to withdraw my objection.

Mr. WHERRY. That is fine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But I hope that the Chair or whoever may be occupying the chair, will cast his glance all around the Chamber when it comes time to recognize Senators, when this matter comes up.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I withdraw the motion I made, and I thank the Senator from Illinois for his cooperation. But I do not want the glancing part of the argument to prevail upon the occupant of the chair when the time comes to consider chapter X-A.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely said I hoped the eyes of the Presiding Officer would describe a semicircle—an arc, so to speak, and that he would not ignore the junior Senator from Illinois when the proper time came.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Chapter X-A will be passed over.

CONTROL OF ANCHORAGE AND MOVEMENT OF FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS IN UNITED STATES WATERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOY in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3859) to authorize the President to control the anchorage and movement of foreign-flag vessels in waters of the United States when the national security of the United States is endangered, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 1 of title II of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 217; U. S. C., title 50, sec. 191), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Whenever the President finds that the security of the United States is endangered by reason of actual or threatened war, or invasion, or insurrection, or subversive activity, or of disturbances or threatened disturbances of the international relations of the United States, the President is authorized to institute such measures and issue such rules and regulations—

"(a) to govern the anchorage and movement of any foreign-flag vessels in the territorial waters of the United States, to inspect such vessels at any time, to place guards thereon, and, if necessary in his opinion in order to secure such vessels from damage or injury, or to prevent damage or injury to any harbor or waters of the United States, or to secure the observance of rights and obligations of the United States, may take for such purposes full possession and control of such vessels and remove therefrom the officers and crew thereof, and all other persons not especially authorized by him to go or remain on board thereof;

"(b) to safeguard against destruction, loss, or injury from sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents, or other causes of similar nature, vessels, harbors, ports, and waterfront facilities in the United States, the Canal Zone, and all territory and water, continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

international free port. It reached its crescendo at Yalta, where we attempted to pin down prior elusive Soviet promises to take up arms against Japan. The negotiations about future action against the Japanese were interspersed with discussions of the peace settlement and the German question in Europe, and their political implications were made secondary to the President's prime objective at Yalta—"the brave new world," the establishment of the basic framework of the United Nations.

For all these reasons—and because of a fundamental military as well as political misconception—Russia held the whip hand, and the United States representatives placed themselves in the amazing position of "giving away" territories which did not belong to us, and of undertaking to secure concessions which impaired the sovereignty of a friendly Allied state. The political misconception, so obvious now, should have been apparent then; it was not to our interest, or the interests of China or of the world, to make Russia a Pacific power; it was not to our interest to beg or barter for Russia's entry into the Pacific war.

Nor should military considerations have affected this political judgment. At the time of Yalta, Japan was already beaten—not by the atomic bomb, which had not yet been perfected, not by conventional bombing, then just starting, but by attrition and blockade. The home islands were severed from the Empire by our conquest of the Philippines and the Marianas, and the submarine and surface blockade already had brought the pinch of hunger and the stress of severe raw material shortages to Japan. Even before the first bomb was dropped by our B-29's on the Japanese home islands, the enemy aircraft industry was disrupted and on the decline; shortages due to the blockade and a chaotic program of decentralization, dispersion, and underground development, badly carried out, already had reduced severely the output of Japanese factories. The full seriousness of the Japanese plight was not then, of course, completely understood. Our military men were preoccupied and concerned with the fierceness of the Japanese defense; the tactical situation obscured the hopeless strategic position of Japan, and some of our commanders took, therefore, far too pessimistic a view. Mistakes in intelligence, or rather in evaluation, also contributed to an erroneous assessment of Japanese intentions and capabilities. We feared that even after the main Japanese islands had been conquered, the enemy resistance would continue on the continent of Asia with the much-vaunted Kwantung Manchurian Army as its core.

Yet, our intelligence officers in Washington and throughout the Pacific for months had been identifying units of the Kwantung Army and of its air support which had been transferred from that quiet area to various battle sectors.

By late 1944 it was—or should have been—apparent that what remained of the Kwantung Army was largely composed of green conscripts and second-rate troops, with virtually no air support, incapable of a prolonged campaign; it had been bled white to provide reinforcements for other fronts. We also confused Japanese capabilities with Japanese intentions. We believed the Japanese would resist to the last man, no matter how hopelessly beaten.

These beliefs, which were completely erroneous—

Mr. President, whose beliefs were erroneous? Those of the Democratic Party, which has just issued the scurrilous sheet to which I have referred. We provided them with money enough. Heav-

en knows, there were hundreds of millions of dollars available to them. But apparently, as this military expert says, the Democratic administration knew nothing of the results of that terrible situation which arose, which gave Russia a part of Manchuria and turned over to Russia the Kurile Islands and North Korea. I continue:

These beliefs, which were completely erroneous, influenced materially the politico-military approach made at Yalta. They were not held, at the time, by all our experts; but they were, unfortunately, the controlling opinions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator recall that but 2 or 3 weeks ago on the floor of the Senate, when the Senate was discussing military assistance to Korea, it was brought out that last year the Senate voted an appropriation of \$10,600,000 for a military mission to Korea, and that not one dime of it had been spent all last year, and that after the investigation was started the startling information was brought forth that \$200 had been charged against the account and that the \$200 was for the purpose of rehabilitating \$30,000 worth of signal wire that was to be shipped to Korea, which has not even yet reached Korea? The \$200 represents the complete history of what this administration spent in Korea during the last fiscal year. Does the Senator know that?

Mr. LANGER. I know it only too well. It is one of the great tragedies of our time. In my reading, Mr. President, I now want to skip over a little and come to another part of this book, written by the military expert for the New York Times, who received the Pulitzer prize, Hanson W. Baldwin. I want to indicate the division among those high in authority in the United States for the purpose of showing that while our boys were dying the men appointed under this Democratic administration could not even agree among themselves. At page 82, Mr. Baldwin says:

General Marshall was then convinced that an invasion of the Japanese main islands was essential, and he insisted that help from Russia on the mainland of Asia was necessary. Admiral King seemed to share this view. But there were divergences of opinion as to the necessity of this operation; Admiral William D. Leahy, who feared the cost in casualties of invasion, and who correctly assessed the crippling effect of the blockade on Japan, opposed the invasion. The compromise eventually reached—a sensible one—was to prepare for invasion, but in the meantime to utilize the blockade and air bombardment to the utmost to bring Japan to her knees.

These strategic differences—and a failure to appreciate fully the hopeless strategical position of Japan—colored the military thinking at Yalta and helped to lead to indefensible political arrangements.

There you have it, Mr. President. That is the kind of leadership our Government had at that time. I continue:

"Certainly," as the Washington Post has commented, "the Chiefs of Staff made a blunder to advise Roosevelt and Churchill

at Yalta that Japan would last 18 months after VE-day. Our military men underrated Japan at the beginning of the war, then overrated it, and refused to see the patent fact, obvious to the Navy, that Japan was through even while the brass hats were meeting at Yalta."

Yet at Yalta—and even at the Potsdam Conference in July 1945, when Hitler lay dead and dishonored near the ruins of his bunker in Berlin and the Third Reich was broken and shattered—one month before the surrender of Japan, there were still many Americans who were interested primarily in getting a firm commitment from Russia to enter the Pacific war.

This mistaken policy stemmed in part from the basic political misconceptions outlined at the beginning of this book, in part from strategic misconceptions, some of them based on inadequate logistical planning. As General Deane points out in his book, our planners were obsessed with two ideas—to bring Russia into the Pacific war and to utilize Russian territory as bases for our war effort against Japan. Repeatedly, General Deane and other United States representatives had pressed Soviet leaders long before Yalta for permission to utilize Russian territory as air bases for our attacks on Japan. Yet the cart was put before the horse—we made diplomatic representations for this permission before we had estimated, logistically, the value of such bases to us.

The author then goes on to tell how utterly useless those bases would have been to us. I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of page 84, page 85, and page 86 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our attempts to get firm Soviet commitments about the war against Japan reached a preliminary crisis in October 1944, more than 4 months before Yalta, when Churchill and a British entourage visited Moscow. General Deane describes the resulting conferences which he attended as the principal American military representative. Stalin reiterated his intention, first announced to Cordell Hull at Moscow in October 1943, then more or less formalized at Tehran, of entering the Pacific war, said he needed 3 months after VE-day to stockpile supplies in Siberia, declared that the United States could have air bases and one naval base in the Far East; but added that "if the United States and Great Britain preferred to bring Japan to her knees without Russian participation, he was ready to agree." Furthermore, there was a little item of additional supplies that Russia would require to help her build up a 2 months' reserve in Siberia. All in all, Stalin said the Russians would need more than 1,000,000 tons of cargo, and they must be delivered by June 30, 1945, the deliveries to be in addition to those already being made under the fourth lend-lease protocol. In Moscow, in 1944, Stalin made many glowing promises, but, "despite these promises, the end result was that the Russians got their supplies and the United States got nothing except a belated and last-minute Russian attack against the Japanese."

As the Soviets stalled on their promises and we delivered supplies, the months drew on into the winter of 1944-45; and at Yalta, in February, President Roosevelt, pressed by the United States Chiefs of Staff, again took up the questions of bomber bases in Siberia and the date of Russian entry into the Pacific war. Stalin again agreed in principle, and set the date at 3 months after victory in Europe had been won. He said the United States could establish bases in the Komsomolsk-Nikolaevsk area and eventually in Kamchatka. But he got down in black and white his price: The Curzon line

for the eastern border of Poland, the Kurile Islands and controlling economic and strategic concessions in Manchuria. (Stalin's Manchurian price for Russia's entry into the Pacific war had first been broached apparently with no grave objections on our part, at Tehran in December 1943, just a few days after Roosevelt, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek had agreed in the Cairo Declaration that Manchuria and Formosa should be restored to China.)

But it was not until the spring, when Germany was at her last gasp and Japan near the end, that, in the words of General Deane, "it was found that the net increase that would result from putting four groups of B-29's in the Amur River district would be 1.39 percent of the total bomb tonnage we could place on Japan without using Russian bases." This was convincing proof, adds Deane, "that the slight increase in our bombing effort and the advantage of an added direction of approach for our bomber formations were not at all commensurate with the logistical effort involved in establishing our forces in Siberia."

A little late—after more than 3 years of United States participation in the war and numerous major concessions to Russia, concessions which were to affect the peace—to be making this ABC logistical discovery. By then Russia had most of the supplies she had demanded; and she had carefully recorded the secret concessions of Yalta.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish now to pay my respects to a Democratic convention. The convention that met and nominated President Roosevelt for a third term. I say that everyone of the delegates at that Democratic convention who voted to break the traditional two terms for the President of the United States should hang his head in shame for having foisted upon this country for a third term a man who ultimately, according to this military expert of the New York Times, brought ruin to the United States of America. Oh, they wanted to win, Mr. President. They said, "We can elect Mr. Roosevelt for a third term." I talked to some of the delegates from North Dakota upon their return home. The substance of what they said to me upon their return was, "Sure, he should not have been nominated. But we want to win. We can win with Roosevelt." In substance they said, "To hell with the Constitution," which does not specifically prohibit it. "To hell with George Washington," who said that two terms were enough. We have got to hold our jobs, and to hold them we will break away from the two-term tradition. So those delegates to the Democratic national convention sold the country in order to gain what little miserable political advantage they could secure by nominating him instead of nominating some other one of the great Democrats who were candidates at that convention and they had many good ones—able, efficient, God-fearing men who would have been good Presidents.

There is one thing I say to the everlasting glory of Jim Farley. If everything else about Jim Farley is forgotten as the years go by, one thing will forever, in my opinion, cause him to be remembered as a patriotic American, namely, that he dared, at the risk of obscurity, which I hope will never come to him, to fight the third term. Of course, after the Democrats had won a third term for Mr. Roosevelt, they wanted him for a

fourth term. Why? To protect their jobs. What happened to him in his fourth term? I have here a book written by the great military expert of the New York Times telling what happened to Mr. Roosevelt in his fourth term. Here is what he did. Thousands and thousands of American boys paid with their lives for that un-American democratic convention because the Democrats wanted to win.

I remember, Mr. President, sitting in the House Chamber at the joint session when Mr. Roosevelt came back. I saw him only a few short weeks before he died. Anyone looking at him knew he had only a few short weeks to live.

Here is what the New York Times military expert says:

Russia drove a hard bargain at Yalta. Stalin promised to enter the war against Japan within an estimated 90 days after the end of the war against Germany, but for it he got the Kurile Islands, all of Sakhalin, half interest in the railways in Manchuria, Port Arthur, a Russian-controlled "free port" in Dairen, and thus strategic hegemony in important northeast Asia.

"It is my belief," writes Sherwood—

Mind you, Mr. President, of all the apologists for Mr. Roosevelt, even Sherwood said:

"It is my belief," writes Sherwood, "that Roosevelt would not have agreed to that final firm commitment had it not been that the Yalta Conference was almost at an end and he was tired and anxious to avoid further argument. I believe that he was hopeful that when the time came to notify the Chinese, he would be able to straighten the whole thing out with Chiang Kai-shek—but that hope, of course, was not realized."

Of course the very sick Mr. Roosevelt was "tired."

So, Mr. President, because there were at the Democratic Convention a lot of weak men who wanted to win, who wanted to get a few more votes by nominating Roosevelt for President for a third term, they were willing to take this man and sell out the country. That is why a sick man went to Yalta, a man who, in the absence of the Secretary of State, and without even his knowledge gave away the countries and the advantages which I have already named. That is why we today have our boys fighting for their lives in Korea—and why our beloved country is facing ruin and destruction.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate a long time, but I should like to invite the attention of Senators to the bottom of page 87 of this great book, from which I read the following:

The fault was doubly grievous. We not only hurt our own interests and those of a friendly ally, but at Yalta—inferentially, at least—we broke our pledged word to that ally. For at Cairo in 1943, before the Tehran conference and after Stalin had told Hull in Moscow that Russia would enter the Pacific war, we promised publicly the restoration of Manchuria to China. And to a pragmatic politician, Russian control of Port Arthur and a half interest in the Manchurian Railways could only mean Soviet strategic hegemony over Manchuria.

Nor was this all. During the discussions, it was suggested by President Roosevelt that perhaps the Russians ought to have a commercial outlet to the Persian Gulf; and maybe the Trans-Iranian Railway, built by Amer-

ican engineers, with the help of American capital, ought to be partially owned by Russia, or at least Russia should have certain transit rights. Fortunately wiser counsel soft-pedaled the proposal, and Stalin, apparently suspicious, showed no interest.

No wonder Stimson wrote that the meeting at Yalta dealt "a good deal in altruism and idealism instead of stark realities."

Yet, Mr. President, with this terrible record staring the Democratic Party in the face, in a time of war, when our boys are dying in Korea, when we are sending thousands of unprepared and untrained boys to Korea, the Democratic National Committee chooses this time, of all times, to issue a political pamphlet which is being circulated all over the country attacking the Republicans. The Democrats come upon this floor and ask for Republican cooperation. They say, "Please, please, Republicans, we have got this country into a hell of a mess, and we need help. Please, please, and please come to our aid and help. Please, please, and please vote for these bills." Within 12 hours after we give them help, Mr. President, they issue a shameful pamphlet, a political pamphlet, published by the Democratic National Committee, misrepresenting and lying about the Republicans.

I suppose that tomorrow or the next day, or the day after that, they will be standing up again in the Halls of Congress asking for the cooperation of the Republicans, and saying, "Do what you can to get us out of this terrible situation which has been brought about because of the fact that the Democratic Party did not have good leadership." And for all of this the people in the last analysis can thank that Democratic convention that broke the second-term tradition and regretfully think back on what might have been."

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Senator from Vermont proceeds, the clerk will state the first committee amendment in chapter X-B, on page 447 of the bill.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if the Senate is about consider a new chapter in the bill, a very important one, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield for that purpose?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	Douglas	Graham
Bricker	Dworshak	Green
Bridges	Eastland	Gurney
Butler	Eaton	Hayden
Byrd	Ellender	Hendrickson
Capehart	Ferguson	Hickenlooper
Chapman	Flanders	Hill
Chavez	Frear	Hoy
Connally	Fulbright	Holland
Cordon	George	Humphrey
Donnell	Gillette	Hunt

Ives	McKellar	Smith, N. J.
Jenner	Magnuson	Sparkman
Johnson, Colo.	Malone	Stennis
Johnson, Tex.	Maybank	Taft
Kefauver	Mundt	Thomas, Okla.
Kem	Murray	Thye
Langer	Myers	Tydings
Lehman	Neely	Watkins
Lodge	O'Connor	Wherry
Lucas	O'Mahoney	Wiley
McCarran	Pepper	Williams
McCarthy	Robertson	Young
McClellan	Russell	
McFarland	Smith, Maine	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in discussing the next chapter and its subdivision marked "X-B," which has to do with foreign aid, being the portion of the bill beginning on page 447, we have more or less reached an agreement to vote on chapter X-B and all amendments thereto on Monday next. So I am going to submit a unanimous-consent request in line with my understanding of what we have been discussing and considering for the last few moments while the quorum call was being had.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that on Monday next, beginning at 2 p. m., the Senate proceed to vote upon chapter X-B, foreign aid, page 447, and all amendments thereto; that following the disposition of that chapter and the amendments thereto, and not later than 3 hours thereafter, the Senate vote upon the amendment, to be offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCarran], involving Spain; that no amendments which are not germane shall be offered; and that under the agreement the right to raise points of order shall not be waived.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, that is the substance of the proposal, and it will be written up by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. KEM and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Let me call attention to the fact that the Senator from Illinois did not provide for a division of the time.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I modify my request by including in it a provision that on Monday next, the time between 12 noon and 2 p. m. shall be divided equally between the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator from Illinois mean to include a provision for division of the time available for consideration of the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LUCAS. I think perhaps the time on the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Nevada should be divided equally between the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair ask a further question: Did the Senator from Illinois mean to include in his unanimous-consent request a provision in regard to all motions, in addition

to all amendments offered or which may be offered?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, we can include the word "motions," too; that will be perfectly satisfactory.

EIGHT BILLION FROM PEACETIME BUDGET FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE—TOTAL OF \$21,545,000,000 FOR DEFENSE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I may say that I have no intention of objecting to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement—if the Senator from Illinois will yield, I should like to ask a question of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Wherry].

UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, if I may obtain consent to that effect. I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent that he be permitted to yield to the Senator from Nevada, to permit him to ask a question of the junior Senator from Nebraska. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE PROPOSED REDUCTION OF DOMESTIC BUDGET FROM 15 TO 20 PERCENT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the junior Senator from Nebraska whether he would consent to increasing the percentage of the proposed reduction of the peacetime domestic budget, but without any relationship to the \$6,080,000,000 for veterans' services and benefits or the \$5,625,000,000 for interest and service on the public debt or the \$13,545,000,000 for the national defense, but to have it apply to the remaining \$17,189,000,000 of the domestic budget. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska whether he will consent to amend his amendment to provide for a 20-percent cut, rather than a 15-percent reduction, in the domestic budget, which is covered in the portion of the bill discussed yesterday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I may reply without prejudicing the right of the majority leader to the floor—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Illinois has yielded for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that what I am sure he is attempting to do is to increase the proposed reduction under the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment from 15 to 20 percent. That amendment includes all the exemptions—and a few more, so far as that is concerned—that the Senator from Nevada has just listed or that he would wish to list. However, I am perfectly willing to give the Senate a chance to vote on a proposed 20-percent reduction.

On the other hand, I have already requested that the reduction proposed in the amendment be increased to 15 percent. Therefore, a further amendment, so as to change the percentage from 15 to 20, would constitute an amendment in the second degree.

If the Senator from Nevada will check over the proposed amendments, I am

quite sure he will find that the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Butler] proposed an amendment, in his own right, to provide for a 20-percent reduction.

So I shall be glad to join with the two Senators in an amendment to accomplish the same result, but which still will not jeopardize the standing of my amendment.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am aware of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska, and I should like to join with him in sponsoring it with the 5-percent increase—making a total of 20 percent. In fact, I had intended to offer such an amendment myself, but I now want to join the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. MALONE. So we shall join in sponsoring that amendment.

TRANSFER \$3,000,000,000 FROM ECA TO NATIONAL DEFENSE FUND

Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield further—

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I have intended, and I believe this is the proper place, to offer an amendment to the ECA provision in the appropriation bill. The junior Senator from Nevada is not entirely clear at the moment how the amendment may be made, but it will be worked out. It is an amendment to transfer to the National Defense Fund or at least to dispense with the \$3,000,000,000, or approximately \$3,000,000,000, now available or being made available to ECA nations.

ECA NATIONS 120 PERCENT RECOVERED

We are, of course, all familiar with the fact that the ECA nations are approximately 120 percent recovered, on the basis of the 1937-38 index of industrial development, and that this is a peacetime development that we have been financing. There may have been some question over the last 3 years as to the necessity, but now there can be none. It is impossible to develop peacetime industry while we are engaged in a wartime development.

The two things are not compatible. I shall propose an amendment which will propose to dispense entirely with the \$3,000,000,000 or such an amount as may be available to ECA under this bill. But what the junior Senator from Nevada wants to do is to make that money available, to be included in the \$10,000,000,000 defense fund requested by the President of the United States—I do propose such an amendment.

TWENTY-PERCENT REDUCTION—\$3,500,000,000—\$500,000,000 PUBLIC WORKS FUND

With the 20-percent reduction in the \$17,189,000,000 of the domestic budget, this approximately \$3,000,000,000 and the \$1,150,000,000 for the arming of the Atlantic Pact nations—which should be included in one budget; then add the \$500,000,000 appropriated for public works—the additional \$8,000,000,000 is available for the national-defense fund. We will give the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] something to really vote for—the amendment will propose to dispense with the public works entirely, of \$500,000,000, except such amounts as

the President may believe to be really emergency work until this Congress convenes again in January 1951.

It could mean only a few months' delay at most—and by that time the situation should clarify so we will know exactly what is needed.

UNIVERSAL TRAINING

The junior Senator from Nevada joined the senior Senator from Maryland early in 1949 in the introduction of a universal training bill.

This legislation has since been buried in a democratically controlled committee—such legislation is needed to protect this Nation and to protect the boys through better knowing their business and protect themselves in combat.

EIGHT BILLION DOLLARS OF THE PRESIDENT'S TEN BILLION REQUEST

Certainly there will be no public works, except emergency works, during this period, so that with the amount allocated to such works, it adds up to \$8,000,000,000 available for the \$10,000,000,000 program.

The junior Senator from Nevada hereby offers such amendment. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I first answer the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the parliamentary inquiry is, Who has the floor? I believe I have the floor, appearances to the contrary notwithstanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the Senator from Vermont is correct. The Chair was perhaps in error in recognizing the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. FLANDERS. I gladly yield to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont yielded solely for the purpose stated.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, we have not finished the unanimous-consent agreement yet, and I have been standing here yielding to Senators, hoping we might get it accomplished. I did not think I had lost the floor, otherwise I should have taken my seat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Vermont will bear with the Chair for a moment, it seems that the consent request could be worked out shortly.

Mr. FLANDERS. I gladly yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I do not lose my position on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will later recognize the Senator from Vermont. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to answer the Senator from Nevada by simply say-

ing that under the parliamentary situation there will be no reason why he cannot offer the kind of amendment he has been discussing here, as I understand. Certainly I shall have no objection. What I should like to do is to get the unanimous-consent agreement on its way and get the Senate's confirmation on it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I do offer such an amendment, to be properly written by the clerk of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the unanimous consent requested by the Senator from Illinois, but I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. After the Senate concludes work on the ECA chapter, what else will be left in the appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there are still some chapters of the appropriation bill that have not been acted on, and that after the consideration of the committee amendments, if any, to those chapters which have not been acted on, the Senate will then take up amendments offered by individual Senators.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from Illinois and to the chairman of the committee that what I had in mind was this: Chapter V has been concluded, with the exception of the items of health and cancer research funds, the heart institute, mental hygiene, and dental activities. I was wondering whether it was the intention of the Senator from Illinois, in making his unanimous-consent request, to conclude with the bill on that particular date?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to finish the bill then, if possible, but that situation is perhaps more or less in the lap of—

Mr. CHAVEZ. The gods?

Mr. LUCAS. It is more or less perhaps in the lap of Senators, as to when we shall get through with the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I merely wanted to know in order to get ready for the items in chapter 5 which have not been concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. If we run out of something to do, the Senator can certainly offer amendments at that time.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Reserving the right to object, I find myself in a rather peculiar situation. I had already spoken to the leader on this side of the aisle several days ago. I understood that the final vote would not come up until Tuesday or perhaps Thursday. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether that is true. I am particularly interested in the vote on the 10-percent over-all reduction, with the exceptions enumerated, and I am interested in the

passage of the bill. I had therefore planned to be absent Monday, and to return Tuesday morning. Apparently I shall lose my opportunity to vote on the Spanish loan, which I would favor, because I feel that Spain is decidedly in the world picture. I know of nothing else to be done except to carry out my obligations already incurred. But I should like an answer to this question: Certainly the Senator does not expect a vote on final passage or on the 10-percent cut until Tuesday, at any rate, does he?

Mr. LUCAS. Probably not until Wednesday. I do not know, but we hope we may get a vote on Tuesday, but certainly we shall not vote on it on Monday, I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Therefore, I shall not object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the clerk please read the unanimous-consent request, as far as we have gone? If he has not been able to reduce it to writing yet, I should like to ask: Did the majority leader request that on amendments pending or which may be offered, 5 minutes be allowed to each side on each amendment? I do not anticipate that any amendments will be offered, but I think the unanimous-consent agreement should contain such a provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was not included. The Chair will advise the Senator from Nebraska that that was not included in the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHERRY. If the majority leader will modify his request to include a provision that on each amendment pending or to be offered, 5 minutes shall be allowed on each amendment to each side, I think it will be satisfactory.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is, 5 minutes to each side, on each amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection at this time to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to be sure that the last request of the majority leader has nothing to do with the division of time prior to 2 o'clock.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the Chair state in substance what the request is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will endeavor to state his understanding of the unanimous-consent request. It is that on Monday next the time shall be divided from the convening of the Senate until 2 o'clock between the proponents and the opponents, the time to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]; that at 2 o'clock a vote shall be taken upon any amendment pending or that may be offered, or on any mo-

tions, with 5 minutes allowed to each side for debate on any such amendments or motions; that the requirements of the unanimous-consent request as proposed are that amendments must be germane, that any right to raise a point of order is not involved or limited by the request; that upon disposition of the matters which will come on for vote at 2 o'clock an additional 3-hour period shall be allowed for debate on the amendment to be offered by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] relating to the giving of aid to Spain.

Mr. LUCAS. May I suggest it is to be not later than 3 hours thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not later than 3 hours after the vote, which will begin at 2 o'clock, the vote will also begin upon the amendment of the senior Senator from Nevada, and the time will be divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] as to that second period of time, and the 5-minute limitation on debate to apply to any amendment proposed thereto.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I understand that the succinct statement made by the Chair relates to chapter X-B and has no reference to any other portion of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Chair intended to state that.

Mr. LUCAS. And we shall not only vote on amendments, but on the chapter itself after we make disposition of the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Monday, July 31, 1950, at the hour of 2 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, except as hereinafter provided, on any amendment or motion that may be pending or that may be offered to the committee amendment beginning on page 447 and extending down to and including page 461, inclusive, being Chapter X-B—Foreign aid, to the bill H. R. 7786, the general appropriation bill for 1951: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter shall be in order and that points of order may not be waived under the agreement.

Ordered further, That the time between 12 o'clock noon and 2 o'clock p. m. shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposed to the committee amendment and controlled, respectively, by Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. KEM.

Ordered further, That after said hour of 2 o'clock p. m., debate on any amendment or

motion shall be limited to not exceeding 10 minutes, to be equally divided between the mover thereof and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ordered further, That with reference to the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McCARRAN, providing that \$100,000,000 of the appropriation shall be used for assistance to Spain, debate shall be limited not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. McKELLAR.

Ordered further, That upon the disposition of the amendment proposed by Mr. McCARRAN, the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the committee amendment, whether amended or not.

Ordered further, That after the period for debate on the so-called McCarran amendment has expired, debate upon any amendment thereto shall be limited to not exceeding 10 minutes to be equally divided between the mover thereof and Mr. McCARRAN.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the current chapter of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I agreed to yield to the Senator from Tennessee, provided I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Vermont may yield for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, chapter X-B of the bill appropriates money for foreign aid. This part of the bill probably will give rise to a great deal of discussion as it involves the question of money and aid extended to foreign governments.

Last year we appropriated the enormous sum of \$5,513,890,000 for foreign aid. The estimate for this year is about \$650,000,000 less and amounts to \$4,855,073,729. The House did not pass on these items of foreign aid at all, although the House took the lead in having a unified appropriation bill. We need not inquire as to why the House left out of the bill these huge gifts to foreign countries, but we shall go ahead and keep the foreign-aid chapter in with the other appropriation chapters.

The committee recommends a much smaller sum than the amount authorized for foreign aid for fiscal year 1951. The committee has allowed the sum of \$4,522,158,729, which is approximately a billion dollars less than the appropriation for fiscal year 1950, and is \$332,915,000 below the budget estimate. The committee thinks that, under all of the circumstances, it is justified in making this reduction.

Mr. President, I shall refer briefly to some of the larger items of foreign aid in

this chapter. The largest single appropriation is to the ECA. The budget estimate for ECA is \$2,657,700,000 and the committee recommends that the estimate be cut 10 percent to provide an appropriation of \$2,391,930,000. This amount is \$1,236,450,000 under the 1950 appropriation. The committee also agreed to allow ECA to use the 1950 carry-over funds of approximately \$277,000,000. The committee arrived at these recommendations after very careful consideration and I hope the Senate will approve of them.

The next large item in the chapter is for mutual-defense assistance. The committee was unanimous in recommending the full amount of the budget estimate of \$1,678,023,729.

On the funds for International Development, commonly referred to as point 4, the committee originally recommended an appropriation of \$10,000,000 in this chapter. I would like to make it clear to the Senate that the \$10,000,000 recommended is in addition to other funds for point 4 programs carried under the Department of State appropriations in chapter III.

In the Department of State appropriations under the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,000,000 and in the appropriation for International Information and Educational Activities there is an appropriation of \$2,600,000, for point 4 programs.

Since the committee recommended the appropriation of \$10,000,000 in this chapter for point 4, I have conferred with the President, and I have also received a letter from the President urging that the appropriation of \$10,000,000 be increased to the full amount of the budget estimate of \$26,900,000. The President told me that the amount of \$10,000,000 was not enough in his opinion as we were at war and more funds would be necessary to carry out the program to the best advantage of our defense. I at once submitted the request to the Appropriations Committee and we have reconsidered it and the committee has voted to allow the President the amount of money he asked for, namely, \$26,900,000 for the purpose of carrying out the point 4 program which the President recommended and the Congress has agreed to. We are at war, the President is our Commander in Chief, and the committee thinks that we should leave no stone unturned to back him up. I hope the Senate will agree with our recommendations.

There are several other items in this chapter which I will not explain in detail since they are referred to in our committee report. I do, however, Mr. President, ask unanimous consent to

insert in the record a table which I have had prepared by the staff showing the individual appropriation items, the

amounts for 1950, the amounts of the budget estimates, and the amounts recommended by the committee.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1950, budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1951

	Appropriations, 1950	Budget estimate, 1951	Committee recommendation	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—			
				Appropriations, 1950		Budget estimate, 1951	
				Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Funds appropriated to the President:							
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	¹ \$3,628,380,000	² \$2,657,700,000	\$2,391,930,000	−\$1,236,450,000	34.1	−\$265,770,000	10.0
Assistance to Greece and Turkey.....	45,000,000			−45,000,000			
Assistance to the Republic of Korea.....	110,000,000	100,000,000	90,000,000	−20,000,000	18.2	−10,000,000	10.0
International children's welfare work.....		15,000,000	12,500,000	+12,500,000		−2,500,000	16.7
International development (point IV).....		26,900,000	10,000,000	+10,000,000		−16,900,000	62.8
Mutual defense assistance.....	³ 814,010,000	⁴ 1,678,023,729	⁴ 1,678,023,729	+864,013,729	106.1		
Department of Defense, Department of the Army, civil functions: GARIOA.....	912,500,000	320,000,000	288,000,000	−624,500,000	68.4	−32,000,000	10.0
Department of State:							
Government in occupied areas of Germany.....	(⁵)	30,000,000	27,000,000	+27,000,000		−3,000,000	10.0
Aid to Palestine refugees.....	4,000,000	27,450,000	24,705,000	+20,705,000	517.6	−2,745,000	10.0
Grand total.....	5,513,890,000	4,855,073,729	4,522,158,720	−991,731,271	17.9	−332,915,000	6.85

¹ In addition, loan authority in the amount of \$150,000,000 or a total of \$3,778,380,000.

² Original submission in H. Doc. No. 479 was in the amount of \$2,950,000,000. Revised estimate submitted in S. Doc. 176 in the amount of \$2,657,700,000.

³ In addition, contract authority in the amount of \$500,000,000.

⁴ Includes \$455,523,729 for liquidation of prior-year contract authority, S. Doc. No. 194.

⁵ Formerly under "Government and relief in occupied areas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment to chapter X-B.

The first amendment was, at the top of page 447, to insert:

CHAPTER X-B—FOREIGN AID

TITLE I—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Economic cooperation

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended by the act of April 19, 1949 (Public Law 47), and as further amended by the act of June 5, 1950 (Public Law 535), including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation (not to exceed \$30,000); hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation and hire of aircraft; payment of damage claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); rents in the District of Columbia; transportation of privately owned automobiles; entertainment (not to exceed \$20,000); exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes; and loss by exchange; \$2,391,930,000, of which not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for expenditures of a confidential character (other than entertainment) under the direction of the Administrator or the Deputy Administrator, who shall make a certificate of the amount of each such expenditure which he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein specified: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be consolidated and merged with funds heretofore made available for the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and such consolidated appropriation may be used during the fiscal year 1951 within the limitations herein specified: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$15,255,000 of such consolidated appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses during the fiscal year 1951, of which not more than \$25,000 shall be available to the Administrator for any further action he may consider advisable to carry out the provisions of section 115 (f) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$600,000,000 shall be available for transfers under section 111 (d) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended: *Provided further*, That no

part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended in a manner that will permit any of the local currency equivalents, derived therefrom in compliance with section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, to be placed at the disposal of any recipient country so long as any dependent area of such country fails to comply with any treaty to which such dependent area and the United States are parties.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate, in connection with chapter X-B, to lines 17 to 24, on page 448, commencing with the words "Provided, further." This section relates to the difficulties which have been encountered under the ECA by certain American merchants in Morocco.

Those difficulties stem from treaty interpretations, as I understand, relating to treaties of this country with France and with Morocco and the relations between France and Morocco.

Mr. President, I would object, under any circumstances, to this provision in this chapter of the bill. I would object to anything which used an incident which, however serious, is yet of comparatively small proportions, as a means by which the work of the ECA to support the Republic of France might be removed. It seems to me, from all I can learn, that there are two elements of the situation. One element is that the problem is one which should be solved, if not by negotiation, by international judicial action. Furthermore, I am informed that a modus vivendi has been arranged and is in process of development with some success, and that the situation is improving as time goes on.

Mr. President, the remarks I have made I would make under any circumstances, but at this point I raise a point of order as to the language which I have just defined as commencing with the word "Provided" on line 17 of page 448, through line 24 of the same page. This seems to me to be very clearly legislative material in an appropriation bill, and therefore I raise the question as to whether it belongs in the bill at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont raises a point of order to that portion of chapter X-B of the bill beginning with the third word on line 17 of page 448 and going down to the end of line 24 on the same page. Does any Senator wish to be heard? If not, the present occupant of the chair is prepared to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair, the point of order should lie, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in connection with this amendment, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me and also a memorandum relating to the subject.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY's statement and the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

MOROCCAN AMENDMENT MUST BE ENACTED IN GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. President, there is pending before the Senate an amendment written into this bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee in connection with ECA appropriations for the next fiscal year. Under this amendment, which I originally proposed to the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. McKELLAR], and which he fortunately accepted, provision will be made at long last for protection of American business interests in Morocco.

I have taken the floor on several occasions since early 1949 in order to protest the deplorable discrimination against American business interests in Morocco.

In all this time we have had one long series of exchanges of correspondence and talks with State Department officials. Time after time we have brought to the attention of the Department abuses of the Moroccan Treaty by which French officials have deliberately favored French business interests in direct contradiction with treaties. Time after time we have been given assurances by the State Department that the abuses would come to an end, that legislation would not be essential, and time after time assurances and pious promises have been shown not to be worth the paper they were printed on.

For the fourth time a protective amendment is now before the Senate, and it is my

earnest hope that this amendment as written in the Appropriations Committee will be retained on the floor, taken to the conference committee, and thereafter retained in the final conference report.

To do otherwise would be to encourage other countries deliberately to break their treaties with the United States and deliberately to discriminate against American businessmen.

I shall not take the further time to review a history of this situation, but I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a further memorandum on the problem, reviewing it historically.

MEMORANDUM

The Morocco Treaty violations were brought to the attention of the Foreign Relations Committee by correspondence back in 1947 and 1948. We were told that the Department of State was investigating and would take appropriate steps.

Two representatives of Americans in Morocco called on me early in 1949. They had documentation and other evidence to show that the French had assessed illegal taxes and customs against them, had seized their goods, denied them the right to compete in many businesses, refused them a share in ECA business, and in general tried to force them out. The French had finally placed embargoes on almost all American goods, while giving preferred treatment to Argentina, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and others.

I knew this kind of thing was prevalent in outrightly owned French colonies but Morocco is not a colony, it is an "autonomous country under the rule of a Sultan" (Willard Thorp's affidavit in U. S. District Court, Oct. 4, 1949). I know that our treaties with Morocco guaranteed our citizens and trade equal treatment with those of other countries and that they fixed duties and taxes. I put the representatives of the American group in Morocco in touch with Secretary Acheson in the Foreign Relations Committee Room and he directed Mr. Ernest Gross to investigate and fix the matter up.

At that time at a conference on March 24, 1949, the State Department agreed that illegal taxes and customs overcharges would be refunded and other redress given, that is, that all treaty violations which were not considered by the Department as connected with the dollar shortage would be ended, before acceptance of the embargo decree would be considered.

The President of the American Trade Association of Morocco reported this decision to me and to other members of the Foreign Relations Committee in writing. The arrangement has never been denied by the Department. It was reported to Morocco by a cable cleared with a Department official. Because of these promises, and because the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee told the Senate "We are sending a top man * * * to investigate all these cases, and if there is any discrimination or any violation of fundamental rights of Americans, they will be corrected, and corrected promptly" (p. 3950, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 5, 1949). I am sure that the distinguished chairman was relying on State Department promises when he made that statement—because of all this legislation proposed to end the Moroccan abuses was defeated on this floor on April 5, 1949. As soon as it was defeated the promises were ignored and on June 10, 1949, the State Department gave temporary assent to the Moroccan embargoes with none of its conditions fulfilled.

In August of 1949 this was all repeated. Mr. Ernest Gross, then Assistant Secretary of State, wrote on July 29 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10975, August 4, 1949): "The Depart-

ment has repeatedly recognized that American businessmen have specific legitimate grievances in French Morocco that should be remedied." He listed "failure to allocate to Americans a reasonable amount of dollar exchange. The employment of delaying tactics in granting import licenses for goods Americans needed for the maintenance of enterprises they were operating * * * the assessment of customs duties on the basis of arbitrary valuations of imports; the assessment of consumption taxes * * * and other matters such as the failure to install telephones, furnish adequate gasoline rations," etc.

Mr. Gross emphasized that the Department's objective is to assure an appropriate measure of protection to these Americans in Morocco. The able Senator from Pennsylvania stated: "At this very time American representatives are engaged with representatives of France in ironing out legitimate complaints which have been made against the French treatment of American businessmen" (p. 11034, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 5, 1949). Legislation was again defeated in the Senate on August 5, 1949. Again, when the chance of action by Congress was past, the Department abandoned its "appropriate measure of protection" and ruled, at a public hearing to investigate the matter on September 27 that both treaty violations and the fact that Americans have been subject to discrimination in the administration of import controls were beyond the scope of the meeting. On December 31, assent for an indefinite period was given to the embargoes and to almost all other violations on the basis of a compromise agreement of September 4, the terms of which were broken as soon as it was signed.

When the ECA authorization was pending this spring, Members of the Senate for the third time considered an amendment to end the campaign against our citizens and our trade in Morocco. Again, the State Department claimed that the situation was being effectively handled. A majority of the Foreign Relations Committee decided that "in view of the arrangements * * * made with the French Government," legislative remedy "was not necessary" (Foreign Relations Committee report, p. 22). Despite this decision, an amendment finally passed the Senate on May 5, 1950. As a member of the Senate-House conference, I was skeptical of the promises made in a reassuring letter dated May 5, 1950, from Administrator Hoffman and a State Department memorandum confirming it, to the effect that consultative machinery had been set up and was operating successfully to handle American complaints. The conference accepted these assurances, decided that the Connally amendment could be invoked in case the consultative machinery failed, and the Morocco amendment was again defeated.

A letter from the president of the American Chamber of Commerce in Morocco, in May, listed 11 specific legitimate grievances, including most of those cited by Mr. Gross a year ago and many others and stated that the situation was worse than ever. He said that "conferences between consular and residency officials involve the same personnel and lead to the same frustrating results even though they are now called deliberations of a mixed commission." The State Department's own opinion of its consultative machinery, which had served to defeat legislation, dwindled once the legislation was defeated. The Department's report of June 5, 1950, to the Appropriations Committee stated:

"Our consul at Rabat has done an excellent and conscientious job in bringing about such solutions as are possible from the consultative meetings. The administrative tactics of the French officials, however, continue to delay the results and to multiply the minor discriminations * * * the

consultative machinery has not been successful in solving larger problems touching French policy."

The only excuse which has been offered by the State Department for its failure in Morocco for a year and a half is that the French program is necessitated by Morocco's dollar shortage. Official statistics show that the import and export embargoes have actually raised Morocco's dollar imports by 50 percent, lowered her dollar exports by 30 percent, and brought her trade deficit to an all-time high. They have shifted import profits from independent Americans to French cartels and other favored French interests. They have given preference in trade not only to France but to every nation having a bilateral agreement with France, and that includes Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, etc. While Morocco's total dollar imports are at an all-time high, the United States share of Morocco's trade has decreased. Dollar purchases from non-United States sources have almost doubled. (Moroccan Government Statistical Bulletin, April 15, 1950.)

Of all the treaty violations complained of, only import embargoes are in any way connected with Morocco's dollar position.

Furthermore, the Department of State told the conference that the Hickenlooper amendment, stating that treaties remain in full force until changed with Senate ratification, was not necessary. It has always claimed it was not setting our treaties aside. That same Department's memorandum to the Appropriations Committee (p. 258 of the hearings) states "Some of the complaints that they (Americans) have made appear to be based on the original treaty position rather than on failure of the French to live up to the terms of their agreement with the United States." The clear meaning is that the Department's agreement of December 31, 1949, has set aside the treaties assuring equal rights, on which Americans relied when starting business in Morocco.

Not one tangible result has come from all this State Department shilly-shallying. Not 1 cent has been reimbursed. Moroccan laws limiting American business activities still are in force. Trade with every nation on earth is preferred to ours.

The Moroccan abuses are before the Senate for the fourth time. The State Department is no longer claiming that it will end them. Instead, it is now trying to quibble about whether the violations which it admitted and protested for almost 2 years are discriminatory. It can stall another 2 years while debating that. If it intended to act under the terms of the Connally amendment it has had nearly 3 months in which to do so. It has stated in its memorandum of July 11 that "it is understood steps are being taken to create a more favorable atmosphere," that action by Congress would be "drastic and inapt" and would damage our relations with France. Just how much further does it wish to go, in our pursuit of a favorable atmosphere? I do not believe that our relations abroad were ever improved by a policy of weakness, which only makes us ridiculous. I think this farce has continued long enough and hope the amendment reported by the Appropriations Committee will be adopted.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on page 447, line 18, I move to strike out "\$2,391,930,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$2,450,000,000." This is an amendment in the second degree. The Senator from Missouri, instead of increasing the amount of the appropriation, as I have suggested, desires to decrease it. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that this chapter X-B, for purposes of the amendment, may be considered as a part of the original text of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, my amendment is pending now. If the Senator from Missouri wishes to offer his amendment now, he may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the amendment of the Senator from Arizona is itself open to amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I shall ask that my amendment be considered on Monday.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to address the Senate, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Vice Adm. Edward L. Cochrane, United States Navy (retired), to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Paul M. Herzog, of New York, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board; and

Ewan Clague, of Pennsylvania, to be a Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Joseph Frederick Green, a graduated cadet of the United States Military Academy, for appointment as second lieutenant in the United States Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

ADVISORY BOARD FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. H. Allen, of Florida, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to make a few brief remarks with respect to the nomination of Mr. Allen. I know that the Presiding Officer will bear me out when I say that Mr. Allen is one of the outstanding businessmen, not only of Florida, but of the whole country. He is not only competent, but he is devoted to the public interest. I can assure the Senate that Mr. Allen's service in the position to which he has been nominated will be illustrious, distinguished, and in the public interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Chair thinks his colleague.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the remaining nominations to the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota desires the nomination of Mr. Morris L. Ernst, of New York, to go over. I move that, with that exception, the other nominations to the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the remaining nominations to the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department, with the exception of the nomination of Morris L. Ernst, of New York, are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc. That completes the Executive Calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the appropriation bill and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, July 31, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 28 (legislative day of July 20), 1950:

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Vice Adm. Edward L. Cochrane, United States Navy (retired), to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the term expiring June 30, 1952.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 28 (legislative day of July 20), 1950:

ADVISORY BOARD FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

To be members of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department

J. H. Allen, of Florida.

Daniel W. Bell, of the District of Columbia.

Frank M. Folsom, of New York.

Alfred E. Lyon, of New York.
Robert L. Thornton, of Texas.
Charles A. Ward, of Minnesota.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Morris F. Watson, Montevallo.
Jacob L. Slaughter, Pine Hill.

CALIFORNIA

Helen G. Walters, Brockway.
Rita P. Patton, Idyllwild.
Ben B. Rodgers, Milpitas.
Bernard G. Proksch, Pollock Pines.
Betty Jo Gilliam, Sloat.
Sallye F. Bartlow, Valley Center.

COLORADO

Schuyler C. Parker, Durango.

FLORIDA

Luther W. Reel, Eloise.
Edna Gowen Smith, Hilliard.
Wiley Bird, Live Oak.
Lynn H. Thames, Osprey.
Harry Gordon Higel, Sarasota.

GEORGIA

Estelle M. Jacques, Baconton.

HAWAII

Toshihiro Nakagawa, Kunia.
Adolph S. K. Leong, Lahaina.

IDAHO

Ellwood R. Werry, Shoshone.

ILLINOIS

Bruna R. Gherardini, Bulpitt.
Louis J. Froonineckx, Jr., Clifton.

INDIANA

Vernice L. Larkin, Cloverdale.
Richard C. Walker, Granger.
Charles Donald Manaugh, Hanover.
Kenneth E. Romine, Mentone.
Helen M. Cox, Oaklandon.
Thomas M. Gray, Otwell.
Arvil Weilbaker, Palmyra.
Louise W. Broyles, Pittsboro.
John E. Brewer, Summitville.
James L. Wall, Winchester.

IOWA

James Lawrence Klauer, Akron.
Woodrow J. Shearer, Columbus Junction.
Leroy W. Threde, Lake Park.
Fernando Gianni, Melcher.

KANSAS

Carl N. Couch, Atlanta.
Yoland L. Faris, Elmdale.
Charles Dwain Duecy, Galesburg.
John C. Bowman, Garnett.
Ruel Lazarus, Norwich.

KENTUCKY

Austin V. Thompson, Moreland.
William F. Gibson, Whitesburg.

LOUISIANA

Robert W. Gandy, Jr., Tallulah.

MAINE

Irma J. Gott, Southwest Harbor.

MARYLAND

Melvin H. Bowers, Lilypons.
Michael Keehan, Patuxent River.

MASSACHUSETTS

James E. Rogers, East Bridgewater.
Daniel F. Cahill, Lawrence.
Ralph Howard Bryant, South Lancaster.
Edmund L. Hannaford, Wellfleet.

MICHIGAN

Donald M. Brown, Addison.
William Bombyk, Applegate.
William R. Shortridge, Big Bay.
Robert J. Giteroske, Bridgman.
Gust C. Burandt, Coldwater.
Elmer L. Wittenberg, Constantine.
Merle E. Kinney, Davisburg.
John T. Fahey, Goodells.
Charles R. LaClair, Hemlock.
Leon C. Stewart, Hersey.



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 96

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 31, 1950

No. 150

Senate

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, assistant minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

We would lift our eyes unto the hills eternal, knowing that our help comes from Thee, O God. We would laud and hallow Thee for Thou art good and hast done us good. We have had at Thy hand bountiful benefits all our days. Thy sunlight has made our path daylight. The dark night has had its star; and when our need was great our night has had its sun.

Remembering Thy past benefits, grant us to rely upon Thy sure mercy as we take up the opportunities of this new day. Help us that in all our ways we might acknowledge Thee, knowing that Thou wilt direct our paths.

"Set our feet on lofty places;

Gird our lives, that they may be Armored with all Christ-like graces
In the fight to keep men free.

Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,
That we fail not man nor Thee."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 28, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 28, 1950, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1049. An act for the relief of Amy Alexandrovna Taylor and Myrna Taylor;

S. 1779. An act for the relief of Phil Meyers, also known as Gil Meyers;

S. 1792. An act for the relief of Thomas Nicholas Epiphaniades and Wanda Julia Epiphaniades;

S. 2077. An act for the relief of Francisco Gonzalez Perez; and

S. 2864. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Department of Justice, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 157) authorizing the Department of Justice of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. TOBEY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today, Tuesday, and Wednesday.

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], on page 447, line 18, to strike out "\$2,391,930,000" and insert "\$2,450,000,000."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement the time between now and 2 o'clock is divided equally, to be controlled respectively by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. It is understood that we will start to vote at 2 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. The time between now and 2 o'clock is divided equally between and controlled by the two Senators.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, and I ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator refer to his amendment to the Hayden amendment?

Mr. KEM. No; it is an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot offer an amendment to the committee amendment at this time. It must be to the so-called Hayden amendment. Otherwise it would be an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. KEM. I suppose it does not make any difference in the final analysis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first vote would come to the Senator's amendment to the Hayden amendment. Therefore the Senator would get the same result.

Mr. KEM. Yes. I have no objection to its being so considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish his amendment to be stated?

Mr. KEM. I should like to have my amendment stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 447, line 18, in lieu of "\$2,391,930,000" it is proposed to insert "\$1,950,000,000"; on page 448, in line 2, beginning with the word "Provided," to strike out all to and including the words "limitations herein specified," in line 7, page 448; on page 448, lines 8 and 9, to strike out the word "consolidated."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I notice that the Senator's amendment is in three parts. Does the Senator wish to have each part considered separately, or all of them en bloc?

Mr. KEM. En bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the Senator has offered an amendment to the Hayden amendment. As I understand, the Hayden amendment raises the appropriation from \$2,391,000,000 to \$2,450,000,000.

Mr. KEM. The purpose of my amendment is to decrease the appropriation by the amount provided in my amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator from Missouri fixed the amount proposed by his amendment, so that if it is applied to the \$2,450,000,000, there will result the saving contemplated by him?

Mr. KEM. My amendment is drawn as an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's amendment is really an amendment to the committee amendment. Under the parliamentary situation it had to be offered to the Hayden amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder whether the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri is so drawn so as to bring the reduction down to the figure of \$1,950,000,000?

Mr. KEM. I should like to have it considered so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first vote would come on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 minutes.

As Senators will note, the amendment I offer would reduce the amount to be appropriated to the Economic Cooperation Administration for the fiscal ending June 30, 1951, to \$1,950,000,000. Furthermore, the amendment would eliminate from the appropriation bill the sum of \$276,761,473, which was carried over from last year's appropriations. The total saving effected by this amendment would be \$718,691,473, or a saving of approximately \$1,000,000,000 in the original budget estimate.

I should like to invite attention particularly to the fact that the amendment would in no way affect the appropriations for assistance to the Republic of Korea, the military-aid program, or several other programs included in the foreign-aid section of the pending measure. My amendment applies solely to the economic-aid program for western Europe.

The unexpended balance for the fiscal year 1950, which amounts to more than \$276,000,000, is the amount that was appropriated to the ECA but not used during the last 12 months. I see no justification, Mr. President, for its being reappropriated. As I have said before, Administrator Hoffman is to be congratulated on making this saving. But the amount should be a saving to the United States. Merely because a saving was made in 1 year is no reason why it should be made available in another year.

Mr. President, this is a time for realism. It is a time for us to think and act in the light of things as they are. It is a time to reject and repudiate all unrealizable and visionary plans and schemes. It is my firm conviction that the amount provided in the bill for foreign aid is unrealistic in view of the position in which we now find ourselves both from a financial and military point of view. Our national debt is more than \$257,000,000,000. Even if \$10,000,000,000 would cover the added cost of the Korean war during the present fiscal year, the deficit, in the absence of an in-

crease in taxes, would amount to approximately \$17,000,000,000.

It is no wonder, Mr. President, that our foreign friends cannot understand why we are not paying our own debts, or at least balancing our budget, instead of paying their debts and building at the cost of the American taxpayers, expensive improvements all over western Europe, with the exception of Spain.

A few days ago the ECA released its report to the Advisory Board. In this report, on page 21, there is an interesting table entitled "Counterpart Fund Withdrawals by Purpose, in Dollar Equivalents, as of May 31."

This table contains a breakdown of the purposes for which ECA has permitted the participating countries to spend the Marshall plan matching funds, the so-called counterpart funds. \$1,042,000,000 worth of counterpart funds have been used to retire the debts of several Marshall plan countries. The amount thus used, it will be noted, is in excess of a billion dollars. \$558,000,000 worth have gone for electric, gas, and power projects in Marshall-plan countries; \$331,000,000 worth for agriculture and forestry; \$224,000,000 worth for railroads; \$196,000,000 worth for manufacturing establishments; \$57,000,000 worth for roads, waterways, and harbors; \$208,000,000 for housing; \$75,000,000 worth for merchant and fishing fleets.

From a military standpoint it is certainly not in the interest of our boys on the fighting front for us at this time to be giving away critical materials, vast quantities of things that may be necessary to prosecute the war. The kinds of materials I have in mind are \$200,000,000 worth of industrial materials produced in the United States, including iron, steel, aluminum, copper, zinc, and industrial chemicals. Those materials the ECA proposes to send to western Europe in the year for which provision is now being made. ECA also proposes to give away \$448,700,000 worth of industrial machinery and equipment; \$7,500,000 worth of rubber and rubber products; and more than \$77,000,000 worth of petroleum and petroleum products.

So, Mr. President, we are increasing our own debt day by day, and it is proposed that we continue the shipment to Marshall plan countries of vast quantities of critical war materials which we ourselves might well need before too long.

Not only that, Mr. President, but we are facing the specter of inflation. Nothing will feed the fires of inflation more than, first, the issuing of obligations of the Government to cover a deficit; second, creating a shortage in the available supply of goods. The large appropriations for foreign aid in the pending bill will have a direct effect in both respects.

Mr. President, I sometimes think the people back home in their thinking are a bit ahead of those of us who sit here in the Halls of Congress. Sometimes it is difficult to see the forest for the trees. A few days ago I received a letter from one of my fellow citizens in Kansas City, Mo. He describes himself as "a little man, a cab driver and my wife is a waitress, but we can read, and listen and wonder. We

are beginning to see why we must pay such exorbitant taxes, and beginning to wonder what kind of men are leading us."

Then he says:

Do you blame us? Where does Congress get the idea the rank and file of the people are in favor of the Marshall plan? They are not now, and never have been. I talk to over 30 passengers every night, and not 1 in 20 is in favor of it, and the ones who are, have relatives over there. There is something decidedly smelly about the whole aid-to-Europe program.

Mr. President, I have had occasion before to refer to shipments of war materials by Marshall-plan countries to Russia and her satellites. This is an ironical situation. It was hardly to be expected, in view of our overgenerous gifts of economic aid to the participating countries. However, the facts are plain, and, so far as I know, have never been denied.

For instance, it has been frequently said on the floor of the Senate that the Marshall-plan countries have 96 separate trade treaties with Russia and other countries behind the iron curtain. Great Britain, for example, has bilateral trade agreements with Russia, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Hungary, and Poland. Pursuant to these treaties a wide variety of materials, many of them potential articles and materials of war, are being constantly shipped by the Marshall-plan countries to Russia and the satellites.

On July 17 I put into the RECORD a table of shipments of war materials from Great Britain, Belgium-Luxemburg, and France, to Russia. The information in these tables was furnished me by the Department of Commerce. The original tables covered only the year 1949. The Department of Commerce later furnished me additional information covering shipments made to Russia and the satellites from the Marshall-plan countries during the first 4 months of 1950. I have now some further information which covers the month of May this year, bringing the information approximately up to date. This information shows that a great deal of such material is being shipped, and the shipments of certain materials are at a constantly accelerated rate.

I have emphasized the shipments of war materials from Marshall-plan countries to Russia because I believe it is a very important matter. It is important to know whether our boys who are having to face tanks in Korea, which are superior to any we have on that front, are facing equipment which has been fabricated from goods shipped to Russia by our allies.

The Department of Commerce has furnished me with information showing that in one case war materials imported into Great Britain have been reexported to Russia and the satellites. During the 5 months which ended May 31, 1950, more than \$2,633,900 worth of machine tools were exported by Britain to Russia, Finland, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. Four hundred fifty-four thousand five hundred and thirty-eight dollars worth of these tools were exported during the month of May alone. That is new information, so far as I am concerned.

During the 5 months which ended May 21, 1950, Britain reexported—note this, Mr. President—reexported more than \$67,320 worth of machine tools. Machine tools are being given to Great Britain under the Marshall plan.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the time is limited, and I suggest that the eminent Senator from Vermont secure time from the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar]. I know the views of the Senator from Vermont on this matter very well, and I think he belongs on the other side.

Mr. FLANDERS. I intend simply to raise a question as to the information the Senator has just given.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. KEM. I decline to yield at this time. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator later.

In connection with our own consideration of the item in the appropriations bill for foreign aid, I believe the Senate will be interested in some figures which I have obtained from the State Department respecting the number of ships, combatant and otherwise, which the United States turned over to Russia during World War II. I have been surprised at the lack of success which the administration has had in securing the return of those ships.

These figures show that we transferred to the Russians 585 naval craft of various types, and that 459 of those naval craft are still in the hands of the Russians, and reported to be in operable condition. We have been able to get back from Russia only 28 ships. Others were reported as lost, damaged, and stuck in the ice.

Of the 96 American merchant ships which Russia had at the end of the war, 84 are still in the hands of the Russians, and presumably in usable condition. We have had returned to us seven tankers and one old cargo vessel. Merchant ships which the Russians retained include 36 Liberty ships.

The naval craft which were transferred to the Russians include 3 ice breakers, 28 frigates, 77 minesweepers, 78 large submarine chasers, 62 small submarine chasers, 205 torpedo boats, 36 LCI's, that is, landing craft-infantry, 17 LCT's, that is, landing craft tanks; 2 LCV's, that is, landing craft vehicle, 2 LCS's, that is, landing craft support, 54 LCM's that is, landing craft mechanized, 4 floating repair shops, 15 river tugs, 6 pontoon bridges, 1 motor launch, 1 plane personnel boat.

The ships we have been able to get back consist of only 1 ice breaker and 27 frigates.

My information is that a request has been made by the State Department for the return of only 217 of the naval ships, and there has been no request whatever that any of the merchant ships be returned.

I may say, Mr. President, in passing, that I think several questions should be answered by the State Department. Why have we not been able to get any more of our ships back? Who deter-

mined that a request for our merchant ships should not be made? Who has been conducting the negotiations for the return of a part of the naval ships with so little success? The soft policy against Russia at Yalta, Potsdam, and since, has played a major part in placing the United States in the unfortunate position in which it finds itself today.

Mr. President, I now want to say a few words as to why I think that is very significant. That has to do with the ability of the Marshall-plan countries to defend themselves. On July 27 Mr. Winston Churchill was reported as speaking in the House of Commons, as follows:

"It looks as if there is at present no effective defense in western Europe beyond the Channel." He said that unless government spokesmen could prove otherwise, he believed "the preparations of the western union to defend itself certainly stand on a far lower level than those of the South Koreans."

In the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 23 there appears a very interesting article, an Associated Press dispatch from Frankfurt, Germany, written by Wes Gallagher. I shall quote from it in part:

If war comes between the west and Russia, the United States will have to fight and pay the lion's share of it.

A glimpse at western Europe's defenses today shows them not only feeble and inadequate, but with little prospect of real strengthening in the future.

President Truman's request Wednesday for \$10,000,000,000 more for defense means each American taxpayer will be paying nearly 50 cents out of each dollar for defense. No western European is paying more than 25 cents on each dollar and most of them far less for their defense.

There are varied reasons why some nations are not paying more. Many suffered such heavy war damages they have had to devote their attention to rebuilding economically. France cannot get large defense budgets through its strife-torn assembly without tumbling the government.

Budgets of seven of the main nations of western Europe show less than \$4,000,000,000 will be spent on arms this year. This compares with \$25,000,000,000 being spent by the United States, which represents 48 percent of the total United States Government expenditures.

Mr. President, I ask at this time that there be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table of the comparative defense budgets of these countries, all in dollars.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative defense budgets
[All in dollars]

Nation	For defense	Percent ¹
Britain.....	\$2, 186, 800, 000	20
France.....	1, 200, 000, 000	18.9
Netherlands.....	223, 000, 000	25
Belgium.....	163, 662, 520	11
Italy ²	123, 000, 000	8.5
Denmark.....	48, 000, 000	16.5
Norway.....	40, 000, 000	12.5

¹ Percentage of total budget.

² Total Italian defense budget is \$538,380,000, but major portion goes to civil aviation, veterans administration, housing, etc.

Mr. KEM. Then to continue from Mr. Gallagher's dispatch:

Even if all the western European nations would put aside their sovereignty, increase their budgets and push building up of their

defenses, military men estimate it would take a minimum of 2 and probably 4 years to build adequate forces to balance current Russian power.

So, Mr. President, we find ourselves having loaned to Russia during World War I a tremendous armament of naval ships and a great fleet of merchant ships. We have had no success or practically none in getting those ships back, although many of them, as I have just said, are understood to be in sound operable condition. In other words, they are in condition to be used against the United States; and now we propose to continue to build hydroelectric plants, railroad terminals, railroads, aqueducts, bridges, and military highways in western Europe, where in the course of time, if Mr. Churchill is correct, and if what Mr. Gallagher says is true—the ability of the countries of western Europe to defend themselves to protect these gifts of ours will be somewhat dubious.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have allowed myself 30 minutes, and I should prefer to continue with my speech. Then, if some time remains, I shall be glad to yield to the able Senator from Utah and to the able Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri declines to yield at this time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words more about the way our money is being spent. As I have said, I think this is a time for realism. Yet, Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star for July 15 revealed that ECA is in the night-club business in Rome; we are reported as helping to pay the rent for a swank Roman night club. According to the Evening Star's report, the club is replete with creamy furniture, sumptuous decorations, and a doorman clothed in green and gold. Someone may say that the amount involved in that undertaking is small—only \$15,000. However, Mr. President, \$15,000 would pay for a 155-millimeter howitzer so badly needed in the front lines in Korea today.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that the issue before the Senate today is a rather clean-cut one, namely, is it to be funds for creamy furniture in a night club in Rome or funds for a gambling casino in Le Havre—also being built with ECA funds—or is it to be money for guns and modern equipment for our boys in the front lines in Korea today? As Mr. Truman has said, "You have got to make up your minds. It is one or the other."

Mr. President, in view of the course of events, I think it is out of order for us to make commitments to the extent provided in this bill for economic aid in western Europe at this time.

If my amendment is adopted, the taxpayers of the United States will be saved, and will have available for other purposes, in excess of \$700,000,000; and still the ECA will have available for its program in western Europe the princely sum of \$1,950,000,000.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the Sen-

ator's time is exhausted. If it is not, I should like to ask him a question in his time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, have I consumed my 30 minutes? I think I have about done so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has approximately 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KEM. Then I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri if he was saying, a few minutes ago, that \$67,000,000 worth of machine tools had been exported from America to England and that the identical machine tools were re-exported from England to Russia.

Mr. KEM. I said that at the same time that we were giving machine tools to Great Britain, machine tools were being exported by Great Britain to Russia and the satellites. I said, further, that the records show that in the month in question, England imported an amount of machine tools which subsequently were exported—the same, identical machine tools—to Russia and the satellites.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from Missouri did not give the figures for that transaction, did he?

Mr. KEM. Yes, I did.

Mr. FLANDERS. Were those the figures for the same, identical machine tools?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to repeat them.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the question I was asking.

Mr. KEM. I do not know whether they were Marshall plan machine tools, but they were identical machine tools shipped from the United States.

Mr. FLANDERS. Sixty-seven million dollars' worth, as I recall.

Mr. KEM. It was \$67,000 worth, I believe.

Mr. FLANDERS. Oh, then I feel concerned, but not quite as much concerned as I feared I was going to be.

Mr. KEM. I shall repeat my statement, for the benefit of the Senator from Vermont. During the 5 months ended May 31, 1950, more than \$2,633,900 worth of machine tools were exported by Britain to Russia, Finland, Poland, and Czechoslovakia—\$454,538 worth of these tools were exported during the month of May alone.

During the 5 months which ended May 31, 1950, Britain reexported more than \$67,320 worth of machine tools, and machine tools are being given to Britain under the Marshall plan.

Does that clear up the matter?

Mr. FLANDERS. That answers the question, yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has used 31 minutes.

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the amendment I have offered to the committee amendment on page 447 in line 18, namely, to strike out "\$2,391,930,000" and insert "\$2,450,000,000."

I should like to state that when this item was under study by the Appropriations Committee, it received very careful consideration. Upon recommendation by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], we voted an amount of \$2,500,000,000. On that question, on a record vote, the result showed 11 in favor and 10 opposed.

It had been suggested by other members of the committee that the amount should be \$2,450,000,000; and at that time I moved to reconsider, in order that we might have a more nearly unanimous committee report. That was done; and by a vote of 17 to 3 the amount was fixed at \$2,450,000,000.

Subsequently, a few days later, a motion was made to cut the appropriation by 10 percent under the budget estimate. The action on that question resulted in the further reduction of \$58,070,000 which leaves the amount that now appears in the bill.

It is to restore the appropriation in the amount voted in the committee by a majority of 17 to 3 that I have offered the amendment to the committee amendment.

In regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri to my amendment to the committee amendment—

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator on what date that vote was taken in the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. About 3 weeks ago.

Mr. KEM. Let me inquire what day of the month it was.

Mr. HAYDEN. On June 29.

Mr. KEM. That was just 2 days after the operations began in Korea. Would the Senator from Arizona agree that our situation has taken on an entirely different aspect since that date?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; and therefore I am more than ever convinced that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri to my amendment to the committee amendment should not be adopted, for the following reasons: It is a favorite maxim of Josef V. Stalin that "production wins wars." He has made that statement many times from the platform and has repeated it in his writings.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Was it not also a favorite maxim of Lenin's that, "We shall cause the Americans to spend themselves to their destruction"?

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, everyone knows that the Communists would like to see a financial panic in this country. But permit me to proceed.

The greatest single deterrent to an all-out Communist attack on the peace of the world today is that Stalin and his Politburo know that in two world wars the United States has demonstrated its capacity to produce abundantly every type of munitions and all the material needed to carry on that kind of war.

The decisive factor is always military strength resting upon a firm, secure foundation of economic strength.

The critical importance of western Europe to the free world can be illustrated with a few figures: Western Europe has 274,000,000 people. The Soviet Union and its satellites in Europe have approximately 255,000,000 people. Steel capacity in western Europe, including of course, that of Great Britain, is about 50,000,000 tons a year as against 31,000,000 tons in all the Soviet sphere. Coal output in western Europe is about one and one-half times as great as in eastern Europe, counting in the Soviet Republic. Western Europe's electric power is now almost five times larger than that of eastern Europe, and its system of transport is infinitely superior, as is its level of skills.

Why should we allow the Communists to more than double their ability to defeat us by securing possession of these industrial resources of western Europe?

It is only against this background that the supreme significance of Marshall plan accomplishments can be properly appraised. During the first 2 years of its operation, it has sparked an increase of 24 percent in average industrial production for all participating countries. This becomes all the more dramatic and heartening when we look at individual figures for industries of central importance to defense production. There has been, under the Marshall plan, a 52-percent rise in steel output, and 58 percent for cement, along with 21 percent for electric power, and 17 percent for hard coal. At the same time, there has been a 30-percent rise in the yield for all grains, 19 percent for fats and oils, and 16 percent for meat.

Hence in the event of a shooting war on the Continent, western Europe is now in a much better position to feed itself without the need to ship vast quantities of American and Canadian foods in bottoms that would then be required for war matériel.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Of this whole allocation, how much money is to go for food?

Mr. HAYDEN. The point is that we do not now have to send wheat to Europe, because they are producing it themselves.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point. So when the Senator says they need food—

Mr. HAYDEN. I did not say that. I said the conditions had improved so that the European people can feed themselves, but that we can help to improve their economic position.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That implies that we need to continue the same amount of food shipments.

Mr. HAYDEN. It implies nothing of the kind. It implies less need for food-stuffs, as I have just stated.

Mr. WHERRY. Why should we not then transfer the aid funds to military needs, if food is in abundance and clothing is in abundance?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not think the Senator heard me.

Mr. WHERRY. I heard every word.

Mr. HAYDEN. If we can help to create a sound economic situation in western Europe, with ability on their part to support their armies, then they are in a much better position to fight communism.

Mr. WHERRY. Well, they have food, they have clothing—what else do they need except military equipment? That is the point the Senator from Missouri made.

Mr. HAYDEN. Their need is for more steel and more coal to use in making munitions.

Mr. WHERRY. They are getting the steel from us, from which to manufacture the equipment.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; they are making it themselves.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator say now that food and clothing are taken care of, that military equipment would be the next thing in order, so far as appropriations are concerned?

Mr. HAYDEN. If I had to say that, then I would also say that we should cut down in our economic effort in the United States and put the money into arms and a larger army.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly our unnecessary expenditures should be cut down and transferred not only to home but also in order to further the national defense. That is exactly the position the Senator from Nebraska has taken, and that is exactly what the Senator from Missouri has been suggesting.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask the Senator from Nebraska to please debate that question in the time of some other Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona declines to yield further.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Marshall plan is developing an integrated economic power which in turn is giving rise to an integrated military power both of which are being welded with our own. Let us never forget that the Atlantic Pact could never have been signed, or if signed, would have been meaningless, unless the Marshall plan had first revived and vitalized western Europe's economy; unless the Marshall plan had first pushed back the Communist thrust to take over; unless the Marshall plan had made it possible for western Europe to turn out some arms today, but many tomorrow, for its own protection and ours.

Too sudden a diversion of Marshall plan aid from general industrial purposes to specific military purposes, at this stage, would plunge western Europe into that disorder from which it has only lately emerged. It would derange, for the sake of an immediate and piddling arms production, the soundness of an economy which promises prodigious arms production later on. In this whole situation, timing is the key. Let us always keep in the front of our minds the central fact that western Europe has become laboratory and pilot plant for a

United States foreign policy that is bold, affirmative, and tough-minded. The Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact are the twin motors of that foreign policy and the forerunners of its application elsewhere. What has been done in western Europe can be duplicated wherever necessary in the rest of the non-Communist world.

Let us therefore, not be guilty of the murderous stupidity of impairing the Marshall plan which has proven its value by its deeds, and which against handicaps has shown that the ways of freedom can win. The Marshall plan has pioneered not only the single greatest success of our foreign policy but has also fashioned the formula for a foreign policy that makes sense. It brings to its job an accumulation of skills and experience that can develop and extend that formula around the globe. The Marshall plan, in its aims and techniques is the hard core of our foreign policy, tested and tempered. To do it damage would be in Bismarck's phrase "worse than a crime, a blunder"—a blunder that would haunt us all our days.

Let me ask, how can a starving people, a dispirited people, be expected to fight when they have no incentive even to live, much less to fight? To the extent that we have restored and improved the economic condition of the people of Europe, we have made it possible for them to develop a fighting spirit which can aid us in a world-wide defense against the advance of communism. My judgment therefore is that the proposal of the Senator from Missouri is contrary to the best interest of our own national defense. I have always said that we might practice altruism, and we might well say that we could not see people starved, but the prime purpose of and the controlling reason for the Marshall plan has been the defense of the United States of America.

Any wavering of United States interest in the Marshall plan, any crippling cuts in financial support for any of its interlocking activities would have a disastrous effect upon western Europe today. For the Marshall plan is not only the sign and seal of United States partnership but also the way by which western Europe can attain the strength, economic, political, moral, and military, which, in today's world, are the precursors of peace.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I find that I have prepared remarks that would require somewhat longer than 15 minutes for delivery. Therefore, I shall ask unanimous consent that the early part of my statement be incorporated in the RECORD, and that I may proceed with that part of my statement which I feel is important to the discussion which is now under way.

Before doing that, I may say that, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and as one who has watched very closely the historic progress of European recovery through the ECA program, I rise to oppose any further reduction in the amount to be appropriated for the ECA. I wish also to announce my support for the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to raise the amount of new money for economic cooperation from \$2,391,930,000 to \$2,450,000,000. This figure, added to the estimated carry-over from fiscal 1950, would make available to ECA a total of some \$2,727,000,000.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in my remarks the few pages which I shall pass over without reading.

There being no objection, the portion of the statement referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My support of this figure rests on two grounds. The first is that sharp reductions have already been made, and that any further substantial reduction this year would gravely imperil the whole program.

My second reason is that today, more than ever, the ECA program is a vital element in the defense of the United States.

Let me consider first of all the question of reductions. It was anticipated from the beginning that the annual figures for ECA would decrease at a rate of about \$1,000,000,000 a year, beginning at about \$5,000,000,000 and declining to about \$4,000,000,000 in the second year, \$3,000,000,000 in the third, and \$2,000,000,000 in the fourth and last year.

We have done better than that, Mr. President. In the present year the figure authorized by the Senate, plus the carry-over from fiscal 1950, was about \$2,977,000,000. The committee figure, as adjusted by the Hayden amendment, brings us to a total of about \$2,727,000,000. This is eight and three-quarters percent below the amount authorized by the Senate. It is also over 9 percent below the \$3,000,000,000 originally forecast for the third year of the program.

Nevertheless, the question has been raised whether a greater reduction cannot safely be made, in light of the other great demands upon our economy. An amendment has been proposed which would bring about a reduction in available funds, as compared with the amount authorized, of nearly 35 percent. We have heard another proposal that the entire program should be abolished. I feel that these proposals should be immediately answered.

There are several points that we must remember. The first is that the ECA has been so cooperative in cutting its earlier estimates that in light of recent domestic price rises the actual size of the 1951 ECA program, in terms of goods and services, will have to be very substantially reduced. A decline in United States prices enabled the ECA on May 25 to submit a reduced estimate of \$2,933,000,000, including carry-over, which was 1½ percent below the total authorized by Congress. The Hayden amendment brings us to a total figure more than 7 percent below this final ECA estimate.

But since that final ECA estimate was made, prices in this country have advanced rapidly. They are already at or beyond a point where the program originally planned by ECA for the current year would cost some \$300,000,000 more than the revised estimate. In effect, the price rise in this country, even allowing for a resulting increase in European dollar earnings through exports to the United States, has already brought about a further material cut in the size of the pro-

gram which ECA can carry out this year. We must remember that fact in considering any proposed new cuts.

The second fact which we must remember is that a cut in ECA dollar aid is multiplied many times in its dampening effect on the European economy. In very many instances, where dollar aid allows a European businessman to buy a key piece of machinery in the United States, or to buy raw materials for processing in his own factory, the resulting increase in economic activity in Europe is several times the amount of the dollar aid involved. These are the multiplying factors which have made it possible for the total economy of western Europe to rebound so rapidly in the first 2 years of the program. Naturally, when the impact of every ECA dollar is multiplied in this way, the impact of any reduction in the ECA program is multiplied in the same degree. Thus a relatively small reduction in this carefully calculated appropriation for ECA will have an adverse effect on the European economy far out of proportion to the amount of money we save in our national budget.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, having discussed two of the points, I proceed now to the next one.

The third point I want to stress is in answer to the argument that the Marshall-plan countries no longer need our aid because, it is said, they are already better off than they were before World War II. In my judgment this is entirely incorrect. To be sure the industrial production of the participating countries is now 120 percent of the 1938 level. But if we are to have the whole picture clearly in mind we must also remember the following factors:

First, Agricultural production, even though the ECA program has raised it almost as dramatically as industrial production, is still below prewar levels.

Second. The income from the so-called invisible exports—overseas investments, shipping, tourism, banking, and other services—which before the war accounted for a very significant share of European income and an even larger share of their foreign exchange, is now a mere fraction of the prewar figure.

In studying this question we have all been interested in raising that figure so far as we could, but at the moment it is merely a fraction of the prewar figure.

Third. To make up for the wear and tear of the war years, capital investment, as distinguished from consumption, is claiming a larger share of current production than it did before the war.

Fourth. The total population of these Marshall-plan countries has increased considerably since 1938.

All these factors add up to the undeniable fact that the conditions of life in these countries today are still well below those of 1938. We cannot do away with this fact simply by ignoring it. Dramatic progress has indeed been made since the almost desperate period before ECA began, but a great deal more needs to be done before western Europe can go ahead without dollar aid.

Now, the three major points which I have inserted without discussing them, I shall now sum up.

First. Because even with the Hayden amendment we will be making a 9 percent cut in the amount authorized for ECA, and because of the sharp increase in America prices in recent months the

ECA program for fiscal 1951 will have to be very substantially curtailed as compared with original plans—even if no further cut is made. That is one of the things which have been very clear, especially since the Korean crisis. Prices have gone up, and further aid has been cut accordingly.

Second. Because of the fact that every dollar of ECA aid means several dollars of new economic activity in the participating countries any reduction in a carefully planned ECA program means an adverse effect on European recovery several times greater than the amount of the reduction. Of course, that applies also to every dollar they get to put into plants to make military matériel.

Third. Despite spectacular production progress since the dark days of 1947 the conditions of life in the ECA countries are still well below those of 1938, and much further progress must be made if we are to have stable economies in Europe.

The facts lead inevitably to the conclusion that the reductions already made are very substantial and that if we go beyond these reductions we will jeopardize the entire movement toward European recovery and self-reliance, which, Mr. President, I feel are an essential part of an all-out military activity in those countries.

Now, Mr. President, even if these points are agreed to, the question remains, What good is this program to us, the American people? What is it worth, especially in light of the new military emergency? In concluding I wish to address myself to that question.

In my judgment, the ECA program for European recovery is more than ever a vital element in the defense and security of the United States. From the beginning this program has been presented to us, and quite accurately so, as a measure of defense against communism. I may say in passing that I think it is more than that; I think it is also a positive, constructive program to enable these free peoples with whom we share a common civilization once again to live decently, to maintain and develop their free institutions, and once again to contribute to the free world the tremendous strength and vitality of which they are capable. But let us for the moment view the ECA program simply as a defense against communism, because even though that is the negative side of the picture it may be a matter of life and death today. In my judgment the importance of ECA from that point of view is greater than ever. There are two reasons for this, one political and psychological, and the other military.

First, as to the political aspect, it is known that people who are hungry and discontented turn to extreme political movements. That is why the Communist Parties had such tremendous successes in France and Italy just after the war, and we know what a vital part the passage of the first ECA bill in 1948 played in preventing the Communists from winning the Italian election that spring. Even in other countries, where communism is not numerically strong on the surface, its potential power—and

that of other extremist groups with which communism collaborates when it is convenient to do so—is greatly enhanced by the presence of miserable and disaffected groups whose governments are unable to improve their lot.

That is true all over the world today. That is the angle which the Russians are using with such terrible effect.

The contribution which the ECA program has made in preventing these disastrous political developments can never be measured, but there can be no question that it has been vitally important. It has immeasurably bolstered the political and psychological defenses of western Europe. If it is abandoned now, those defenses will be in grave danger.

The second reason why the ECA is vital to our security has directly to do with military defense. Because we in America have viewed western Europe as a strategically vital area—perhaps the most vital in the world outside our own shores—and because we have seen that Communist possession of this area with its great industrial power and its long Atlantic coast line would place us in the gravest kind of military danger, we negotiated and ratified the North Atlantic Treaty, and we inaugurated a program of military assistance to these countries. Now, in the face of the Korean crisis, it is expected that this military assistance program will be greatly accelerated, and that a great share of the new equipment required for the common defense will be manufactured in Europe.

I desire to stress that statement. A great share of the new equipment required for the common defense will be manufactured in Europe. That is what we will be doing with the military-aid program and the ECA program.

But this military-defense program cannot succeed unless these countries maintain and increase their economic health. At the beginning we made it clear that European recovery would have priority over the military program under the Atlantic Pact. Now, it is obvious that the priority has had to be reversed under the pressure of circumstances. But it is as true as ever that to build up military defense without also building up the economic foundations of the countries concerned would be like building a structure on sand. There is no essential part of the economy of a country that does not contribute to its total posture of military defense. Roads, hydroelectric-power projects, food production, manufacture of steel, clothing, and countless other items are basically necessary for defense. And these are the very sectors of the European economy in which the ECA is capable of building up production and economic health.

In addition to this basic relationship between economic progress and defense, it now appears essential that ECA should contribute directly to military production in the participating countries by releasing counterpart funds for manufacture of military equipment. That is my own personal judgment, and I think it is important that we should consider it at once.

In light of these facts, Mr. President, I think we would be clearly mistaken if

we were to take the view that ECA and the military program are incompatible. Far from being in conflict, they vitally reinforce each other. Taking them both together, in the strategically vital area of free Europe, we are now planning a greatly expanded over-all effort. Simultaneously we are planning a shift in the emphasis of that effort in the direction of greater military defense. I may add that this expanded effort, and this shift in emphasis, both apply to the European countries themselves, fully as much as they apply to the United States.

But this shift in emphasis need not mean, and must not mean, abandonment or drastic curtailment of economic recovery. Economic recovery becomes more essential than ever, viewed as an integral part of the political and military defense and the military potential of these countries, whose safety is so vital to our own.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I urge the rejection of any amendment further reducing the appropriation for the Economic Cooperation Administration. In my carefully considered judgment, this appropriation is a basic element in the defense and security of the American people at this critical time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If I have time to yield, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator where he proposes that the Government of the United States get the money which he wants to send to western Europe for economic aid?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It must come from all the people, realizing that it is a part of our strategic defense in this critical hour.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator realize that the budget is out of balance, and will be more out of balance, approximately \$17,000,000,000, for the current year if we appropriate \$10,000,000,000 for military defense?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from New Jersey does realize that, but we must tighten our belts.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from New Jersey know of any proposal to raise that very large amount of additional money during the current fiscal year?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. This year and next year I think we can do it. The Finance Committee is now studying the subject.

Mr. KEM. Just where does the Senator propose to get the money?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not a member of the Finance Committee, but I have discussed it with Senators who are members of that committee, and they think it can be found on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Mr. KEM. Where can we get this enormous sum of money?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I imagine it will have to be done by increasing income taxes all along the line.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator think our economy can stand such an increase of income taxes?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That would apply to the whole military budget.

All the bill calls for on this point is \$2,000,000,000. The military budget is \$13,000,000,000, plus \$10,000,000,000, plus \$4,000,000,000, the request for which will come to us today.

Mr. KEM. I understood the Senator from New Jersey to say that the military should have priority.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The military certainly must have priority, but I consider the economic program which I am discussing to be a high point in the whole military picture. Without economic recovery, we cannot have military recovery.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator whether it is not true that the Senator from Missouri is against all ECA appropriations. He offers an amendment to cut them a certain amount, but is it not a fact that he is not for any of them, and never has been?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I cannot answer the question of the distinguished Senator from Texas. No doubt the Senator from Missouri can answer it himself. The Senator from Missouri is troubled by the enormous figure for military expenditures, and overlooks, it seems to me, the fact that for ECA it is only \$2,000,000,000 as against \$20,000,000,000, at a time when this \$2,000,000,000 is as important to our security program as any part of the military program.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I fully agree with what the Senator from New Jersey has said as to the necessity and the importance of the ECA program. The Senator from New Jersey has been discussing our fight against communism and the urgency of taking care of western Europe. Does the Senator from New Jersey mean western Europe from the standpoint of particular governments, or western Europe as a geographic unit?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. So far as the Senator from New Jersey is concerned, of course the immediate matter before us at the present time is the ECA program with respect to ECA countries. If I gather what the Senator from New Mexico has in mind, he is indicating that we should include all of western Europe. I agree with him that we should consider it as a geographic unit and move right in on that basis. I would include Spain, too.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I ask that he be granted one more minute so that I may ask another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time is under the control of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator from New Jersey agree with me that if this fight against communism is worth while, and if the ECA program is worth while—and I believe ECA as a whole is

worth while—both Germany and Spain should be included in the program if the desires of the Senator, which he has stated so well, are to be realized.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In order to clarify my position I may say that I think Spain should be included in our considerations. So far as the people of Japan and Germany are concerned—and I include Japan also—I think they too should be given the opportunity at least voluntarily to come in and defend their own countries and civilizations. They should not be made to stand defenseless against being attacked.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only that, but the geography which is involved should be considered as well. If we are to take care of western Europe, how can we carry on the fight without including Germany and Spain?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think western Germany should be included, and I should like to see all of Germany included in order to prevent the onrush of communism.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Kem amendment which seeks a reduction in ECA appropriations to \$1,950,000,000. The "watchdog committee," after an elaborate study, presented very firm evidence before the Appropriations Committee, in which it recommended \$2,200,000,000. If we add the amount of money which the Administrator has not used during the last year, which is upward of \$200,000,000, the Kem amendment provides an amount which comes close to the amount which the "watchdog committee" felt was necessary for ECA.

Mr. President, I believe an emergency exists. Certainly I would be willing to appropriate all the money and shall vote to appropriate all the money that is necessary for the military to accomplish the mission in the face of the challenge which now confronts the administration in the Korean situation. However, I ask my distinguished colleagues who are arguing against the Kem amendment, on the theory that we cannot cut any one of the projects covered, to turn to page 383 of the hearings on the foreign aid appropriations. There we find listed 22 projects, including Jamaica irrigation project, Gold Coast road development project, Northern Rhodesia road project, and British Honduras road project. I was in British Honduras last year. That project has not even been started. All that is being done about it is to attempt to sell to the people the idea of British Honduras. Several hundred thousand dollars are asked for that project. Project after project of similar character could be listed. Mr. President, I would ask those who say seriously that they want to preserve the resources of the country if they feel that projects such as that, which they would not even start in this country today, are more important to our national defense than are the bullets and tanks which our soldiers now need? I ask them to answer that question. That is the whole thing in a nutshell.

We must use money that we do not need to spend on the foreign front and we must use money that we can spare on the domestic front to carry on military operations. I believe the expenses for military operations will increase. By way of a thumb-nail sketch only, we have MAP, \$4,200,000,000, and if we add to that figure the new military appropriations which are being asked and the appropriations for foreign aid, and similar items, such appropriations will aggregate nearly \$30,000,000,000.

I appeal to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to scrutinize these projects. I believe the President will scrutinize them. I would not be at all surprised, when he reviews the appropriations for foreign aid and also those for domestic purposes, that he will either rescind some of them or impound the money, which we need so badly at this time for our military forces. That makes sense.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I have only 15 minutes. However, I shall be glad to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have only a brief question to ask the Senator. I agree that all of it amounts to a lot of money. It runs into billions of dollars. Making these appropriations will hurt the American people. However, unless we do, what will we have instead?

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to the question of the Senator from New Mexico, the first thing we should do is to meet the challenge on the battlefield. Developments such as the road project in British Honduras can wait until we decide the issue in Korea. If we are to stop such projects in this country, we must stop them overseas as well. I was in British Honduras last year. To complete that road will take many years, and it has nothing to do with the present situation with which we are faced. I believe every Senator should see the reasonableness of the situation. I do not say that we should cut out all ECA appropriations. I say that with the recommendations of the "watchdog committee" together with cuts that can be made on projects such as those I have mentioned, the amount proposed under the Kem amendment can easily be adequate.

I rose to explain the amendment which I shall offer, and it is the only one I intend to offer. It has to do with the sale of strategic materials to the satellite countries and Russia. The amendment will be stated after 2 o'clock. The purpose of the amendment was suggested to the Senator from Nebraska by the debates on the floor of the Senate, participated in by many Senators, particularly my good friend from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. Its purpose would be to strengthen section 117 (d). That section provides:

The Administrator is directed to refuse delivery insofar as practicable, to partici-

pating countries of commodities which go into the production of any commodity for delivery to any nonparticipating European country which commodity would be refused export licenses to those countries by the United States in the interest of national security.

So far as I am able to determine, no organization has been developed by the ECA Administrator to effectuate this requirement. The difficulty which I am sure and other Members of the Senate have experienced in trying to get statistics with relation to western European trade proves that point. The "watchdog committee," to which I have referred previously, in its analysis of the ECA program, as published in March 1950 discussed this point in detail. It pointed out very forcefully the failure of the ECA to obtain cooperation from the participating countries, as provided for in section 117 (d). This is what the committee said. I read from their report:

The problem confronting Congress is the fact that after nearly 2 years the wholehearted cooperation of European countries receiving American aid in controlling the east-west trade has not been obtained. It presumably could be obtained if section 117 (d) were strengthened by directing the Administrator to withhold economic assistance from all countries which do not satisfy him that they have put into effect controls which prevent shipments of goods to the iron-curtain areas which the United States itself does not permit.

In this connection it must be recognized that this problem might fall more directly into the sphere of the North Atlantic Treaty and its administration. Nevertheless, certain countries receive economic assistance which do not participate in the foreign military assistance program. The fundamental question then remains as to whether American dollars should go to countries which do not carry out our policies concerning trade with Soviet-dominated countries.

I have been quoting from the report, Senate Document No. 142. We are confronted with a problem which not only I but the other Members of the Senate have presented in great detail. I have offered this amendment, which I am sure will strengthen the particular section of the basic ECA Act to which it is directed, which act was intended to accomplish the very thing that is intended by the amendment.

Certainly there is no doubt as to what we need. I should like to place in the RECORD at this point, because my time is very limited, exhibit A. Let me state that last year, 1949, according to information from the most recent reports, which are difficult to obtain, the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce, shows that there was \$1,098,000,000 worth of trade between western European and eastern European countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that exhibit A be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the exhibit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A
Western European trade with
eastern Europe

	Total, 1949
Austria	\$75,771,000
Belgium-Luxembourg	115,097,000
Denmark	55,473,000
France	105,616,000
Germany	59,248,000
Greece	4,780,000
Iceland	3,662,000
Ireland	288,000
Italy	86,247,000
Netherlands	107,002,000
Norway	54,987,000
Portugal	939,000
Sweden	109,213,000
Switzerland	70,314,000
Trieste	1,891,000
Turkey	30,838,000
United Kingdom	217,539,000
Grand total	1,098,905,000

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this exhibit shows the different countries which sold the goods. They include Belgium-Luxembourg—\$115,000,000 worth; France, \$105,000,000 worth; Netherlands, \$107,000,000 worth; Sweden, \$109,000,000 worth; United Kingdom, \$217,000,000 worth. And there were others.

The total for the first 3 months of 1950, according to the figures I have been able to get, which are not complete, was \$186,347,000. I am told that the sales are seasonable and that the first 3 months of this year compare quite favorably with the first 3 months of 1949.

Mr. President, I ask that the table showing these exports be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT B
Exports by ECA countries to eastern Europe,
first quarter of 1950

Austria	(¹)
Belgium-Luxembourg	\$19,603,000
Denmark	12,318,000
France	18,694,000
Greece	1,231,000
Germany	(¹)
Iceland	1,489,000
Ireland	(¹)
Italy	26,897,000
Netherlands	15,747,000
Norway	8,255,000
Portugal	373,000
Sweden	21,541,000
Switzerland	14,016,000
Turkey	3,651,000
United Kingdom	42,532,000
Total	186,347,000

¹ Not available.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the Washington Star of yesterday there was an article relative to the question I have been discussing. One of the paragraphs states:

Leaks, owing to transshipments, are heavy and difficult to block. The United States has many checks on leaks and places a great share of the responsibility for preventing them on the American exporter. Also ECA investigators in Europe follow the goods to their final destinations. Still transshipments

to the Soviet bloc reportedly have been numerous in western Europe. A recent report to Congress—

That is the report of the "watchdog committee"—

A recent report to Congress stated that an estimated \$200,000,000 in goods had been smuggled out of bizonal Germany in 1948.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator believe that the \$200,000,000 worth of goods were all strategic and critical materials, or were they merely ordinary goods?

Mr. WHERRY. With the information I have at hand I cannot say that every bit of the \$200,000,000 worth of goods was strategic material. What I propose by my amendment is to provide that no ECA country shall be paid any of the funds if it continues to ship to Russia goods such as oil, steel, and especially machine tools which can be used by the military for the purpose of making war, and which, as the distinguished Senator from Missouri pointed out very forcibly upon the floor of the Senate, were being shipped to Russia to be used in making more tools to produce more machinery which could be used against our forces in the field.

Mr. HAYDEN. Food, of course, is a war material.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator really advocate the absolute stoppage of all shipments of food?

Mr. WHERRY. No; my amendment does not provide for that at all. Under my amendment, if a participating country should ship food to the Russian Army, they would not get any more food, but so long as England, for instance, uses the food she obtained under ECA, and did not give it to the Russian Army, there would be no restriction. It is a very good amendment, and I hope the chairman of the committee will accept it, because it provides only that the material which is sent to a participating country must not be used to help the Russian forces. Certainly everyone should be for that. The Senator from Arizona does not want materials which can be used against American boys to be furnished to Red China through a satellite country does he?

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course not.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not want to have such materials shipped to some other country, and to go to the North Korean forces so as to help them defeat our boys, does he?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly not.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am seeking. Support my amendment, and all that will be stopped.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator indicated that \$200,000,000 worth of these supplies were strategic materials.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. The Senator knows I love him, he is one of my good friends, but the Senator from Nebraska never made such a statement. He showed that \$200,000,000 worth of

goods were being sent over. I did not say they were all strategic materials.

Mr. HAYDEN. How much was? That is the question.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish the Senator would find out. Our Intelligence does not know, and I cannot find that out. No one can find it out. I say it is the responsibility of the Administrator to enforce section 117 (d) of the basic act. If he knows that goods are being so shipped, he should stop the shipment of such materials to Russia.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator to the possibility, which I hope may eventuate, that we and the other free nations will develop enough military strength so that in a year or 2 years we will have such great strength that we will be able to retrieve the influence we threw away in 1945, and that then we can reasonably hope that the free elements in the satellite countries will have a chance, with our influence, working through the United Nations, to regain their freedom, and that the iron curtain will then be pushed back perhaps to the eastern frontier of Poland.

In that situation, does not the Senator from Nebraska think it would be a very great pity if we cut off all our channels of political influence and all our channels of intelligence, thereby putting the whole weight of the war on the backs of our own soldiers, and ignoring the fact that modern war is won in part by political and economic means? The Senator does not want to bring about that result, does he?

Mr. WHERRY. No. The Senator made a very positive and a very constructive statement. I am not at this time talking about the reduction amendment, I am talking about the amendment I offer, referring to strategic materials. That is what I am discussing. I wish to make the point that my amendment does not restrict in any way the relationship between the countries concerned, so long as the countries do not intentionally—and I emphasize the word "intentionally"—violate the provisions of section 117 (d) of the basic act, which provides that they shall not send strategic materials, knowingly, to one of the satellite countries, if it is a potential enemy. The Senator agrees with that, I am sure.

Mr. President, may I have another 2 minutes?

Mr. KEM. I yield two more minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for two more minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I am satisfied the Senator from Massachusetts desires to reach the same objective I have in mind.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I have just 2 minutes. Let me complete this point, and then I will yield. I read from the article in the Washington Star of yesterday:

In the interest of national security—

And that is what the Senator desires—

In the interest of national security, American officials believe technical information as well as strategic goods should be kept from the Soviet. But in the absence of censorship, the Nation has to rely on a voluntary control plan. The OIT has undertaken to advise American businessmen in doubt as to what may be sent.

Mr. President, what I should like to have established, and it would be provided by the amendment, would be a coordinated export license system applicable to the European countries which work with us, in order to prevent the export of strategic materials, and a coordinated plan so that these countries will not intentionally export materials which can be used by Russia or the satellite countries for war purposes.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I understood that the Senator's amendment was worded so broadly that it would stop virtually all the export trade.

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. LODGE. I would go along with an amendment which would prevent the sending of purely military materials, but I do not wish to cut off our channels of intelligence and make it impossible to use economic and political methods in the struggle in which we are engaged. The President has said—

Mr. WHERRY. Let me read my amendment at this time.

Mr. LODGE. Permit me to finish this thought. The President has said that one of our aims is to liberate Korea and that another of our aims is to become strong enough to resist aggression. Of course, those are two of our aims, but I think the President could have gone further. I think Americans want us to regain the initiative and organize peace in a free world. That is what I think the President ought to say. If we take young men away from their homes and jobs it ought to be for some great purpose: We ought to accomplish something radically new and that means a type of war we have not had before, because it involves the political and the military.

Mr. WHERRY. I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator from Massachusetts. Let me read the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield me one more minute?

Mr. KEM. I yield the Senator from Nebraska one additional minute.

Mr. WHERRY. I will read the amendment:

Provided further, That, during any period during which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations—

Which is the situation now—

no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which exports or permits the exportation, to the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics or any of its satel-

lite countries (including China and northern Korea), of any article or commodity—

Which is the language in section 117—

usable by, or which may be used in the manufacture of any article or commodity which may be useful to, the armed forces of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics or such satellite countries.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that includes food.

Mr. WHERRY. If food were used intentionally to help bolster the Russian Army the Senator would not want that to be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the amendment, and also the complete article published in the Star, part of which I read, but which I did not complete.

There being no objection, the amendment and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 448, line 24, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That, during any period during which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which exports or permits the exportation, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including China and northern Korea), of any article or commodity usable by, or which may be used in the manufacture of any article or commodity which may be useful to, the armed forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or such satellite countries."

WAR POTENTIAL GOODS REACHING RED SATELLITES DESPITE CONTROLS—FLOW OF MATERIALS DIMINISHES, BUT TOO MUCH IS GETTING BY, UNITED STATES OFFICIALS SAY

(By L. Edgar Prima)

Despite a stringent export control system here and pledges of cooperation from Marshall-plan countries, war-potential goods still are being shipped behind the iron curtain from the United States and western Europe.

Officials of the State and Commerce Departments and ECA say the flow is being cut down, but that too much is getting by, both openly and secretly.

Here are the reasons:

1. The Marshall-plan nations do not have a formal joint export control set-up. Most have individual systems, none of which is as strict as ours, while others apparently have no controls worthy of the name.

2. Leaks, owing to transshipments, are heavy and difficult to block. The United States has many checks on leaks, and places a great share of the responsibility for preventing them on the American exporter. Also, ECA investigators in Europe follow the goods to their final destinations. Still transshipments to the Soviet bloc reportedly have been numerous in western Europe. A recent report to Congress stated that an estimated \$200,000,000 in goods had been smuggled out of bizonal Germany in 1948. Bizonia produces many strategic items which the Russians are willing to buy at premium prices.

3. The customs systems of western Europe are far below the effectiveness of United States customs, and some prohibited goods

undoubtedly are exported illegally by Americans each year.

In this connection, an ECA official said, "Some of the Marshall-plan nations do not have any clear idea of what and how much some of their exporters are shipping."

MAJOR PROBLEM IS EUROPEAN

It was stressed that the problem is not so much the transshipment of goods produced in the United States. This problem is under fairly good control.

More important are shipments of items produced in western Europe and sent to other ECA countries or to Switzerland and then to iron-curtain nations.

For months, some legislators, led by Senator KEM, Republican, of Missouri, have been asked what the United States is doing to stop such leaks.

An opponent of ECA, Senator KEM said on July 17 that Commerce Department officials made it clear to him that Marshall-plan countries "still are making substantial shipments of war materials to Russia and her satellites."

He recommended that ECA Administrator Hoffman be given the power to halt all ECA aid to those countries permitting such shipments.

Senate Republican Leader WHERRY, who plans to introduce an amendment to the ECA portion of the omnibus appropriations bill tomorrow, agrees with Senator KEM. His amendment would bar ECA funds to any nation exporting to Russia or its satellites anything that might become useful for military purposes.

The attitude of ECA State Commerce Department official, however, is that such a step must be accompanied by "moral suasion." These nations are sovereign and would resent our interference, they explain.

EACH MUST MEET PROBLEM

Further, these officials hold that each nation has to meet the problem in light of its own trade and political relations with the Soviet bloc as well as its interest in the common security.

This explanation drew the sharp retort of "hogwash," from Senator KEM. He asserted that we had no reluctance about interfering in the Italian elections of 1948 nor in trying to promote the Schuman plan for a European iron-steel pool.

The American control system was set up in March 1948 to check the export of scarce strategic materials and to halt all shipments of such goods to the Soviet bloc as a matter of national security.

The Secretary of Commerce is in charge of the system. An interagency Advisory Committee on Requirements represents the Central Intelligence Agency, National Security Resources Board, ECA, and the State, Defense, Interior, and Agriculture.

The group helps with the security review of individual cases and the strategic evaluation of commodities. It approves the Positive List of Commodities, which is broken down into the so-called 1-A and 1-B lists.

1-A EXPORTS FORBIDDEN

Articles of greatest importance are in the 1-A category and may not be exported to iron curtain countries. They may be shipped to other countries, under license, however.

Items on the 1-B list, of lesser importance, may be exported to the Soviet orbit in certain restricted quantities.

An applicant for an American export license must furnish much specific information and faces criminal action for falsification. He must describe in detail the commodity to be shipped. He must name the country in which the goods will be consumed and the ultimate consignee. He must also list the names and addresses of all interested parties (agents, brokers, middlemen, etc.) and give specific details on the end-use of the item to be exported.

Marshall plan nations have been informed of our positive list and told why controls are important to the common security.

"We meet with the representatives of these countries in informal, continuing consultations," Wright, the State Department's assistant chief of the Economic and Securities staff, declared.

NATIONS ARE COOPERATING

"They know what we want and we are working it out on a cooperative, mutual defense basis. We don't feel we ought to go beyond that," he added.

(It has been reported in some quarters that the United States brought the matter of British oil shipments to the Chinese Reds to the attention of London. The shipments were stopped soon thereafter.)

Earlier this month, Senator KEM, quoting data from the Office of International Trade, told his colleagues that during the first 4 months of 1950, Great Britain shipped to Russia more than \$1,087,000 worth of machine tools, a tenfold increase over the same period last year.

He listed in detail the amounts of machinery, ball bearings, steel-mill products, electrical goods, and even arms, sent to the Soviet and its satellites by Britain, Belgium, France, and Luxemburg.

The Senator stressed the importance of machine tools and Senator FLANDERS, Republican, of Vermont, a machine-tool manufacturer, supported him in principle.

"I should like to enunciate, sir, a profound truth, which is that the only inanimate thing which reproduces itself is a machine-tool," Senator FLANDERS said.

Robert N. Golding, ECA consultant and former general counsel of the congressional ECA watchdog committee, had an explanation.

SOME TOOLS NONSTRATEGIC

"There are strategic machine tools and nonstrategic machine tools," he declared. "Why, we have some we'd be willing to ship to Russia today if she wanted them."

He insisted that before one became alarmed over a line in a trade report that a general item had been shipped one should try to ascertain specifically what the item was.

"For all we know the electrical goods sent to the Soviet orbit by the western Europeans might have been light bulbs."

Mr. Golding conceded, however, that we don't get very complete information on what the Marshall plan countries ship.

In an interview at his office, Mr. Golding expounded on the meaning of east-west trade for the recovery of Europe. Last year it totaled \$2,600,000,000.

"If the Marshall plan countries are to get certain foods and raw materials from the east they must ship machinery and manufactured goods. That's all there is to it. If they don't, the Russians will cut off the trade. And the Europeans would look to us to supply the needed items," he warned.

Mr. Golding added that the aim of east-west trade should be to increase the economic strength of western Europe in relation to the east.

There is one other related problem which the Commerce Department has under consideration, but for which there is apparently no real peacetime solution. That is the control of technical data.

In the interest of national security, American officials believe technical information as well as strategic goods should be kept from the Soviet. But in the absence of censorship, the Nation has to rely on a voluntary control plan. The OIT has undertaken to advise American businessmen in doubt as to what may be sent.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, since we have very limited time remaining, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement I have prepared on the pending legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I am, of course, deeply gratified that the Appropriations Committee in the face of the present crisis has now recommended the full appropriation of \$26,900,000 for the point 4 program. In view of the committee's action, my amendment to make this full amount available for the self-improvement and perhaps even for the self-preservation of democratic nations is unnecessary. I have never faltered in my belief that the full amount of \$26,900,000 is essential if we intend to initiate and encourage any kind of a realistic, cooperative economic effort among nations which, though friendly to us, and anxious to become self-sustaining, do not have the organizational and technical talent to use fully their own resources.

As I have said, I am deeply gratified that the Committee on Appropriations has acted to restore the funds which the President recommended for implementing point 4.

I would like to take this occasion to say that I am aware of the need for economy in Government expenditures. I have joined, and will continue to join, my efforts with other members of this body in cutting down on expenditures for purposes which are non-essential to the security, operation, and welfare of this Nation.

But economy is simply a slogan if we do not balance our expenditures in such a way as to use fully all the money we are putting into these efforts to improve the welfare of this Nation and insure its security.

We proposed, for instance, to spend upward of \$30,000,000 for a program of information and propaganda designed to convince the peoples abroad that our motives are unselfish and that we do desire to advance their welfare and insure their security as well as our own. I have urged an increase in this appropriation, too, and it is very likely that we will finally spend for this purpose far more than the amount now provided in current legislation.

Speaking from a strictly selfish viewpoint, we can say that our investment in the United Nations has now paid rich dividends. The peace-loving nations of the world have thrown their moral weight and, in some cases, their physical strength behind the efforts to repel aggression in Korea. This weight was and is being exerted through the United Nations. We dare not weaken that organization by skimping or hedging on a vital economic program which is to be carried out under its auspices.

In mid-June 54 nations, including the United States, met at Lake Success to pledge funds for the program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas.

At that meeting at Lake Success the United States was one of 50 countries which pledged a total of \$20,000,000. The United States pledged \$12,000,000. This pledge was, of course, contingent upon a congressional authorization and appropriation. That pledge was made in good faith, although the other nations were perfectly aware that the American Congress had the last word on the expenditure of funds. I am confident now that the Congress of the United States will live up to that solemn commitment.

One of the chief difficulties in the Senate's consideration of the point 4 program is perhaps our lack of understanding of it. Most of us have little appreciation of the specific activities intended to be carried out. We can understand the information program in

terms of the Voice of America, but the point 4 program is much less easy to comprehend. I understand that the chief difficulty faced by the Appropriations Committee in considering this proposal was the lack of a concrete and itemized program.

Since this program is an international program, based upon cooperative undertakings with other countries, no detailed and itemized schedule of activities was possible until the nations involved had been consulted for their views on what services they required.

The contemplated program is in two parts: A program of activities through the United Nations and a program contemplating bilateral arrangements between the United States and individual countries. No part of this point 4 program is or should be unilateral. This is not a ready-made program—it must be tailored to suit the interests and requirements of the countries involved. The basic theme of the point 4 program is the extension of technical assistance in all fields of endeavor. We intend to make available to foreign countries our own rich store of technological and scientific knowledge, in industrial, agricultural, public health, and educational fields. We propose to send experts and advisers, seeds and disease-resistant strains of special crops, and to export the knowledge we have to raise the standard of living, to cut down disease and epidemics, and to increase the productive output of all these countries.

For 10 years the United States has been carrying on technical-assistance programs through the Institute of Inter-American Affairs and under the terms of Public Law 402. Our technicians have visited many countries abroad. This Institute of Inter-American Affairs, in cooperation with Latin-American countries, has developed demonstration projects which have changed the living conditions and the way of life of thousands of impoverished and disease-ridden people. By demonstrating modern scientific techniques, health has been improved, working conditions made tolerable, and more and better food put into the mouths of hungry individuals.

American geological experts have given expert advice and made preliminary surveys which have resulted in the location of entire new fields of critical ores and minerals. We have shown how to reclaim wasted lands; we have eradicated malaria; we have stopped epidemics; we have brought hope to areas where hope was lost; we have given stability to governments struggling to rehabilitate their economies.

I should like to give some specific examples: A child health specialist of the United States Children's Bureau, working in the town of Nuevo Laredo, on the Mexican border, was instrumental over a 2-year period in reducing the deaths of children under 1 year of age by more than 50 percent. Clinics for the treatment of yaws, established by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs in Haiti, helped cure 100,000 farm workers in that country. Drainage work carried out by the Institute for the Control of Malaria made it possible to bring 10,000 acres of farmland back into cultivation.

Pioneer work in this field has also been done by the World Health Organization. In one rich agricultural area in India malaria had been so severe that 104 villages had been totally abandoned. World Health Organization teams, in the space of less than 1 year, succeeded in eliminating infected mosquitoes from the area surrounding these villages. Refugee families came back to the villages to bring back into production lands urgently needed to meet the tremendous food shortages facing India today.

The point 4 program would include not only work in the field of health but in the development of natural resources.

Tungsten, tin, and deposits of lignite coal adequate to support an important mining

industry have existed in Thailand. In that country a team of three United States and four native geologists has just completed a basic survey of these resources as a preliminary to the large-scale developments of these deposits.

In Brazil, the cooperative work of United States and Brazilian geologists has uncovered the largest manganese reserves in the Western Hemisphere. Such developments help to meet the needs of these countries as well as of the world generally, and provide new sources of income and employment for the country in which they are located.

In Liberia, United States technicians have helped map out roads and the timber supply, and to open up iron deposits. American agricultural experts have helped expand rice production for the local market, and the production of palm oil and cocoa for export. In one village near Monrovia, the result has been to increase the average cash income of the people from \$5 to \$35 per person.

In El Salvador, American agricultural technicians have helped develop and distribute to the farmer new corn varieties which produce 45 to 60 bushels per acre, instead of the old varieties which produced only 12 bushels per acre.

In the Philippines, fish is second only to rice in the national diet. The work of American fishery experts under our technical aid program for the Philippines is resulting in replacing primitive-type fishing gear with more efficient devices. The price of fish to the consumer has decreased because of the more plentiful supply, and the quality of the marketed product is improving.

The rural education program of the institute of Inter-American Affairs in Bolivia has resulted in nearly doubling the number of rural school centers. The project has directly or indirectly benefited well over half a million children and adults.

The impact of these activities on the economy and living conditions of other peoples is tremendous. And they know that it is the United States which is cooperating with them to make such improvement possible.

The UN, as I have stated, has also been at work, through its specialized agencies, providing technical advice and assistance in various areas of the world. These efforts have been on a small scale because the funds available have been small and the number of technicians available for this work has been limited. I have already referred to the activities of the World Health Organization. It is this kind of work which led the chairman of the UN conference which formulated that UN program, to call it the most constructive program so far prepared by the UN.

This then is the point 4 program. It is not a relief program. It calls for no shipment of food, goods, or other commodities. It calls for no capital loans or grants.

It is simply a program for the sending of experts from this country and from other countries to share their technical knowledge with those who have little or none. It calls for bringing to the United States alert young scientists and professionals from these underdeveloped nations so that they may learn first-hand our methods and our techniques.

I have tried to bring it out of the half light of vague generalities into the full light of specific details. I have tried to indicate its importance in the great struggle which is agitating the world today. I would like to say to this Senate that the point 4 program, or even the promise it holds forth—for it will take some time for this program to show results—may mean as much in the present world struggle as the military measures which we must and will take.

Point 4 establishes the essential framework for the building of the structure of world peace for that day—and I pray it may come soon—when we will no longer be forced to think in terms of war, of death, and of conflict, and may turn with full heart to

goals of peace, freedom, and fullness of life for ourselves and our fellowmen.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, it is somewhat amazing to me that in this unusual hour of peril to our Nation and to other free countries throughout the world, there should be offered amendments which would emasculate the European recovery program. If there was ever a time when men should yield and bend, regardless of their previous positions with respect to the European recovery program, it is at this particular hour in the history of our Republic. But, instead of that, we find the same Senators who have fought the Marshall plan from the very beginning, still on the floor of the Senate making the same kind of arguments against this recovery program which has done so much to place the western European democracies once again upon their economic feet. Yet, the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would, if they were adopted, absolutely destroy the European recovery program in its entirety.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator issued a challenge.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have only 10 minutes. I ask the Senator please not to ask me to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I make the statement that whatever the Senator from Nebraska may say about his amendment in the form in which it is at present, as the Senator from Massachusetts said and the Senator from Arizona has said, certainly food is war material, and if food is sent to the people of Russia, or her satellites, even though it is not sent direct to the army, it is replacing food that goes direct to the Russian Army. That is a fact that cannot be challenged. But to destroy all the trade between the east and the west in Europe—and that is exactly what would be done by the amendments—is to destroy the Marshall plan. Mr. President, this means in no sense that I am for shipping real war material, such as planes, tanks, and guns, to Russia or any of her satellites. The Senators who have been against the ECA program from the beginning desire to destroy it through the back door if they possibly can, by means of the type of emasculating amendments they have offered. They have tirelessly attempted to defeat this program by making it unworkable.

Mr. President, if it were not for the Marshall plan at this moment, in my humble judgment—and I think it is the judgment of the great mass of American people—the European countries who are now the beneficiaries of the Marshall plan would be under the iron and tyrannical heel of communism. If it were not for the Marshall plan, the Kremlin, the men of Moscow, at this very moment would have France, Italy,

Belgium, and the The Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, in their tyrannical and enslaving grasp. Only England would be standing up against the threat of the infiltration of the communistic poison. Yet, notwithstanding the communistic threat throughout the whole world at this very moment, which, in view of what is now happening in Korea, is very evident, for we know who is behind the North Korean movement, we know the power which is behind it, we find Senators still clinging to the old isolationist stand in the United States Senate, saying in effect "Give them nothing. Cut the appropriations for the Marshall plan down a billion dollars." We can live alone in this atomic world.

That would destroy the plan in its entirety. It would destroy the morale of the free people of the countries of western Europe. Never in the history of America have we had such need for friends and allies as we have at this very moment. This is a crucial hour, one of the most dangerous hours in the history of America. Yet there are Senators who seek to destroy a plan which has done so much to keep communism from spreading its poisonous tentacles throughout the western democracies having a population of 270,000,000. We need them as our friends. We need them as our allies. We need them at this hour. We should give them not only the kind of assistance we give them under the Marshall plan, but also give them military aid to meet the challenge of communism, the onrush of communism, which seeks to sweep over the world and enslave us all.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot yield.

Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri talks about being realistic in this hour. I wish more Senators were as realistic as those who have been going along with the Marshall plan and the military-assistance program, the Atlantic Pact, and all other bipartisan measures the last few years in our efforts to find the road to a durable peace. I submit that the junior Senator from Missouri has consistently advocated a short-sighted and ineffectual foreign policy. His course is not the wise one at this hour of history. Certainly through aid to Turkey and Greece, by the Marshall plan, we have kept communism from spreading throughout Europe, as it is in China today.

Mr. President, I say we are the ones who are the realists in this hour, and that the Senator from Missouri and others who join with him in trying to reduce the appropriation by \$1,000,000,000 are still unrealistic, they are still living in the McKinley age of 40 years ago, believing that this country can get along without the people of western Europe.

The Senator from Missouri says we have to see things as they are. We who favor the Marshall plan contend we do see things as they are. As a result of what is going on in Korea this very moment we contend we can look into the future and see the great dangers which exist to the American Republic.

Mr. President, the affair in Korea is not a local one. No one knows what will happen tomorrow. A move similar to that in Korea may be made in other parts of the world, followed by a communistic tirade such as we have heard against us recently. So to reduce the ECA appropriation at this moment is to play directly into the hands of Stalin and his group of international bandits who run the Politburo in the Kremlin at Moscow. Of course, Stalin would like to have that done. He has never wanted the Marshall plan. He has fought against it from the beginning. He would not permit Poland or Czechoslovakia or other countries to come into the Marshall plan because he saw in the Marshall plan something worth while for the economic recovery of those nations across the sea. Recovery in their economic affairs is a direct aid and comfort and help to the United States of America.

Mr. President, appropriating for ECA aid is not throwing money down a rat hole; this amendment is a direct blow at England. Who was it who first came to our aid in Asiatic waters? It was England with her fleet. She is also sending ground troops to help us along. Yet, for the past months and years, we have heard tirades against socialistic England whenever we have tried to grant and loan her money under the ECA program.

As I said before the Korean affair on the floor of the Senate, when the chips are down in the world-wide conflagration in which we may be engaged, we will find England—regardless of the kind of government she has; and no one detests socialism more than I do—standing by the side of the United States of America. At the present time she is our real ally in Europe and Asia.

To hurt England at this hour, through cutting off money under the ECA program, not only will be doing a disservice to our western European allies, but it will be doing a disservice to the safety and security of our own country. It will give aid and comfort to communism.

I repeat that at this particular hour we need all the friends we can have. We should do nothing to disturb the relationship which exists at this moment with respect to the ECA funds which we are sending across the water.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate will not vote for any of these crippling amendments. They are emasculating amendments, designed to cripple the ECA to the point where it cannot be effective, to the point where Paul Hoffman, the great Administrator, will have no possibility of administering it in an efficacious way.

The Kem amendment would defeat our purposes in that respect and would disturb the morale of the people of western Europe, at this time when we in America should do everything within our poor power to raise and lift their morale.

So I hope the Senate at this hour will be more realistic than it has ever been before. I hope Senators who in the past have voted against ECA appropriations, at this time will give ECA the benefit of the doubt, because ECA needs the cooperation of all Members of the Senate—

America needs this unity and the free world needs it. The Senate must rise to a level of high wisdom. We must reject amendments which would bring utter chaos to our friends abroad.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes.

Mr. KEM. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there seems to be some question about the report of the "watchdog" committee and where it came from. I should like to call attention to the fact that the report is to be found on page 265 of the hearings before the Appropriations Committee, and it was given to the Appropriations Committee members.

Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader would have us believe that those who have not voted to provide every dollar that ECA has wanted are responsible for the situation which exists today.

To the contrary, the responsibility for the situation existing today rests on the present administration because of its policy in regard to Asia. No one can deny that. That is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the policy in regard to Asia the administration has had up until very recently has now been completely repudiated, it has adopted a policy entirely contrary to what its policy has been.

So far as China is concerned, the administration's policy was to "wait until the dust settles." The administration has followed a policy that the situation in China had nothing to do with ECA or with Korea.

I voted for Asia aid, I voted for Korean aid, and I voted for the sending of military equipment to Korea. However, what has the administration done in that connection? Under the military assistance program of last year this administration allotted the South Koreans only \$2,600,000. However, how much did the South Koreans get? They did not get a dime's worth. They finally were allotted a little wire for repairs which cost \$200. It is on the way there now, and has not yet been paid for.

Yet some Senators claim that the responsibility for what has happened rests on the shoulders of Senators who had the nerve to stand on this floor and ask that such action be justified or else that the policy be changed. What has happened is the fault of this administration, Mr. President, which ever since 1944 has followed a policy of "wait and let the dust settle in China."

I voted against confirmation of the nomination of the present Secretary of State, the man who was the architect of that policy, and who still is Secretary of State and still is the architect of the foreign policy of the United States, and will continue to be until he has been repudiated by the President. The vote I cast against the confirmation of his nomination is the best vote I ever cast.

Why should anyone want to vote for money in support of a policy of the kind

I have indicated? Why should anyone wish to support a policy of "wait until the dust settles"? How can anyone dispute the fact that today our boys are being attacked by troops using equipment and supplies, including gasoline, which, under our policy, have been allowed to go to the Chinese Reds?

Mr. President, my amendment will clear up such a loophole and will make it possible for us to make sure that no further strategic materials will go from this country to Russia and her satellites, in eastern Europe or Red China.

Let us be united in stopping such things. That is the way to win the war in the Pacific.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the question before the Senate at this time is an amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri, relating to the ECA.

The minority leader has seen fit to take a considerable amount of his time to talk about political considerations and the Secretary of State and what happened in China. I do not care to discuss those matters. I am willing to discuss them, but they are not before the Senate.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] calls for a very large cut in the ECA appropriation.

Is the Senator from Missouri really interested in the ECA appropriation, or is he endeavoring to cripple ECA and wound it and cut down its appropriation? I have before me the records of the vote on the original Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. Among Senators who voted "nay" at that time, the name of the Senator from Missouri shines like an evening star. When we examine the vote on the question of the passage of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, we find that among the "nays" is the name of the Senator from Missouri.

When we examine the vote on the question of the passage of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, among the seven "nays" is the name of the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Again, Mr. President, when it came to the question of furnishing military assistance to Europe, allied more or less with the general principle of the ECA, we find among those voting "nay" the name of the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

And when it came to the question of the North Atlantic Treaty, lining up the democracies of western Europe with Canada and the United States and other countries, we find that among those who voted "nay" was the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, with that sort of a record behind the Senator from Missouri—opposing the North Atlantic Treaty and the arms aid and the ECA—can we expect anything good, so far as ECA is concerned, to come from the hands of the Senator from Missouri, who has been against it? Yet he appears as

its friend. He wants to amend the act. He wants to cut the original item as we agreed upon it in committee by about \$1,000,000,000. The proposal would cut the amount of the appropriation in the pending bill from \$2,391,930,000 to \$1,950,000,000.

Mr. President, this is not the time for us to halt or to equivocate on the ECA program. A time of peril is not a time to retreat. This is no time to run for cover. We initiated this program to aid in the economic rehabilitation of western Europe. We realized when we did so that economic rehabilitation is, after all, in aid of military preparation and military defense. Military defense cannot proceed except upon the basis of a sound economy. The reports from western Europe regarding what has been done under ECA are astounding, so much so that they sometimes shake one's credulity. Production in those countries has been vastly improved; in most cases, to a point above the prewar level.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not send to western Europe the message that we are lacking in our willingness to continue this program to the point of achieving its result.

Reference is made to our solemn responsibility to Korea and Asia. We are aware of those responsibilities, but we cannot, before the whole world, send forth a message that we are weakening, that we are unable to meet our responsibilities, that we are unwilling to keep faith with the powers of western Europe whom we have assured of our aid through the ECA program, through the Atlantic Pact, and through the arms-implementation program. I stand for all those things.

Mr. President, the free governments of Europe, the United States, and Canada are all tied up with a single faith. We could not, if we would, cut ourselves loose from them. If democracy is to survive, the free nations which advocate democracy must stand together, must keep the faith, must carry out the programs designed to accomplish the survival of democracy and freedom, and which are designed to bring about the destruction of the evil and fatal policies of communism.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not disagree with what the able Senator from Texas has been stating in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but it seems to me—and I think it important to bring it up at this point—that the world is faced at the present time, as we are meeting here, with the necessity of having a united front—one that cannot be sabotaged—with the change which takes place tomorrow with Mr. Malik assuming the chairmanship of the Security Council?

It seems to me that the able Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the State Department should be able to work out some method or propose some resolution

whereby no person may assume the chairmanship of the Security Council without first taking an oath to support the action of the Security Council. To invite or permit Mr. Malik to gain the chairmanship by rotation is like permitting a member of the Capone crime syndicate to head the FBI. Certainly, if we are going to do these things which the able Senator from Texas has expounded, we should have some additional cooperation in keeping Mr. Malik from taking his seat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield two more minutes to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for two more minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California. His ideas and mine have gone along pretty much together in regard to foreign problems. However, to do what the Senator from California suggests would probably require action by the United Nations. Whether that could be accomplished between now and tomorrow, when Mr. Malik takes over as President of the Security Council, would be doubtful. It would at least be a very difficult undertaking.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely desire to say that I contacted Mr. Hickerson, of the State Department, this morning and pointed out that the President of the United States is not permitted to assume the Presidency until he has taken an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It seems to me that today the United Nations Security Council could adopt the resolution that no one could assume the chairmanship without agreeing to uphold and defend the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the Senator from California, and if that can be accomplished, I hope that our representatives and others will advocate it. But, Mr. President, I do not view the return of Mr. Malik to the United Nations with any satisfaction whatever. I cannot believe that he is going to take the position as head of the Security Council for any good purpose, so far as the things recently done by the United Nations are concerned, or so far as its ultimate objectives are concerned. Mr. Malik is proposing to return to the Security Council for some strategic purpose. I trust that members of the Security Council will, while keeping their own counsel, see to it that he does not undermine the high purposes of the United Nations.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Does not the able Senator from Texas think that Mr. Malik has probably returned with the express purpose of confusing American public opinion and weakening our whole military effort?

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the Senator. I think his return is largely tied up with propaganda. Russia wants to pretend before the world that she is the peace advocate, and that the United States and Great Britain are the imperialists. I doubt not, as suggested by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, that Malik's purpose is not a good one, but that he is an emissary of confusion, distraction, and disturbance, which he hopes will spread throughout the world, as a part of Russia's propaganda methods.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. We cannot turn back on the course we have charted, at this particular juncture in world affairs. We want unity. We want the world to know that we stand just where we stood before—in unison with the free nations of western Europe. If Europe is to survive, if we are to survive, we must stand together for freedom and for democracy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I can only wish that those of us who have opposed ECA from the beginning had been as successful in persuasion as we have been in prophecy.

I well remember that when the original bill was presented in this body the Senator from Texas raised his voice until the rafters of the Chamber resounded—

Mr. CONNALLY. There were no rafters in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Texas said, "We are voting for the peace of the world." ECA was sold to us as a policy of insurance against war.

I well remember, Mr. President, when the first bill was before us. Its proponents told the Senate, "You have two alternatives; either pass this bill or arm yourselves to the teeth." The Senate passed the bill. The ink was hardly dry on the President's signature when the administration was back again, presenting the largest war budget in the peacetime history of the United States. We voted for that budget. Then the administration came back again and said, "It is not sufficient to arm the people of the United States; we must arm the people of 12 nations of western Europe." So we did that. And so on and on and on.

Each prophecy has fallen short of performance. Each time it has been necessary for the majority leader and for the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to come back with additional proposals, each time involving the expenditure of vast sums of money. It would not have been so bad if we had the money to spend, but we have been mortgaging the future of the United States. We have been placing a lien on the Nation to be paid sometime, somehow, by our children and our children's children. All the time we have been causing an inflation which is rising like a great monster to plague us. The people suddenly find that the money backed by the credit of the United States

in which they have had faith does not have the purchasing power that they thought it would have.

Mr. President, there is so much about the ECA bill that is based on a delusion that I do not know how to start discussing it. Much is said about the defense of western Europe, and it is contended that if we pass the bill we shall aid western Europe in defending itself. I have before me the budget estimate for July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951, revised May 4, 1950. Running through the budget at random I see that the United Kingdom is to have 33 projects in 19 territories which call for specialized items of equipment from the United States to be used in improving basic economic conditions in the territories which will lead, in time, to further developmental activity.

I see that the Belgian Government is to have money for road building and development projects in the Congo.

France is to have money to improve roads, to open up new production areas in west and equatorial Africa and in the Cameroons, for the development of soil conservation in Algeria, rice production in Morocco, and for the development of iron deposits in French Guinea.

The Portuguese Government is to have money for the erection of a livestock utilization plant in Angola. Involved, among other things, would be a slaughterhouse, a byproducts plant, a quick-freeze cold-storage plant, a steam and power plant, and a cold-storage plant for the distribution of meat products. Approximately 6,000 metric tons of meat each year could be supplied to Brazzaville, Leopoldville, and other equatorial African markets, metropolitan Portugal, and the United Kingdom.

The Netherlands is to develop small farming projects in Dutch Guiana, to make possible the immigration of Dutch, Indo-Europeans, and possibly others to Surinam. In Surinam it is proposed to have a project involving the reclamation of 5,000 hectares of coastal land on which to raise rice and other products.

All of these projects are to be paid for by taxes on the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I rise to announce that what I have recognized in the European recovery program has been a good investment of American dollars toward permanent peace, bringing to our side the support of the nations of western Europe in our attempt to establish permanent peace in the world.

The present Presiding Officer was with me on the visit which he and I were privileged to make to nations of western Europe. We traveled by car from Frankfurt across to Munich. We were in the company of five other Members of Congress who visited 13 nations of western Europe. We talked not only with farmers, small-business men, and corporation executives, but with men and women in the governments of those countries, and we commenced to sense that through the ECA and the Atlantic

Pact we were rehabilitating the best citizens and restoring to the channels of commerce the hidden dollars of those nations. Yes, Mr. President, we were enlisting the best efforts of France, Italy, the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries, Great Britain, and Greece in an attempt to try to rebuild their economies and their governments.

When we visited Norway we found the people very enthusiastic. They were rebuilding their fishing fleet, which meant so much to them; they were rebuilding their merchant marine, which meant much to their commerce. It was ECA dollars which made that possible.

Mr. President, when I returned to the United States, in speaking to citizens of my State I told them that I thought through ECA funds we had made a good start toward permanent and lasting peace.

I have in my hand a letter which I received today from Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange. I shall quote only a few words from his letter. He says:

ECA as a means of meeting the threat of communism has been an outstanding success. This is not alone the judgment of the National Grange, but is the unqualified conclusion of the four national farm organizations that inspected the work of ECA in May and June of this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may I have half a minute?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield half a minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter from Mr. Albert S. Goss printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GRANGE,

Washington, D. C., July 31, 1950.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: ECA as a means of meeting the threat of communism has been an outstanding success. This is not alone the judgment of the National Grange, but is the unqualified conclusion of the four national farm organizations that inspected the work of ECA in May and June this year.

The elements of this outstanding success of ECA in checking aggressive communism are the identical elements needed to check it as the war becomes hotter. These elements are: (1) expanded industrial output of Europe; (2) agricultural production at least equal to that of prewar; and (3) a consequent faith among Europeans, and a fear among Communists that we are determined to continue unabated our opposition to communism through ECA.

The most important task of ECA, and the most difficult part of its task, lies ahead. We should not make the fatal mistake of reducing its funds at this critical stage below its full needs. We anticipate intensified Russian efforts in many parts of the world to divert us from our purpose of promoting sound European recovery before the job is completed. We hope that you will give full support to the continuation of this essential program.

Sincerely,

A. S. Goss,

Master, the National Grange.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a Republican I rise to support the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee with respect to ECA, and I would quickly invite attention to these points:

Point No. 1 is that in my judgment the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee are in keeping with the spirit and intent of the great Republican platform of 1948 in which we pledged to the American people that we would keep partisanship at the water's edge, so far as foreign policy was concerned. In my judgment, any attempt to cut the heart out of the ECA program by the Kem amendments at this time cannot be reconciled with the spirit and intent of that plank of the Republican platform.

Point No. 2 is that it can now be stated that in February, March, and April 1947, we were nearer to war than the American people realized. I speak as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. There were many of us in those critical months who expected the Russian troop movements which were westward in those days to take Trieste and Italy by force, if necessary. The Congress took some very quick action on two fronts to show Russia that we were willing to defend the peace. We proceeded with the appropriations necessary to strengthen our military defenses in Europe, and we proceeded with ECA. I happen to be one who believes that ECA, as much as has our military appropriations, strengthened our position in Europe. I am not on the floor of the Senate today going to cast a vote that will weaken the position of the allies we need in Europe in the critical months and years ahead, because I believe, Mr. President, that Russia will try to lick us—

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall not yield to the Senator from Missouri. I am talking about his amendment which I think is an undesirable amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I shall not vote for an amendment which would weaken, in my opinion, the strength of my Nation in the critical months ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of State, dated July 27, 1950, and a letter from William Foster, Acting Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration, dated July 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 27, 1950.

The Honorable TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: I have read the letter which Mr. William C. Foster, Acting Administrator for the Economic Cooperation Administration, is forwarding you with respect to the importance of the appropriation for the European recovery program.

I concur completely in Mr. Foster's letter and wish to take this opportunity to endorse his statements to you.

You will recall that this question of the importance of ECA funds was raised when I appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee earlier this week. I should like to emphasize again that the mounting economic strength of western Europe is of paramount importance to the fulfillment of the policies which the United States Government has been pursuing. I cannot urge too strongly that the Congress take action to provide adequate funds to support this mounting strength.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION

ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D. C., July 27, 1950.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: It is expected that the Senate will vote very soon on the appropriation for the European recovery program. This vote and the amount to be appropriated take on new significance in view of the struggle in which we are now engaged.

I think it vital that certain considerations be emphasized in advance.

Vast new expenditures for military purposes are called for and in light of this circumstance all proposed appropriations must be strictly scrutinized so that resources can be husbanded for the most essential needs. But among such needs high priority must be given to the sums required for maintaining the economic strength of our friends and increasing their military strength as well.

It is important to recollect that early in 1948 the Communist threat to western Europe was a clear and present danger. The Marshall plan has not only so far prevented this threat from being translated into action, but has greatly increased the strength of western Europe to resist the danger. The continued need for world-wide strength to prevent further aggression and to preserve the peace is apparent.

It is this strength which the current vote on ECA will decisively affect. It is this strength which obviously must be made up out of the resources of the whole free world and not the United States alone. And the rest of the free world, particularly the free nations of western Europe, are now, as a result of Marshall aid, in a position to contribute substantially to that end.

What are the political, psychological, and economic changes in the OEEC nations that two and a quarter years with ERP aid have accomplished and which justify that statement?

Those changes include: A greatly increased industrial and agricultural production; an attainment of reasonable internal financial stability; a political stability allowing for freely chosen democratic governments with constantly declining totals of Communist voters; the sharp reduction of arbitrary restrictions on intra-European trade; the institution of the European Payments Union with its promise of convertibility within Europe; and a steadily growing belief by the people of Europe in their own future.

Without the assistance furnished by this country through the Foreign Assistance Act, this strong economic base could not have been built. And a strong economy and stable society is the foundation of military strength. In the months ahead, this economic base will have to bear a far heavier load as the free nations of western Europe build up their military strength. It is, therefore, more essential than ever that ECA assistance be continued so that the European economy can carry the load of rearmament, as well as contribute to the maintenance of a decent standard of living.

It is clear that such a continuation of ECA assistance, together with mutual defense assistance, will guarantee more security and a greater increase in military strength for each United States dollar that is spent than we could possibly achieve relying on United States production alone.

This multiplying effect has been demonstrated many times over the past 2 years in the industrial field. For example, electric power capacity in western Europe has vastly increased since April 1948. This increase results mainly from expansion of plants through capital investment, of which about 95 percent was contributed by the European countries themselves, and only 5 percent from ECA dollars. Yet without this 5 percent in dollars the development could not have been built. Similarly, in military items, though the ratio of total production to dollar investment may not be so dramatic, the effect of each dollar made available to Europe will be multiplied many times.

In this connection and because of our own military effort, question has been raised regarding future use of local currency counterpart funds. While it is clear that in some countries at least a portion of the counterpart could well be directed toward expanding facilities to be used for production of military equipment, there are many instances where present use of counterpart should be maintained best to help attain this new objective. For instance, where the major portion of a nation's counterpart is now being released for such purposes as development of electrical energy supply, improvement of basic transportation facilities, such as roads and railroads, or increasing the facilities of important seaports, these developments can contribute substantially and directly to increasing production for military purposes or to the movement of troops and supplies. It is true, moreover, that wise use of counterpart will further increase the multiplying effect to which I referred and our efforts will be directed to that end.

Up to this point the Marshall plan has been chiefly concerned with building resistance to communism within certain of the participating countries; from now on equal emphasis must also be given to building resistance to aggression from without. But in either case the proved principle of the Marshall plan is applicable; that American aid brings increased returns when coupled with self-help and mutual aid by the participating countries. On the other hand, withdrawal of adequate support by the United States would result in almost immediate economic disruption of the western European nations.

Therefore, I urge in the national interest and in order effectively to wage the peace, that you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of your committee, all of whom are so aware of these dangers, press for a fully adequate amount.

The Marshall plan is firmly identified in the European mind as the symbol of United States partnership in attaining peace and strength. Any sharp curtailment of Marshall aid might well be profoundly misunderstood as indicating a loss of United States interest in the economic stability of Europe. However, a further endorsement by the Senate will give confidence in the present and hope for the future to the entire free world.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM FOSTER,
Acting Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will proceed to vote on the pending question, which is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri

[Mr. KEM] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have an amendment which I should like to offer at the proper time. It refers to the first section of chapter X-B, with reference to the Economic Cooperation Act as it now stands. Would I be precluded from offering an amendment to that section after action is taken on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment would not be in order until the amendment proposing to change the figures is disposed of. After that is disposed of the Senator's amendment would be in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hayden	Malone
Benton	Hendrickson	Martin
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Bricker	Hill	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Ives	O'Connor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Langer	Stennis
Ellender	Leahy	Taft
Ferguson	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	Lodge	Thye
Frear	Lucas	Tydings
George	McCarran	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Wherry
Graham	McFarland	Williams
Green	McKellar	Young
Gurney	Magnuson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The Chair will state the question before the Senate. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], inserting the figure \$1,950,000,000, in lieu of \$2,450,000,000, and striking out certain language on page 448, lines 2 and 8.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. WHERRY requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr.

TAYLOR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is detained on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPPEL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] is detained because of attendance at the funeral of a close personal friend and is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPPEL] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—12		
Butler	Frear	Martin
Byrd	Kem	Mundt
Capehart	Langer	Wherry
Dworshak	Malone	Williams

NAYS—59		
Anderson	Flanders	Johnson, Colo.
Benton	George	Johnson, Tex.
Brewster	Gillette	Johnston, S. C.
Bricker	Graham	Kefauver
Bridges	Green	Kerr
Chapman	Gurney	Knowland
Chavez	Hendrickson	Leahy
Connally	Hickenlooper	Lehman
Cordon	Hill	Lodge
Douglas	Holland	Lucas
Eastland	Humphrey	McCarran
Ellender	Ives	McClellan
Ferguson		McFarland

McKellar	Robertson	Taft
Magnuson	Russell	Thomas, Okla.
Maybank	Saltonstall	Thye
Morse	Smith, Maine	Tydings
Murray	Smith, N. J.	Watkins
O'Connor	Sparkman	Young
O'Mahoney	Stennis	

NOT VOTING—25

Alken	Jenner	Schoeppel
Cain	Kilgore	Taylor
Darby	Long	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarthy	Tobey
Downey	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Myers	Withers
Hoey	Neely	
Hunt	Pepper	

So Mr. KEM's amendment to Mr. HAYDEN's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, my understanding is that I have 10 minutes on the amendment. I shall take but 5.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, with respect to the appropriation for ECA, I would like to point out how the committee arrived at the amount in the bill of \$2,391,930,000. When we first considered the amount in the committee we voted on a figure of \$2,500,000,000 as recommended by its chairman, the Senator from Tennessee, and the committee agreed to this figure on a vote of 11 to 10. Since many of the members of the committee who had voted against a figure of \$2,500,000,000 had indicated they would support an appropriation of \$2,450,000,000, the committee agreed to have a roll-call vote on the lesser amount. I made the motion to reconsider. I did not feel it would be desirable to have the committee recommending an appropriation which had been agreed to in the committee by a margin of only one vote. On the vote in the committee on an amount of \$2,450,000,000 for ECA there were 17 yeas and 3 nays. So the committee had by a substantial majority recommended an appropriation of \$2,450,000,000.

Several days later, on July 7, 1950, when the committee was in session considering other chapters of the bill, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] made a motion that all items in the foreign-aid chapter which had not been cut at least 10 percent under the budget estimate be cut 10 percent under the budget estimate, exclusive of the funds for mutual defense assistance. The committee voted on the motion of the Senator from Michigan, and it carried by a vote of 11 to 10. This meant that ECA would be further reduced by \$58,070,000 to allow an appropriation of \$2,391,930,000. This is how the figure was arrived at.

The following day when the committee was again in session one of the members of the committee who had voted in favor of the Ferguson motion stated he was willing to move to reconsider and restore the amount to \$2,450,000,000, as originally adopted by a vote of 17 to 3. It was agreed not to do this, since the report had already been printed, and the matter could be considered further on the Senate floor.

In view of this background, and especially in view of the fact that the figure in the bill of \$2,391,930,000 was agreed upon by such a close vote, I move that, on page 447, line 18, the figure "\$2,391,930,000" be stricken and the figure "\$2,450,000,000" be inserted in lieu thereof, as approved by our committee by 17 out of the 20 members.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Wis-

consin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] is detained because of attendance at the funeral of a close personal friend and is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—42

Anderson	Humphrey	Morse
Benton	Ives	Murray
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kefauver	Pepper
Douglas	Kerr	Robertson
Eastland	Leahy	Saltonstall
Ellender	Lehman	Smith, Maine
George	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Graham	Lucas	Sparkman
Green	McCarran	Stennis
Gurney	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	McKellar	Thye
Hill	Magnuson	Tydings

NAYS—29

Brewster	Gillette	Martin
Bricker	Hendrickson	Maybank
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler	Holland	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Capehart	Kem	Watkins
Dworschak	Knowland	Wherry
Ferguson	Langer	Williams
Flanders	McClellan	Young
Frear	Malone	

NOT VOTING—25

Alken	Hunt	Schoeppel
Cain	Jenner	Taylor
Cordon	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Darby	Long	Tobey
Donnell	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Downey	McMahon	Wiley
Ecton	Millikin	Withers
Fulbright	Myers	
Hoey	Neely	

So Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now before the Senate is on the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the economic cooperation provision and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 448, line 17, following the colon after the word

"amended", it is proposed to insert the following: "Provided further, That after November 1, 1950, no funds herein appropriated shall be made available to any nation of which a dependent area fails to comply with any treaty to which the United States and such dependent area are parties."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on last Friday, shortly following the adoption of the unanimous-consent agreement to vote today, at a time when at least I and a number of other Senators were of the firm opinion that no particular action was to be had on the economic cooperation section of the bill on last Friday, a point of order was raised to that portion of economic cooperation provision beginning after the word "amended" on line 17, on page 448, striking the remainder of that particular section.

Mr. President, it was my intention to discuss any point of order that might be to that particular section, but I did not have the opportunity to do so because I was at a meeting at that time and had not anticipated that such action would be taken then. Business has transpired since the point of order was raised, and I understand under the precedents that an appeal cannot now be taken from the ruling on that point of order.

I therefore had prepared the amendment which I have sent to the desk, and, as it states, it provides "that after November 1, 1950, no funds herein appropriated shall be made available to any nation of which a dependent area fails to comply with any treaty to which the United States and such dependent area are parties."

Anticipating a point of order, Mr. President, I should like to say that I have tried to check the amendment as best I can with the authorities, and the best advice I can secure is that unless new duties are imposed upon some administrative official, such as the Department of State, then the amendment is in order, and I think, that no new duties are imposed upon any official, especially in view of the Connally amendment to the authorization act this spring, which specifically provides: "In any case where the Department of State determines that such discriminatory restriction is maintained or imposed," and so forth.

Mr. President, because I am limited as to time, I should like to have the entire Connally amendment, which is found on page 3 of Public Law 535, the print I have in my hand, in subsection (n), printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(n) It is the sense of Congress that no participating country shall maintain or impose any import, currency, tax, license, quota, or other similar business restrictions which discriminate against citizens of the United States or any corporation, partnership, or other association substantially beneficially owned by citizens of the United States, engaged or desiring to engage, in furtherance of the purposes of this title, in the importation into such country of any commodity,

which restrictions are not reasonably required to meet the balance of payments conditions, or requirements of national security, or are not authorized under international agreements to which such country and the United States are parties. In any case where the Department of State determines that any such discriminatory restriction is maintained or imposed by a participating country or by any dependent area of such country, the Administrator shall take such remedial action as he determines will effectively promote the purposes of this subsection (n).

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have only 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa declines to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, my amendment will particularly affect the inexcusable and unconscionable violation of the rights of American citizens in Morocco. I opposed the insertion of such an amendment last year based upon the solemn promises of the State Department and of the ECA that they would, under the power which they already have under the ECA Act and which is admitted by Mr. Hoffman and the State Department, correct these abuses and see that American citizens doing business in Morocco secure equal, fair, and equitable treatment with other nationals and in full accordance with treaties which are in existence between this country and Morocco. In spite of its promises and in spite of its solemn assurances, the ECA has wholly and completely failed to take action. In spite of the admonition of the Connally amendment this spring, the ECA has done nothing to correct these abuses. In spite of the fact that the State Department itself has repeatedly said in writing that Morocco is violating its treaty with the United States, so far as American nationals are concerned, the abuses continue.

So, Mr. President, I no longer feel constrained to take the word of the State Department or to trust the assurances of the ECA that it will correct the manifest injustices which I think every Member of the Senate knows exists.

I dislike the necessity of putting in the bill a mandatory clause of this kind, but it is the only way by which to get action by the State Department and the ECA—which not only is charged from the standpoint of its patriotism, but is directly charged under the Connally amendment of this spring, with taking action to correct those abuses. However, those two great departments have wholly and utterly failed and refused to do anything to correct them.

Mr. President, I have supported ECA, and I am still supporting ECA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa in order until the committee amendment in line 18 has been adopted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. My amendment is an amendment to perfect the committee amendment, which we agreed will be treated as though it were the text of the bill. I think I am entitled to have a final decision on that question of the adoption of my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa is offered as an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is not this amendment subject to a point of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No point of order has been made.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair overrules the point of order, because it seems to the Chair that the amendment is a limitation on the appropriation, based upon the provisions of the ECA Act, as passed by the Congress, and with particular reference to what is known as the Connally amendment to that act, which stipulates that it is the duty of the Department of State to consider and determine whether there has been any violation of a treaty agreement. The amendment merely provides that if there has been such a violation, the appropriation shall not be available. The Chair thinks the amendment is a limitation, and overrules the point of order.

This question is subject to debate for 5 minutes by any Senator who desires to occupy that time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, how much time is available?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Five minutes is available to any Senator who wishes to discuss this question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the amendment, I wish to read one or two paragraphs from the letter of the Acting Administrator of ECA in regard to the amendment:

In the first place, I believe that the proviso is wholly unnecessary. It is adopted from an amendment proposed to and rejected by the Congress this year in the course of considering the authorizing legislation for ECA. At that time it was pointed out that a procedure had been established in Morocco last December for consultation between American and French authorities to deal with complaints of discrimination against American businessmen. Since that time almost all the specific complaints concerning such discrimination have been brought before the consultative group. An investigation just completed on the ground in Morocco shows that this new procedure, which involved some delays in its early stages, has been speeded up considerably within the last 6 weeks and that the majority of the complaints of the American businessmen have been satisfied. This consultative machinery makes it possible for cases of discrimination to be established and identified, and the authority expressed in the Connally amendment to the ECA Act enables the Administrator for Economic Cooperation to take such action, including suspension of dollar assistance or refusal to release franc funds, as is suited to the particular situation.

In the second place the proviso would, in its operations, be seriously damaging. It would, of course, be wholly contrary to the basic theory that the program is based on cooperation among the free countries and not on coercion by the United States, but

quite apart from this, the actual operation of the proviso would be ruinous to the carrying out of the recovery program for France, for it is at France that the provision is directed. As I have noted above, ECA is now in a position to deal with discriminations against American businessmen, taking such measures as are best suited to meet and cure the discrimination complained of.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should simply like to say to the Senator, if I may do so, that without passing at all on the justice or the injustice of the situation or the question of whether the State Department has been sufficiently diligent in connection with this matter, it seems to me that the amendment goes against one feature of the Economic Cooperation Act, a feature which is vital to the entire conception of ECA, namely, that the recipient nations under the Marshall plan must get all their imports from soft currency areas, wherever it is possible to do so—whereas this amendment would require that France get imports in dollar areas. If we once admit that principle, then the entire ECA Act is in danger of being converted into a subsidy for American products.

For that reason, I intend to oppose the amendment, although I am quite prepared to admit that the State Department has been dilatory in dealing with this subject.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I read further from the letter of the acting Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration:

The suggested proviso would go far beyond this and might require a complete cessation of aid to the whole French Union, a sanction wholly out of proportion to the circumstances. The proposed amendment to the authorizing legislation, which was rejected by the Congress, would have operated to freeze the entire franc counterpart fund. The present proviso is apparently designed with the same sanction in mind. However, presumably in an effort to justify its inclusion in an appropriation bill, it has been recast so as to affect the expenditure of appropriated dollars as well. Hence it might operate to shut off all aid in an effort to insure that no local currency counterpart fund can be created for the ultimate benefit of the French recovery effort. This would be an even more drastic penalty and one directly opposed to the whole spirit and purpose of the Marshall plan.

Mr. President, this amendment is directed at France. France is in the throes of economic recovery. France is in a perilous condition, so far as the world situation is concerned. Surely the Congress does not want to do anything which would adversely affect France in her economic recovery at this particular time. So I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator from Illinois aware that last year I went along with the exact position which is set forth in the letter the Senator from Illinois has been reading, doing so based upon the promises of the State

Department and of the ECA that they would correct the situation and that they had the power to correct it?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I know nothing about that, and I do not know whether the State Department has been diligent or has not been diligent.

My point is that if the acting Administrator of the ECA is correct in the letter I have been reading, which he has sent to the Senator from Texas—so far as the amendment is concerned—and I believe he is correct—then if we are going to cripple France at this stage of the game in her economic recovery, by means of adopting an amendment of this kind, we shall be striking a serious blow, in my opinion, against the entire Marshall-plan recovery program.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois—because a year ago I felt that there was some validity to the point made by the State Department—whether he believes that even the ECA Act can set aside a treaty which has been ratified between two sovereign governments, and, of course, in that connection ratified by the Senate of the United States, or whether the Senator believes that any law can set aside a treaty.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not agree at all that a law can set aside a treaty.

But I say, and repeat what I said a moment ago, that regardless of any technical arguments which might be made about the treaty aspect of the case, we are in a rather serious situation. Regardless of any technicalities which might be raised with respect to whether or not a treaty has been violated or has not been violated, it seems to me that in this case we should rely upon the word of the acting Administrator, when he says definitely that this amendment will injure the recovery program in France. Certainly if we injure the recovery program in France, we shall be doing a disservice to the entire ECA program and shall be impairing it.

This is the time, it seems to me, when we ought to stand firmly back of the ECA program and should defeat amendments which would in anywise cripple it in any part whatever. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is detained on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] is detained because of attendance at the funeral of a close personal friend and if present would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—43

Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Bricker	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Cordon	Lehman	Thye
Dworshak	McCarran	Tydings
Ellender	McClellan	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
George	Martin	Williams
Gillette	Maybank	Young
Gurney	Morse	
Hendrickson	Mundt	

NAYS—29

Anderson	Hayden	McFarland
Benton	Holland	McKellar
Chapman	Humphrey	Magnuson
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Flanders	Kefauver	Pepper
Frear	Kerr	Robertson
Fulbright	Leahy	Smith, Maine
Graham	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Green	Lucas	

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Jenner	Schoeppel
Darby	Kilgore	Taylor
Donnell	Long	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McCarthy	Tobey
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Millikin	Wiley
Hoey	Myers	Withers

So Mr. HICKENLOOPER's amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to the committee amendment, which has been printed, and which is lettered "E." I desire to call up the amendment at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 448, line 24, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That, during any period during which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of

the United Nations, no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which exports or permits the exportation, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including China and Northern Korea), of any article or commodity usable by, or which may be used in the manufacture of any article or commodity which may be useful to, the armed forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or such satellite countries."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not desire to use all my time now. The amendment has been discussed. If there is to be opposition, I should be glad later to use the time allotted me. If there is no opposition to the amendment, I am ready to vote on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Gurney	Magnuson
Benton	Hayden	Malone
Brewster	Hendrickson	Martin
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Bridges	Hill	Morse
Butler	Holland	Mundt
Byrd	Humphrey	Murray
Capehart	Ives	O'Connor
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kem	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Eaton	Knowland	Sparkman
Ellender	Langer	Stennis
Ferguson	Leahy	Taft
Flanders	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	Lodge	Thye
Fulbright	Lucas	Tydings
George	McCarran	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Wherry
Graham	McFarland	Williams
Green	McKellar	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HAYDEN. My point of order is that the amendment as offered imposes additional duties on ECA in that it must find that some countries which would be entitled to the benefits of the recovery program are exporting or permitting the exportation to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of any article or commodity which may be useful to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or satellite countries. It would impose a duty upon the Administrator which is not now authorized by law.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Chair rules with reference to the point raised I should like to modify the amendment by inserting in line 10, after the word "including" the word "Communist" so that it will read "Communist China and Northern Korea." The word "Communist" is not now included in the amendment. I should like to modify it in that respect.

Mr. President, is the point of order made by the Senator from Arizona open for consideration?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is. It lies in the discretion of the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, section 117 (d) of the basic act provides:

The Administrator is directed to refuse delivery insofar as practicable to participating countries of commodities which go into the production of any commodity for delivery to any nonparticipating European country which commodity would be refused export licenses to those countries by the United States in the interest of national security. Whenever the Administrator believes that the issuance of a license for the export of any commodity to any country wholly or partly in Europe which is not a participating country is inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of this title, he shall so advise the department, agency, or officer in the executive branch of the Government exercising the authority with respect to such commodity granted to the President by section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, and, if differences of view are not adjusted by consultation, the matter shall be referred to the President for final decision.

The next section deals with the termination of assistance.

Mr. President, the watchdog committee, on page 16 of its report, stated very emphatically as follows:

The problem confronting Congress is the fact that after nearly 2 years the wholehearted cooperation of the European countries receiving American aid in controlling east-west trade has not been obtained. It presumably could be obtained if section 117 (d) were strengthened by directing the Administrator to withhold economic assistance from all countries which do not satisfy him that they have put into effect controls which prevent shipments of goods to the iron-curtain areas, which the United States itself does not permit.

In this connection it must be recognized that this problem might fall more directly into the sphere of the North Atlantic Treaty and its administration. Nevertheless, certain countries receive economic assistance which do not participate in the foreign military-assistance program. The fundamental question then remains as to whether American dollars should go to countries which do not carry out our policies concerning trade with the Soviet-dominated countries.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The argument should go to the point of order, not to the merits.

Mr. WHERRY. I am arguing the point of order, Mr. President. In carrying out the recommendations made by the watchdog committee there is a limitation as to what the money can be spent for if the policy is not carried out. Therefore, it is not legislation in an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to ask the Senator a question.

The watchdog committee report suggests an amendment to the basic act, which has not been ratified by Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. However, I say that that is the basis for this amendment, which is not an affirmative amendment but a limitation upon an appropriation bill, requiring that no assistance be given to countries which do not carry out in principle what is inherent in the basic act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is trying to ask a question on the point of order. Does the Senator concede or does he take the position or is it his opinion that the adoption of the amendment would impose additional duties on the Administrator of the ECA or anyone connected with it?

Mr. WHERRY. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to hear the Senator on that point.

Mr. WHERRY. That is required under the basic act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator point to the language in the basic act which requires such action?

Mr. WHERRY. Section 117 (d).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator read it again?

Mr. WHERRY. Section 117 (d) provides:

The Administrator is directed to refuse delivery, insofar as practicable, to participating countries of commodities which go into the production of a commodity for delivery to any nonparticipating European country which commodity would be refused export licenses to those countries by the United States in the interest of national security.

The section continues in provision after provision with respect to what the Administrator shall do. It is my opinion that the Administrator has not done it, even though it is provided for in the basic act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Would not those articles be subject to refusal of export licenses?

Mr. WHERRY. The difficulty is not primarily with export licenses issued here. The difficulty is that the Administrator is not requiring the same precaution in export licenses from ECA countries to Russia. Therefore I am asking that the provision of the basic act be carried out insofar as licenses to those countries are concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is undertaking to determine under the basic act which shipments from cooperating countries to noncooperative countries are in such category that export licenses would not be granted for the shipment of those specific article into a noncooperating country.

Mr. WHERRY. The basic provision is that licenses shall be refused by the Administrator for the same articles for which we refuse export licenses in America in direct shipments to Russia or satellite countries.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the point regarding which the Chair is making inquiry. What identical articles are involved in this amendment on which

our country would not issue export licenses?

Mr. WHERRY. They are all strategic articles, on which a board passes. The Secretary of Commerce sits on that board. The Defense Department is also represented. In the past 6 weeks the board has begun to tighten up on many of these strategic materials, such as oil, which are finding their way into satellite countries.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to point out that in reading the report of the watchdog committee the Senator from Nebraska has indicated that the committee recommended that the basic law be changed or modified, and that is what his amendment seeks to do. In other words, he is seeking to legislate.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is listening to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. The "watchdog committee" clearly indicates that the law as it now stands is not satisfactory to the committee, and that it should be changed. That is what the Senator from Nebraska is trying to do. The law which he quoted states that the Administrator shall, so far as practicable, do certain things. The Senator would specifically require the Administrator to do those things whether he believed them to be practicable or not.

Mr. WHERRY. I respectfully disagree with my colleague from Arizona. I again call attention to the fact that I read the basic act, section 117 (d), which sets forth what we are attempting to do here—

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has read from the report of the "watchdog committee."

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator let me finish? In support of the fact that I felt there was need for this amendment I quoted from the "watchdog committee" report. The Senator from Nebraska knows that a legislative act can be amended. The Senator from Nebraska is not attempting to write legislation into an appropriation bill, any more than the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] was attempting to legislate in an appropriation bill. I propose a restriction or a limitation in an appropriation which has been written into the law already.

The Senator from Nebraska is on sound ground so far as the amendment is concerned. If the Senator from Arizona does not agree with it, that is another thing. Certainly the point of order does not lie against my amendment if we proceed on the established precedents. It is restriction on a legislative act, which does not call for affirmative action beyond what is already provided in the act itself. That is the reason I read the act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A limitation on an appropriation, if it changes an existing law or imposes additional duties on an administrative officer, would not necessarily be in order. The question before the Chair is not an easy one to decide. The question before the Chair is whether this restriction im-

poses any additional duties upon the Administrator of the ECA or any other officer with respect to the satellite countries, the Soviet Union, Communist China, or North Korea.

The Chair would like to take a little time to consult the Parliamentarian with respect to that question, because the Chair is undecided about it.

Mr. LUCAS. May I say a word on the point of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will hear the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The basic act, as read by the Senator from Nebraska, definitely states that the Administrator shall do certain things insofar as practicable. I emphasize the words "insofar as practicable." Under the Senator's amendment the Administrator is directed to do certain things. When that direction or authorization is added to the duties of the Administrator we are giving additional duties to him which he did not have under the basic act. In other words, he can take certain action now, so far as practicable, in connection with the disposition of certain articles from one country to another. The decision is up to him. Under the Senator's amendment the Administrator would be compelled to do certain things whether he wanted to do them or not. Certainly that would involve the imposition of additional duties.

Mr. WHERRY. May I say another word before the Chair makes his decision?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will listen to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I maintain that the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska narrows the act. The present provisions of section 117 (d) are very much broader than what the junior Senator from Nebraska is attempting to do with his amendment. All that the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska would do would be to withhold funds from countries which have not conformed to the provisions of the basic act with regard to strategic materials only. The basic act is much broader. It applies to all commodities which go into the production of any commodity for delivery, and so forth. All I am asking for is enforcement of the act with respect to strategic materials, because if we cannot get compliance on the broader scale, certainly we want it on strategic materials, because the time is here when all of us ought to be unanimous in directing the Administrator to refuse to permit strategic materials such as oil to be sent to ECA countries and then to be sold by them to satellite countries or to Russia, to be used against our boys. The Senator from Nebraska is narrowing the obligations of the Administrator to apply only to strategic materials. If the Administrator had complied with the provisions of the act there would be no need for the amendment of the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word on the question of the limitation. It is fundamental that a limitation is purely negative. It cannot direct, it cannot enlarge, it cannot change the responsibilities or the

duties of the administrator under the original provision. So that if the pending amendment in any wise adds to the duties or the obligations of the Administrator, it is out of order. That is all I care to say.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The basic act provides that the ECA Administrator shall act "so far as practicable." That gives him discretion to determine whether it is practicable to supply to the countries concerned goods which may be exported by them to nonparticipating countries and used for the manufacture of arms or supplies which might be useful to them in any conflict with us. That is the effect of it.

The amendment probably requires the ECA Administrator to be a little more alert in carrying out that duty. The Chair thinks that the basic Act would prevent him from providing any assistance to a country which shipped or permitted the shipment of any goods to Russia or a satellite country which might be used by them in any military operation against us. That gives the Administrator considerable discretion and latitude, whereas the amendment probably restricts his discretion, and makes it more mandatory for him to do these things.

The Chair does not see any "fatal infirmity," as Chief Justice Hughes once described a law on which he was passing, between the amendment and the basic law, and the Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Five minutes may be used by any Senator who desires to speak against the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr.

SCHOEPFEL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPFEL] would each vote "yea."

The Senator for Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—33

Brewster	George	Malone
Bricker	Gillette	Martin
Bridges	Hendrickson	Morse
Butler	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Byrd	Ives	O'Connor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Cordon	Kem	Taft
Dworshak	Knowland	Watkins
Ecton	Langer	Wherry
Ferguson	McCarran	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Young

NAYS—39

Anderson	Hill	Magnuson
Benton	Holland	Maybank
Chapman	Humphrey	Murray
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Douglas	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Ellender	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Lehman	Sparkman
Graham	Lodge	Stennis
Green	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	McFarland	Thye
Hayden	McKellar	Tydings

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	Jenner	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Darby	Long	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McMahon	Tobey
Eastland	Millikin	Vandenberg
Hoey	Myers	Wiley
Hunt	Neely	Withers

So Mr. WHERRY's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I call up my amendment lettered "B" of July 28, 1950, to the committee amendment, and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 448, line 24, it is proposed to strike out the period at the end of the sentence and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided further, That in carrying out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, the President shall encourage the cooperating nations to forgive indebtedness incurred with one another during World War II, or to delay payments on such indebtedness for so long a period as United States assistance shall be required for the debtor nation."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I will take 3½ minutes of my 5 minutes myself.

During World War II the United States Government extended \$48,700,000,000 in grants and credits to its allies, the major portion of which was in lend-lease.

In the same period other nations extended minor credits to allied nations to carry out the successful prosecution of the war.

The United States looks for repayment of only minor sums out of the vast amount of World War II aid extended. Where it seeks repayment at all, it has been most willing to grant indefinite delay so as to occasion no hardship to former allies.

As we now undertake economic aid and the rearming of several nations in the mutual-defense assistance program, this Nation finds that some of the receiving nations are saddled with relatively heavy debts incurred during World War II for military supplies.

Great Britain, for instance, extended aid to the Netherlands, France, Greece, and Turkey during World War II. Now it seeks repayment of these wartime loans. Other nations, likewise, extended World War II credits.

It would seem only just that repayment of World War II indebtedness should be postponed during such time as the United States is called upon to equip debtor nations with military supplies or furnish economic aid.

The nations that have been aided so generously by the United States Government ought now to be lenient to nations that contracted military debts in the last war.

Repayment of World War II military debts at this time may retard the recovery of a debtor nation or delay military preparedness needed now.

Turkey, for instance, owes Great Britain approximately £30,000,000. This amount is not large in the British economy. It represents a major obligation in terms of the Turkish economy. The gold reserves of Turkey have been drawn down from approximately \$208,000,000 in 1947 to approximately \$165,000,000 today. We are called on to aid Turkey, both through ECA and through military assistance.

At the same time we are aiding Great Britain.

It seems to me that in carrying out the provisions of economic assistance or of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 we ought to encourage the forgiveness or postponement of World War II debts contracted between participating nations because, in the end, the money comes from the United States, anyway.

This amendment does not direct the President to take any action that would interfere in any way with the sovereignty of other nations. It does not require him to impose any intolerable burden upon any other nation. It only expresses the sense of Congress that he should encourage nations receiving our aid to lessen the load which debtor nations carry today because of credits extended during the wartime period.

In effect the amendment merely asks the President to use his good offices to see if this can be brought about. I think it is a sound thing because, if we are aiding Turkey, and she owes money to Great Britain, and if Great Britain is pressing Turkey for collection, then certainly the money will come out of the United States both ways.

Therefore, I think the amendment is very sound.

I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the views expressed by the Senator from New Hampshire, pointing out that this is not a mandate on the part of the Senate, but this is an effort on our part by amendment which asks the President to encourage our associates in ECA to give

the same kind of treatment to other countries in the Marshall-plan program with regard to World War II indebtedness that we in the United States ourselves are extending to our associates in the Marshall-plan program. It seems to me that is simply injecting an element of realism into this whole business. The amendment simply assures that each of the members of the Marshall-plan program shall receive the same consideration from other creditor countries as the United States, in turn, has extended to such creditor nations as are debtor nations, insofar as our own books are concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to the point of concluding my sentence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield the next half minute to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as I view the amendment I see in it only a direction for cooperation. It is quite in the spirit of all the things we are trying to do with our allies and our friends the world over. I think the amendment is entitled to the support of every Member of this body.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hardly know what the amendment means. I do not, of course, intend to cast any reflection on my friend from New Hampshire. It seems to require the President to do something which is certainly not in order on this appropriation bill, as I believe, and I make a point of order against it. The idea of our asking other nations to forgive each other their debts is remarkable indeed. Such a provision certainly ought not to be on an appropriation bill which authorizes so much money to be given to other nations. By this bill we are appropriating money for certain foreign nations. The Senator's amendment would ask other nations to forgive debts owing to them. How can we ever expect to collect any of the money we have loaned other nations or given to other nations after we make a statement such as is proposed by the amendment? It seems to me the amendment is subject to a point of order. If it is not subject to a point of order, it ought to be voted down, and I hope it will be voted down, and not put in the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator understands, does he not, that we are advancing money to Turkey for economic aid and military aid, for example. If Turkey is being forced by Great Britain to pay old war debts, similar to war debts owing to us and such as we have in large part forgiven, it will only mean that we will be furnishing money to Great Britain, and then she will get more money by siphoning off some we provide for Turkey. The amendment does not direct the President to do anything. It simply asks him to use his good offices to

stop demands for payments owing to them.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator feels as he does with respect to forgiveness of debt, why does he not introduce a bill covering that point? Why does he propose to hang such an amendment onto this appropriation bill? It seems to me the amendment is out of place in every sense of the word. I believe it is not in order on an appropriation bill, and I hope the Chair will hold that it is not in order. If the Chair does not hold that it is not in order, I hope the Senate will vote down the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order. The amendment does not limit the appropriation carried in the bill. But it does issue a direction to the President of the United States to encourage the cooperating nations to forgive indebtedness incurred with one another during World War II, or to delay the payments of such indebtedness so long as we are furnishing money to any of these countries. Presumably the President could by negotiation, by taking up an issue of that sort with the other nations, encourage them to do that thing. But he is not required to do it. It is entirely within his own judgment as to whether or not he shall undertake it.

This amendment says he shall do it; therefore, he is directed by the amendment to proceed with negotiations with all these countries, to see whether they will forgive the indebtedness to them by other countries or postpone its payment.

The Chair thinks that amounts to issuing to the President of the United States a directive that is not contemplated by any present law. Therefore the point of order is sustained.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in order to be consistent, I appeal from the Chair's decision on the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? [Putting the question.]

The "ayes" appear to have it; the "ayes" have it, and the Chair's ruling on the point of order is sustained.

The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I call up the amendment to the committee amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 448 of the committee amendment, before the period in line 24, it is proposed to insert a comma and the following proviso: "Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which, in the opinion of the President, has failed, refused, or neglected to support the United Nations in the Korean war by supplying armed personnel, materials of war, or services."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this amendment to the committee amendment is very plain in its purpose and in its direction. Today we are in a war. It may be called a police action; but to

the men who are fighting and dying over there in Korea, trying to stop that Communist aggression and conquest, it is war. Officially it is a war of the United Nations, but with the United States doing the fighting. That is the situation up to this hour.

Other members of the United Nations have been called upon to furnish assistance in fighting personnel, materials, and services. Some of them have most modestly responded; others have done nothing as yet to assist. There has not been up to now the enthusiastic response and support which is necessary and that we have the right to expect and demand.

I do not believe we should be expected to spend millions of dollars, nor should we tolerate it, to build up the economy of any country participating in the ECA program if that country is able and should fail or refuse, as a member of the United Nations, to furnish either fighting personnel, war materials, or services in this conflict.

This amendment to the committee amendment simply provides that if any country participating in and a recipient of ECA funds fails, refuses, or neglects to furnish either fighting personnel, war materials, or services, then, when such country fails to do so, if in the President's opinion that country could do so, the President in his discretion can stop the spending of ECA funds in that country and for that government.

Mr. President, that should be done. That is all the amendment to the committee amendment provides. It is not compulsory; it leaves the matter to the discretion of the President of the United States.

Someone has said, "We ought not say that now out loud; that we should tell them that in a whisper when we give them the money."

Well, Mr. President, let us tell it to them now in the language of this bill. Let us whisper it loud enough so that when the President says, "Give us some help," these countries will know that the Congress of the United States is back of the President, giving him our moral support, and that the Congress and the people of this Nation do not want this ECA money—which is appropriated by us to help in the fight against communism—to be spent in countries which will not, when the crisis, the real test comes, stand up and be counted in the fight against communism.

There is all there is to the amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield 1 minute to the junior Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish enthusiastically to support and endorse in full the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment.

The battle call has already been sounded; it was sounded more than a month ago. Our men are actually fighting and dying on the battle line. The blue-and-white flag of the United Nations has been unfurled, representing a new forward step in international affairs. However, we are the only country whose

men are actually fighting and giving their blood and dying on the battle line.

The operation of the amendment will not be arbitrary, for it leaves discretion with the President. There is plenty of time to put the amendment into operation, and there is plenty of time for these nations to have advance notice.

It seems to me that this is the test; this is it.

All these years we have been charged with having been the cause of the failure of the League of Nations. Now we have taken a leading part in the United Nations, and today we are on the battle line.

So it seems to me that this is the test; and no one who is acting in good faith in connection with the recovery program can object to this step.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to endorse wholeheartedly the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment.

Today we have a new kind of citizenship—citizenship in the United Nations. Every member of the United Nations is in effect a citizen of the United Nations, and in time of war they can be classified only one way or the other: they are either for the new nation of which they are a citizen or they are against it. In a case of this sort, when a country gives aid and comfort to the enemy, that country is guilty of treason, to all effects and purposes.

I think the time has come when the people of the United States, through their Senate and their House of Representatives, should speak and be heard as advising the President that we expect that the citizens of the United Nations, the members of the United Nations, will take either one side or the other in the great conflict now going on in Korea, the aggression of the North Koreans against the South Koreans. In this conflict, all nations who are members of the United Nations must demonstrate that they are either for or against the United Nations. Those who give aid and comfort against the United Nations are in effect themselves guilty of acts of aggression. They should not be given aid by the United States of America when we are trying to fight communism not only in Korea but in other parts of the world.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the amendment, I ask that it be again stated by the clerk, so that all Senators will understand it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas wants the amendment again stated by the clerk, and I yield that much time—if it does not take all the remaining time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will restate the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 448, before the period in line 24, it is proposed

to insert a comma and the following: "Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which, in the opinion of the President, has failed, refused, or neglected to support the United Nations in the Korean War by supplying armed personnel, materials of war, or services."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Arkansas would be willing to let the amendment go to conference, to be considered there. I think it is subject to a point of order, but if the Senator is willing to let it go to conference, we will accept it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the able Senator. Of course, it will have to go to conference, and I am perfectly willing that it go to conference. But I hope it will be retained in this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Tennessee that the amendment is subject to a point of order. However, the Senator from Illinois will not raise the point. I do not raise it because I am confident that the Senator from Arkansas, in this amendment, is facing in the right direction so far as the United Nations Organization is concerned, and insofar as all men who believe in the free way of life are concerned.

I should like to advise the Senate that, at the first meeting we had with the President of the United States, the Cabinet, and high members of the military, the Army and the Navy, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], and I, at that very first meeting, advocated this very thing. We thought it was very necessary that all nations participating in the United Nations Organization show their good will and their intention of going along with us by doing something along this line. Since that time, the nations have indicated their willingness to help, and I think it is a source of something really worth while for the United Nations and the free world to have all these nations doing something which they can do for the free world, something which indicates that they are with us in this fight. That is what the Senator from Arkansas is aiming to accomplish, by giving the President the power to do the things enumerated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely want the other countries to know that we are furnishing this money, and that the eyes of America are upon them. We want to know whether they are ready to stand up and be counted to the extent of their ability, whenever a crisis comes. If not, I do not favor spending time or money with them.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LUCAS. In a moment. I should like to make a further observation with respect to certain countries sending military and other forms of aid. We must realize, when we think of the 59 nations of different languages and different

types of munitions, and so forth, so far as military aid from them is concerned, it could become a liability rather than an asset. At the same time, they can furnish materials or articles that will be of aid in connection with this crisis. They could send troops, even though they could not speak our language, to be used for example in bringing out those who are wounded, or for certain kinds of field duty, or to do something in the rear of the front lines, so far as menial services are concerned. I think that is what the American people desire.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what we want.

Mr. LUCAS. This is a step in the right direction, and I certainly shall not object to it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Illinois says there have been promises and expectations held out. Will the Senator be more specific? We have promises, but the only things that are definite I think are that Australia is sending, or offering to send, 4,500 trained combat troops; Thailand, 4,000 soldiers; and Bolivia, 30 officers.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know what 30 officers from Bolivia could do in Korea.

Mr. STENNIS. I am not referring particularly to them. But let us be as specific as we can as to what has actually been put on the line, or sent, or representations made that it will be sent at any particular time.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that England is now preparing to send 6,000 infantrymen, engineers, and artillery. They will all be foot soldiers. It is my understanding Australia is sending foot soldiers, and that another nation is probably sending some.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall yield in a moment. I am now quoting from memory, but I know that there are countries which have expressed a willingness to do what is being suggested here. The more we can discuss it and the more the Congress becomes interested in such a program, the better it will be for our own country, and the better for all the peoples concerned.

Mr. STENNIS. Does not the Senator think that the subject ought to be debated more at length, and that it is unfortunate when it comes up under the 10-minute rule?

Mr. LUCAS. I might debate it at great length, and go along with everything said in furtherance of it. I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

ASSISTANCE FROM AUSTRALIA—EDITORIAL FROM THE SYDNEY DAILY TELEGRAPH

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I received by air mail from Australia an editorial which appeared in one of the leading Australian papers. I think it is a splendid editorial. It points up what the people of Australia should do. They should back up the United States, now that the United States is asking for support in the United Nations, or through

the United Nations Organization. And, Mr. President, because the discussion relates directly to what nations should do in support of the United Nations and the United States in this Korean crisis, it seems to me that this editorial would be very timely, if it were permitted to be printed in the body of the RECORD as part of the discussion of this over-all question. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LISTEN, MR. MENZIES! OLD FRIENDS ARE CALLING FOR HELP

If the gentlemen in Canberra have the vaguest idea of this Nation's best interest, they will announce, without any more beating about the bush, that Australia will support the hard-pressed Americans in Korea with a division of land troops and more squadrons of fighting planes.

The reasons why we should give this aid, without hedging, should be obvious to every Australian who remembers how we felt in 1941 when this country lay wide open to invasion.

If the Americans are swept out of Korea and Formosa the Russian front will be triumphant throughout Asia.

Whatever friends we have still on the Asiatic Continent will desert us.

Then Australia will be far out on a lonely limb.

UNO and collective security—the alliance of free peoples—will die.

And the first nation to suffer from that death will be white Australia.

Of all nations, this one depends on the aid of others—and especially on American aid.

What saved us from battle on our soil and conquest in the last war except American help?

Not a thing.

Can we expect similar help again—as we will certainly need it again—if we let the Koreans murder Americans in another Dunkerque without doing everything we can to help avert so terrible a disaster?

The Americans are closely watching all the peoples who have given flowery lip-service to UNO in the last few years and have received in return generous United States aid.

If these peoples sit on the sidelines now, while Americans die in an outnumbered struggle, many American people will argue that they would be wiser to spend their money on themselves and let the rest of the world sink.

That might be a foolish, emotional reaction in the long run, but it would be understandable.

We are told that some British people enjoy the spectacle of Americans fighting while Britain for once is at peace.

That is a stupid satisfaction, which is likely to be very short-lived.

For only one thing keeps Britain or any of us at peace at this moment—Russia's fear of American industrial strength backing up a solid British-American front.

Those who crow over the United States' embarrassment in Korea are helping to smash that front—a job on which Moscow has spent millions of her propaganda funds.

They would have their happiest day of all time at the Kremlin if the Korean struggle ended with Americans feeling that Britain and her Dominions had let Americans down.

For that would damage the only military and political combination which may draw a line to Russian ambitions.

To forestall this blow to our friendship with the United States we and the rest of

the British Commonwealth must show that we are prepared to give as freely and as generously as we expect Americans to give when we are in difficulties.

This is a moment for action which counts only the needs of our friend.

If we let that friend call to us in vain now we can expect no answer to our own appeals when our time comes to face the yellow flood.

PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA TO
VISIT THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact, since Australia has been mentioned, that tomorrow, at 2 or 2:15, the Prime Minister of Australia is to be the guest of the Senate, and is to deliver a brief address. The Chair hopes all Senators will be present to greet the Prime Minister, who is in this country to confer with our Government regarding the nature and extent of the assistance Australia may give in the Korean situation.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that I may have one additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this same question was raised in the committee, and we were told by those from the Department of Defense that there was a parallel situation in a number of countries, that is to say, that the President or the Premier could not commit his country without referring the matter to the legislature, and that that was going on all the time. Reports have been made that help will come, but the announcement could not be made at this time, because the legislatures of the countries had not approved it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator, I think, is correct about that. It will require some time. In other words, we happened to have our troops in Japan, nearby. We are sending them, and also, of course, some from this country. But other countries are sending troops, and they are on the way, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has again expired. All time has expired on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] to the committee amendment.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has been accepted by the committee. [Putting the question.] The amendment is agreed to. The committee amendment is still open to amendment.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment offered by me may be read at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In chapter X-B, it is proposed to strike out all after line 3, on page 447, down to and including line 17; and, at the proper place in chapter XI, insert an amount equal to the sum stricken from the chapter X-B, to be used for defense purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

SUGGESTED 10-POINT PROGRAM FOR WINNING THE
WAR

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, no one believes that the \$10,400,000,000 currently requested by the President is anything but a start. However, the President has not yet outlined what is involved in the police action which he inaugurated without requesting the approval of Congress, except through additional appropriations.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada is suggesting a 10-point program and an outline for emergency procedure. Only one amendment is needed. The remaining nine can be brought about through Executive order.

First, transfer ECA funds to the war chest.

Second, stop the pressure from our State Department to recognize Communist China.

Third, stop Marshall-plan countries from arming Russia and her satellites.

Fourth, call on England and France to cancel their separate nonaggression pacts with Russia.

Fifth, reduce our domestic Government budget by 20 percent and add three and one-half billion dollars to the war chest.

Sixth, transfer to the war chest the \$500,000,000 available for domestic peacetime public works.

Seventh, transfer to the war chest the one and one-fourth billion dollars available for military assistance to foreign countries and unify our military efforts.

Eighth, remove from the State Department Dean Acheson and his satellites.

Ninth, establish a definite foreign policy, describe the areas, and name the nations whose integrity we must currently protect for our own ultimate safety, and notify the world and our own people what we mean to protect.

Tenth, appropriate the necessary funds to build a national-defense organization, spearheaded by an Air Corps and a submarine fleet that will be notice to the world and to our own people that we can enforce our commitments.

Mr. President, supporting the 10-point program, I submit the following:

First, Transfer ECA funds to the war chest. ECA assistance for building up European peacetime industry was to be a peacetime endeavor. While we must pay for a new war, our people cannot be expected to carry the burden of 16 foreign countries on their backs.

Second, Stop pressure from our State Department to recognize Communist China. My fellow Senators will recall that Mr. Acheson told us that the United States would not use its veto power to

block United Nations' recognition of the Communist regime in China. Apparently, this was the last official act on the part of our State Department before the Soviets started their attack on South Korea. We cannot, with any degree of consistency, fight communism on the one hand and recognize it on the other.

Third, Stop the 16 Marshall plan countries from arming Russia and her satellites through the 96 trade treaties which have been made between those countries. We should take every reasonable means to see to it that the 96 trade treaties are canceled immediately.

NINETY-SIX TRADE TREATIES WITH RUSSIA AND
IRON-CURTAIN COUNTRIES

The 16 Marshall plan, ECA nations, have 96 important trade treaties with Soviet Russia and such iron curtain countries shipping them everything they need to consolidate their gains and to make war.

Both England and India, through their spokesmen, Bevin and Nehru, have said that they intended to remain neutral, they wanted to trade with Russia and the Communist countries.

Now, these same nations, erstwhile allies, and other nations, have recognized Communist China without consulting this Nation, at least without the American people being informed, thus leading us into a foreign policy not only distasteful but which may be definitely dangerous.

Therefore, it is high time that the State Department discharge their constitutional responsibility and make up their mind and inform the American people and the Congress of the United States just what our foreign policy should be before it is too late. It is later than we think.

A list of the 96 trade treaties which the 16 Marshall plan countries has made and which are in good standing at this time will be found on page 846, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1950.

Fourth, Call on England and France to cancel forthwith their nonaggression pacts with Soviet Russia. It is time for the countries which we have befriended to choose sides.

NONAGGRESSION PACTS

I shall quote briefly from a nonaggression pact signed by Anthony Eden, representing Britain, and V. Molotov, representing Communist Russia. This treaty, signed by these two men representing their respective countries of Britain and Russia, which is still in full force and effect, contained two significant articles. Article 6 in the Soviet-Britain Pact provides:

The high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

Article 7 reads:

Each high contracting party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other high contracting party.

Mr. President, those provisions read startlingly like the North Atlantic Pact. Since they have pacts now with both the

Soviet Empire and the United States of America, it is difficult to see how they could lose in any emergency which might occur later. They have signed up with both Russia and the United States.

In the treaty signed by Mr. Molotov, again, and Mr. Bidault, representing France, which was signed in Moscow, the two articles corresponding with the two just read taken from the British Empire and the Russian Empire treaty, are article 5 and article 6. Article 5 of the French-Russian nonaggression pact reads:

The high contracting parties undertake not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against either of the high contracting parties.

Article 6 reads:

The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war.

Mr. President, both these nonaggression pacts are in full force and effect. All the 95 trade treaties mentioned in the debate today are in full force and effect, meaning that the parties are continuing at all times to send all the material necessary not only to Russia to consolidate her gains in eastern Europe and in Communist China, and to make war quietly and secretly, as they have in the past in China and Indochina and the Malayan States and the rest of the Far East, but they are sending them material to make war on the United States of America, if they have that idea in their minds. The State Department and the bipartisan group in this body sold that idea, that Russia was and is our potential enemy, thoroughly to the United States Senate during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, and all through the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

Fifth. Reduce our strictly domestic Government budget by 20 percent and transfer the amount saved to the war chest. This would not take one penny from national defense, the stockpiling of atomic energy, veterans' aid, or interest on the public debt. It would simply reduce by 20 percent the domestic spending which is in no way connected with those items. Let us look at our budget for the current fiscal year:

National defense.....	\$13,545,000,000
Veterans' services and benefits.....	6,080,000,000
Interest on public debt.....	5,625,000,000
Remaining	17,189,000,000
Total	42,439,000,000

We would save \$3,500,000,000 by reducing the seventeen-billion item by 20 percent. It has been pointed out by the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Virginia how a saving of more than this could easily be made on our domestic spending.

The administration says the people must tighten their belts. Speaking of curbs for civilians, how about some curbs for the Government as well? If ordinary citizens must cut down on butter in favor of guns, why not render some lard out of the bureaucratic jobs also?

Another Member of this body from across the aisle, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, able chairman

of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, called attention to the fact that the administration could easily tighten its belt. In his report, the senior Senator from Arkansas warned that "this tremendous rising cost—of government—is indicative of a fixed permanent trend that cannot be ignored or remain unchallenged." And he added that this provides a "warning of compelling force against our proceeding with reckless indifference to enact more and more laws expanding present governmental services and instigating new programs creating additional governmental obligations that will add billions annually to the already swollen costs of government."

The necessity of more economy in government is greater now than it was then.

The 1951 budget still covers up much of the waste, duplication, payroll padding, and inefficiencies exposed by the Hoover Commission, Byrd committee and other survey agencies in their numerous reports. These add up to billions of dollars of possible savings. All in all there is room for economizing if the Congress has the guts to do it.

Sixth. Transfer to the war chest the one-half billion dollars available for domestic peacetime public works. Worthy as are our peacetime public works, our taxpayers cannot be expected to pay the cost or furnish the necessary manpower during the war emergency. In wartime such works are unnecessary, and in fact, undesirable. Our money and our man-hours should be devoted to the war effort. This five hundred million should be transferred to the military program.

Seventh. Transfer to the war chest the one and one-fourth billion dollars available for military assistance to foreign countries. Our own expanded military program must be upon a basis of defending the nations whose integrity is important to our ultimate safety. Our military efforts, however, should be unified. Otherwise we might very well be delivering arms to areas which will fall into the hands of our enemies. Countries which we have been arming have shown little concern for our present predicament and are still sending potential war materials to Russia and her satellites.

Eighth. Remove from the State Department Dean Acheson and his satellites who were responsible for the bungling in foreign policy which brought this country to its present plight. It is imperative that we remove these men before other serious mistakes are made.

There are many well-informed people who believe that the primary aim of Stalin and his Politburo in the Kremlin is the economic destruction of the United States, that war with America is secondary and an alternative that will be avoided, if possible, and postponed as long as possible if it is unavoidable. The view in the Kremlin is that the capitalistic United States is the keystone to the entire capitalistic system, and that if that keystone can be brought down, the whole western economic system in Europe, in North and South America,

and what is left of it in Asia and Africa will crash.

The spearpoint of Soviet Russian political, ideological, economic, and military strategy to attain this objective, according to well-informed people who hold this belief, is continual war alarms on the world-encircling front of American commitments, calling for ever-increasing appropriations of vast sums of money in the United States for armaments and war preparations, and in Britain, France, Greece, Turkey, Persia, and other countries dependent upon America for economic and financial aid and military support.

Stalin's orders are reported to be to bring about the collapse of America's capitalistic economy through war alarms, enormous appropriations calling for ever higher taxes, dislocation and disruption of normal business, and ever-increasing demands by other countries dependent on American financing for aid and armaments, thus building up gigantic national debts.

In Washington the administration is unwittingly playing Stalin's game today, just as it has done since the day of unconditional surrender.

In war, the side which holds the initiative to determine the time and place of action has a tremendous advantage over the foe. In the present war in Korea, the initiative is held by Soviet Russia, which can determine the time and place of action. Korea, Formosa, French Indochina, Hongkong, Pakistan, Iran, Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, Germany—any of these might have been selected as the arena of battle. Any of these places might be chosen for the next battle in a prolonged, costly and irritating war.

The Russian holds the initiative because, in a word, at Yalta and Potsdam, Russia's initiative was confirmed, and more recently it has been strengthened in the persistent effort of Great Britain, India, and the State Department to have Soviet China recognized by the UN.

Now, another point in regard to the blunders of Acheson and his satellites:

It is announced now that President Truman is seeking a big war stockpile of strategic war materials. Had the State Department had a little foresight, this pushing of stock piling would not have waited until now. As a matter of fact, the State Department's foreign-trade policy has shut down approximately 70 percent of the American mines which were producing strategic war minerals.

On the Senate floor, on March 7 of this year, the junior Senator from Nevada read an obituary notice on five strategic metals—mercury, antimony, tungsten, manganese and chromite—essential in peacetime and doubly essential in wartime—the production of which ceased as a direct result of State Department foreign-trade policy.

The administration would like for everyone to overlook the civilian blunders by Truman's Secretary of State Dean Acheson which left the professional fighting leaders hamstrung and drained of resources when the administration reversed itself suddenly and told

the military to defend an area which the White House and the State Department had formally declared would not be defended.

In the American intervention in Korea, under the circumstances it occurred, it seems to me that administration policy overrode the sound judgment of the American chiefs of staff. Generals, admirals, soldiers, airmen and seamen are expected to make good the blunders of statesmen.

American boys are paying the penalty in bloodshed in Korea today because of incompetence and lack of foresight on the part of our State Department. We can charge to the State Department the agreement concerning Berlin which did not provide for egress or ingress by western power personnel. We can also charge the State Department with the handing over of Manchuria to Soviet Russia. We can charge to the State Department the steps leading to the Korean situation. The people responsible for the foreign policy have been weak or worse. If we are to win this war and regain our prestige in the world, these persons must be removed.

Ninth. Establish a definite foreign policy.

(a) We should determine the areas in the world—in Europe, Africa, Asia, the South Seas, and the Western Hemisphere—which are important to our ultimate safety. We should determine the countries whose integrity is important to us. For 127 years the Monroe Doctrine has worked. This Nation decided 127 years ago that the integrity of the Western Hemisphere was important to us. Now, apparently, the integrity of other areas is important to us. Let Government officials in whom the people have confidence decide what those areas are.

(b) We should name all such areas and all countries so that everyone will know exactly what we will fight to protect. This will give us a good chance to stay out of trouble. Our own people are entitled to know what we are fighting for. The general opinion today is that Russia would not have started the Korean push if the Kremlin had known we would fight to protect the Republic of Korea.

(c) We should build a defense organization, spearheaded by an air corps and submarine fleet of such strength that the world will realize we can enforce our pronouncements.

Now, a little late, the administration approved universal military training. The junior Senator from Nevada introduced a bill calling for universal military training 2 years ago, and the bill was buried in an administration-controlled committee. Now, after a little fifth-rate country gives the United States one defeat after another, the administration wakes up to the need of the very thing they chose previously to ignore.

There has been stupidity all along.

Out in Korea young Americans, lacking adequate arms, training, and reinforcements, are being killed. And they are not being helped a bit by those who chose to ignore the bill for universal military training.

As the junior Senator from Nevada stated when introducing the bill:

Universal training offers the only method through which we could insure a sufficient number and dispersal of trained military manpower without overburdening the country's economy through the maintenance of a huge standing Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

He also suggested that our young men should be trained for their own survival when the emergency arrives.

Tenth. Mr. President, I will close with a brief reference to the enormous amount of money we have appropriated for national defense. Where did the forty-eight and one-half billion dollars go? Since the close of World War II Congress has appropriated forty-eight and one-half billion dollars for national defense, and yet we meet ignominious defeat at the hands of little Korea. What was the forty-eight and one-half billion supposed to provide for us? Surely something better than we seem to have.

Let me read to you a brief editorial which appeared in the July 27 edition of the New York Journal-American:

THE ADMINISTRATION'S DUTY

President Truman is asking Congress to provide \$10,486,976,000 in new military funds, and to meet part of the requisition by levying \$5,000,000,000 in new or increased taxes.

The President wants the \$10,000,000,000 because, as the little war in Korea suddenly demonstrated, our national defense is inadequate, although we have expended in 4 years of peace \$50,000,000,000 for military purposes.

Our unreadiness to meet promptly a so-called police action in an area as limited as South Korea indicates that the administration has made no wise use of the immense funds it has already had.

So the administration wants more money to do what it should have done before.

And, of course, Congress will assign the funds, if no better way can be found.

But there is a better way—or at least one that should have priority.

For how has it happened that the administration now calls for war taxes to meet its military needs?

Actually, we have continued on a war-tax basis all during the peace—or cold-war—period.

The excise war taxes have never been repealed or reduced.

The personal income and corporation taxes have remained at high levels.

Payroll taxes still flow into the Treasury. Consequently, new war taxes must be added to the war taxes already in effect, which have been retained ever since the last war ceased.

This happens partly because of the New Deal's gross mismanagement of defense expenditures.

It happens more largely because of the New Deal's extravagant expenditures for non-military purposes.

Obviously—and in view of the administration's current deficit—the primary defense need is to eliminate all unnecessary expenditures and put to defense uses the sums retrieved.

If this be done, no tax increase would be justifiable at this time, since the administration would have in hand the \$5,000,000,000 which it seeks in new taxes.

If the job were well done, the administration might have even the whole \$10,000,000,000 desired for military requirements—and perhaps enough besides to balance the budget.

Until the administration is willing to make some political sacrifices for the national se-

curity, its demands for sacrifices by the public are made with very ill grace.

HOW TO SAVE \$8,250,000,000 FOR THE WAR CHEST

(a) Suspend ECA, a peacetime endeavor, save \$3,000,000,000.

(b) Suspend domestic peacetime public works, save \$500,000,000.

(c) Suspend 20 percent of civil Government spending, save \$3,500,000,000.

(d) Suspend extra foreign military assistance, save \$1,250,000,000.

Total savings, \$8,250,000,000.

There is no valid reason for gouging the people to build up peacetime economy in Europe and finance domestic peacetime projects here while we are on a wartime basis. Economy is a much sounder method of meeting the increased military costs than burdening the American people with more taxes.

Let us put our own house in order, and properly prepare to win this and any other war forced upon us. The nine points which I have listed and discussed gives us a winning program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask for the approval of the entire committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That entire matter is to be voted on as a whole—

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Chair will pardon me, ordinarily with an appropriation bill we vote paragraph by paragraph. We have now considered the first paragraph which relates to economic cooperation. The next paragraph relates to assistance to Korea.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the whole chapter is considered as one amendment, to be voted on as a single amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was not my understanding. I ask unanimous consent that for the purposes of amendment the entire chapter be considered as original text. If it were original text in the bill we would adopt it paragraph by paragraph. I think that is the orderly way in which to dispose of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona asks unanimous consent that the entire committee amendment be considered as the text of the bill for purposes of amendment, which means there would be a difference in degree of amendments which would be offered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Reserving the right to object, what effect would that have on the amendment which I desire to offer at this time? I should like to have permission to have it passed upon first.

Mr. HAYDEN. When that page of the bill is reached, which is page 451, the Senator can offer his amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would it be in order after the request of the Senator is agreed to?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not making such a request now. I thought it would be more orderly to proceed paragraph by paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the agreement heretofore made, the whole

chapter is open for amendment as a single paragraph.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I be recognized for 1 minute, under the unanimous-consent agreement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an amendment pending. Under the agreement, there is no provision for general remarks. The Senator will be recognized on the committee amendment itself.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which applies to page 451 of the bill, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 451, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$26,900,000"; on page 451, line 18, after "any project", insert "except for demonstration or instructional purposes"; on page 451, lines 19 and 20, strike out "(not to exceed 10 per centum)."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Was there not an amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and was it acted upon?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was acted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was rejected.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the danger which faces us has already forced us to take such unusual steps as to mobilize manpower and industry and to shed American blood in Korea. But there are other measures which we must take which would have seemed equally unusual a few months ago.

There is first the entrance into the Atlantic Pact of two former neutrals of World War II—Ireland and Spain, which are both Atlantic nations possessing strategic terrain and valuable manpower. The State Department should use its good offices to promote whatever adjustments are necessary between these nations and their neighbors so that they can help the rest of the non-Communist world to carry the load.

Looming even larger is the policy to be followed toward the two former enemies of World War II, Germany and

Japan. It is no exaggeration to say that the fate of these nations is a life-and-death matter for the United States, for, if the Soviets captured Germany and Japan they would possess such a huge industrial potential that they might think they could destroy the United States.

We are deeply grateful to the nations which have realized that this fight is their fight and which have sent troops to Korea. We must also recognize that it is unfair to us and to these free nations to carry the whole load of combat alone. The former neutrals—and even the former enemies—of World War II must help in this struggle for survival of human freedom. It is only fair that they bear part of the burden since their own existence is also in danger.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I shall not want more than a quarter of a minute.

Mr. President, I want to state that I believe the last amendment the Senate adopted is one of the most important amendments which has come up during the discussion of the bill. I am 100 per cent for it, and I hope that in conference it will be insisted upon by the Senate conferees and will be retained in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, by direction of the Appropriations Committee, I wish to call up two more amendments dealing with page 451 of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's amendment has already been stated.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say that the amendment increases the appropriation for point 4, and I hope it will be adopted. The Committee on Appropriations, so far as I recall, virtually unanimously instructed me to offer the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Tennessee has offered the amendment. I favored the amendment in the committee. I was in favor of a lower amount, but was voted down with reference to that. I am certainly glad that the committee is in favor of the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, with that statement, I leave the matter to the Senate, and ask for a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 461 under the heading "Aid to Palestine Refugees." The amendment proposes on page 461, line 22, to strike out "\$24,705,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$27,450,000", which is the budget estimate and the amount authorized by law. In this instance the reduction took place exactly in the same manner as heretofore recited by me with respect to the reduction in the ECA appropriation. It was an arbitrary 10-percent cut in the amount of money for which the budget had asked and for which the committee had at first voted, but subsequently reduced by 10 percent. The people affected are the Arabs who were driven out of Palestine in the course of the war. It seems to me that the cut of \$2,745,000 is too drastic. In view of the pitiable condition of these people I think the Senate should restore the amount which was authorized by law and provided for in the budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute with respect to contributions of armed aid in Korea by United Nations members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey that he be recognized for 1 minute? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, under date of July 27, 1950, I had a compilation prepared showing the armed aid in Korea by United Nations members. The question was discussed this afternoon in connection with an amendment which had been offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I ask that the memorandum be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Armed aid in Korea by United Nations members

	Ground forces	Air forces	Naval forces
Australia.....	"Ground troops"—particulars undecided.....	1 fighter squadron, in Japan when war began; now in action.	1 destroyer, 1 frigate—both in action.
Belgium.....		Air transport, quantity unknown; should be active soon.	
Bolivia.....	"30 officers".....		
Canada.....		1 long-range air transport squadron and ground crews—soon.	3 destroyers, in action.
China.....	33,000 combat troops (not accepted).....	20 C-47 transports (not accepted).....	
Denmark.....			Perhaps 1 merchant ship (under negotiation).
France.....		6 transport planes.....	1 sloop, 1,900 tons—in action soon.
Greece.....			
Netherlands.....			1 destroyer, in action.
New Zealand.....	"Special combat unit," probably artillery—some delay expected.		2 frigates (resemble destroyers)—in action.
Norway.....			Merchant tonnage (amount unspecified; discussions going on).

Armed aid in Korea by United Nations members—Continued

	Ground forces	Air forces	Naval forces
Thailand.....	4,000 officers and men: organized unit, said to be high quality.		
Turkey.....	4,500 troops.		
United Kingdom.....	A "self-contained force," said to be of brigade size (5,000 to 6,000 troops).		3 cruisers, 2 carriers, 6 destroyers and DE's—in action from the start.

RECAPITULATION: FORCES IN ACTION AND FORCES EXPECTED

Now in action.....	None as yet.....	1 fighter squadron (Australian).....	3 cruisers, 2 carriers, 15 smaller combat ships, 1 sloop (French).
Offered and expected soon.....	Perhaps 4,000 Thai troops.....	Air transport: 1 Canadian squadron, Belgian (amount unknown). 6 Greek transports.....	Norwegian merchant tonnage; amount unknown; perhaps 1 Danish merchant ship.
Offered but not expected soon.....	Australian (number unknown); New Zealand special unit; 4,500 from Turkey; 5,000 to 6,000 from United Kingdom.	20 Chinese C-47 transports.....	3 cruisers, 2 carriers, 15 smaller combat ships, several merchant ships.
Offered but not accepted.....	33,000 Chinese Nationalist troops.....	1 fighter squadron. More than a squadron of air transports.	
Total in action or definitely offered and expected to serve.....	About 15,000 troops.....		

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment to section XB, as amended.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in the past 20 minutes discussion has developed between the respective leaders looking toward postponing consideration of my amendment until tomorrow. If it is to go over until tomorrow, the decision to have it go over should be made now. Otherwise we shall go on for 3 hours this afternoon. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to yield the floor for that purpose. Otherwise I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Speaking in the position of the acting minority leader I should like to ask the majority leader what he proposes the Senate take up during the remainder of the afternoon if the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada with respect to postponing consideration of the amendment providing aid for Spain until tomorrow is adopted?

Mr. LUCAS. If the suggestion of the able Senator from Nevada is adopted by the Senate, I presume that other amendments could be considered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Section XB is ready for approval except for this amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps nothing would be left to do this afternoon so far as the appropriation bill is concerned. I understand only one more important amendment is to be voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would call to the attention of the majority leader and the minority leader that chapter XI of the bill has not been acted upon.

Mr. LUCAS. Is that the chapter in which the Senator from California is interested?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is chapter XI, General Provisions—Departments and Agencies.

Mr. LUCAS. Under the unanimous-consent agreement we would be here at least until 7 o'clock if we consumed 3 hours before we would be able to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada. Perhaps it would take until 7:30 or later. The Senator from Nevada is eager to have debate on the amendment go over until tomorrow. It is sat-

isfactory to me if that is the will of the Senate. In the meantime we could take up the one remaining chapter in the appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Chapter XI, on page 462, is the remaining chapter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have talked with Senators on this side of the aisle who I know are interested in the amendment with respect to aid to Spain. So far as I can determine, the suggestion of postponing the amendment until tomorrow is agreeable to them. I should like to have the majority leader indicate how we would proceed tomorrow if that were done.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to make the suggestion, if I may. It has been announced by the Chair that the Prime Minister of Australia would appear before the Senate tomorrow at a certain hour. As I recall, it will be at 2:15 or 2:30 o'clock. Perhaps it could be arranged that the amendment I propose could come up following the appearance of the Prime Minister of Australia. Such an arrangement would be very satisfactory to me.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator mean to have the amendment taken up immediately after the Senate convenes?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. LUCAS. That would leave 2 free hours before the Prime Minister's visit. I do not know whether it would require 2 hours to finish the remainder of the appropriation bill before reaching any controversial amendments. I should not like to waste 2 hours. I wonder whether we could not use 2 hours, from 12 to 2, for debate, take time out for the reception to the Prime Minister of Australia, and finish with the amendment of the Senator from Nevada immediately following the Prime Minister's visit.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope very much we can finish consideration of the bill tomorrow. It has been before the Senate for a long time, and we have nearly finished with it. I think we ought to make some arrangement for final action upon it. I want to help the Senator from Nevada in any way I can so that we may consider his amendment. At the same time, it is very important that this bill be sent to conference.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator from Tennessee. We have been on

the bill for a long time. The sooner we finish its consideration, the better I shall like it.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is the desire of the Senator from Nevada to have the very best attendance possible in the Senate when the matter covered by his amendment is presented. It is with that thought in mind that I believe it would be well to have it taken up after the appearance of the Prime Minister of Australia. I thought that with the Prime Minister's appearance before the Senate a good attendance would be assured, and therefore we could go ahead with the presentation of our facts on the amendment. That is the reason for my suggestion.

Mr. LUCAS. It seems to me—and I am only thinking out loud now—if we had 2 hours of debate, from 12 to 2 tomorrow, and immediately after the Prime Minister's visit we had another short debate, that we would have more Senators in attendance than if we followed the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada to begin the consideration of his amendment after the Prime Minister's visit. Senators must go to committee meetings, and probably would leave the floor. However, I am satisfied that they would remain for an hour and a half if they knew the Senator's amendment was to be voted on.

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment must be voted on. The agreement is for its consideration for 3 hours today, the time to be divided between the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Nevada. We want to bring the matter up as expeditiously as possible and dispose of it as promptly as possible.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In the interest of accomplishing the expedition which the majority leader suggests I should like to suggest that we consider the amendment for an hour and a half preceding the Prime Minister's visit and for an hour and a half following the Prime Minister's visit. Perhaps some other matters could be taken up immediately after the Senate convenes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the suggestion that an hour and a half before 2 o'clock, and an hour and a half after

the Prime Minister finishes his address before the Senate be given to the amendment would be perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, would it be possible to agree on an hour when we could vote? Could we vote at 4 o'clock?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not believe it is going to be necessary to make an agreement such as that. I think that by not agreeing on an hour for a vote, we can save time. I do not think the debate will take 3 hours, when we get to the subject.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think it will.

Mr. McKELLAR. I entertain great hopes that we can dispose of the bill tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the fact that his suggestion would require a modification of the present unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to know whether it is contemplated that the Senate will proceed with chapter XI, the general provisions of the bill, in the event we should reach that point in the bill before the distinguished majority leader desired to move a recess this evening.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what we were discussing when the Senator from Nebraska entered the Chamber. If we postpone consideration of the amendment relating to Spain, and agree to consider it tomorrow, we will proceed with the appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I am reluctant to go into chapter XI until there is a quorum call, at least. I am sure Senators desire to be present when chapter XI is considered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will have a quorum called.

Mr. WHERRY. Before the unanimous consent agreement is entered into, I should like to have a quorum called.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me see if we have a meeting of the minds on this matter. When a recess or an adjournment is taken tonight it will be taken until 12 o'clock tomorrow, and we will then proceed, after the preliminary matters which usually are taken up, to debate the amendment relating to Spain for an hour and a half. Then the Prime Minister from Australia is to be entertained before this body, and there will be an hour and a half of debate thereafter. Is that the general understanding?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not at all objecting to the provisions of the unanimous consent request, except that I was desirous of knowing how far in the bill the distinguished majority leader expected to go before he moved a recess tonight. If it is contemplated that we are to take up the general provisions, chapter XI, I should like to have a quorum called before we enter into the agreement.

Mr. McCARRAN. Before we do that, may I have unanimous consent to offer an amendment to the third chapter of

the bill, which is the chapter covering the judiciary appropriation?

I hold in my hand a letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, and also a letter from Mr. Chandler, the Administrator of the courts, asking for an amendment to the bill regarding the appropriation for the Judiciary.

Some years ago by law we placed referees in bankruptcy on a salary basis. Theretofore they had been on a fee basis. For about 3 years now they have been on a salary basis. In order to furnish clerks for the referees in bankruptcy, the Chief Justice, as chairman of the Judicial Conference, and the Administrator, urge that we go back to the figure which the Budget sent to the Congress, but which was eliminated in the House, and the Senate went along with the House action. If I may have unanimous consent to go into that, I will present it. It will take only a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the parliamentarian that it will be necessary first to modify the standing unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. McCARRAN. I believe that to be true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After it is modified, it would be in order for the Senator from Nevada to make request for another unanimous consent agreement respecting the item to which he has referred.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if I may address an observation to the Senator from Nebraska, I think it would expedite what he wants to have done now if he would agree to the unanimous consent agreement that we postpone consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Nevada until tomorrow, and then proceed with a quorum call, and work for a while longer today. I think we could do that, if he would agree to the unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to the unanimous consent agreement at all, but I should prefer to have a quorum called just before we enter into it. I do not think it will make any difference one way or the other, I am sure it will be agreed to, but I should like to have a quorum called.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Gurney	Malone
Benton	Hayden	Martin
Brewster	Hendrickson	Maybank
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bridges	Hill	Mundt
Butler	Holland	Murray
Byrd	Humphrey	Myers
Capehart	Ives	O'Connor
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kefauver	Russell
Douglas	Kern	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Eaton	Langer	Sparkman
Ellender	Leahy	Stennis
Ferguson	Lehman	Taft
Flanders	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	Lucas	Thye
Fulbright	McCarran	Tydings
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Graham	McKellar	Williams
Green	Magnuson	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is recognized.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I suggest that the majority leader present the request for modification of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that it is now 4:30 o'clock, and that under the previous unanimous-consent agreement the debate was to continue for not longer than 3 hours on the amendment dealing with Spain, after we have disposed of all the amendments on the chapter we have been considering, I now modify the unanimous-consent request by making the following request:

I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that on tomorrow, following the convening of the Senate at 12 o'clock, we proceed to debate the amendment involving aid to Spain for 1½ hours previous to 2 o'clock; that following the address by Prime Minister Menzies of Australia we then further debate the aid to Spain amendment for not longer than 1½ hours, at the conclusion of which a vote be taken on the amendment; the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to ask the question: Is it the understanding of the Senator from Illinois that under his proposed modification the debate would begin at 12:30 tomorrow and extend from 12:30 to 2 o'clock?

Mr. LUCAS. Not necessarily. Any time between 12 and 2 the hour and one-half debate could take place. We will first transact morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At what time would the debate begin?

Mr. LUCAS. Following disposition of business during what we call the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At not later than 12:30.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; not later than 12:30. I should like to include also in the unanimous-consent request the same provision that was included in the agreement previously entered into, that no amendment to the aid to Spain amendment shall be offered which is not germane; also that I am not waiving any points of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator would continue the same conditions that were stated in the current unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the distinguished majority leader. Perhaps the Senate, if it continues consideration of the bill tonight may take up chapter XI, and proceed as far as it can with the remainder of the bill. It is the purpose of the majority leader to take a recess at 6 o'clock. Assume we had gotten into chapter XII, and had not completed action on that chapter tonight. I understand it is proposed, in such event, temporarily to lay consideration of that chapter aside, and the unanimous-consent agreement would apply then to the so-called aid to Spain amendment, in the

foreign aid portion of the bill. I ask the majority leader if it is his intention not only to vote on the aid to Spain amendment, but to complete the foreign aid chapter before the Senate returns to consideration of what would be the pending business, which would be amendments in chapter XI. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska is correct in his understanding of the situation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there are two amendments to the bill which are of great importance to many Members of the Senate. I wanted the understanding that should we finish action on chapter XI tonight, and the bill were to be finished, insofar as committee amendments are concerned, we could then bring up the two amendments tomorrow, after disposition of the Spanish aid amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the amendments to be offered by the Senator from Washington are amendments which are to be offered to the bill after we have completed the committee amendments to the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. After we have completed the committee amendments to the bill the amendments referred to by the Senator from Washington are in the same category as any other amendments, and certainly the Senator from Washington would not be foreclosed from offering his amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupant of the chair will state that he is advised that chapter XI of the bill has not yet been taken up. The Senator from Illinois has requested unanimous consent to modify the current unanimous-consent agreement upon which the Senate is operating, in the manner stated by him. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the chairman of the subcommittee handling chapter XI is the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. In that chapter appears section 1111, better known as the anti-deficiency provision. With reference to that provision, there are some Senators who purport to propose an amendment which deals with grants to the States for old-age pensions. We would not like to have the anti-deficiency provision apply to such grants, because after all it is the States who contribute, who are the determining factor in saying what shall be done. I wonder whether we will have sufficient time this evening, in considering chapter XI, even to discuss that particular provision.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as I understand, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee desires to proceed with chapter XI. We will probably continue until 6 o'clock, and then take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Chapter XI contains section 1111, dealing with the working funds. Section 1111 is the anti-deficiency provision, which is the controversial matter of the chapter. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from

New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and I wish to offer an amendment to the anti-deficiency provision which would take care of the old-age pensioners within the individual States, and would make the anti-deficiency provision inapplicable to them.

Mr. LUCAS. There is nothing to prevent the Senator from doing that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before we begin on chapter XI, I should like to state that the Senate has been on this appropriation bill for weeks, and it seems to me we should be able to finish it not later than Wednesday. Tomorrow we shall dispose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada, and perhaps we can get through these two chapters. Certainly not later than Wednesday we should be able to finish this bill. I am going to try to do so and, if necessary, we shall hold a night session on Wednesday in order to complete action on the bill.

It is my understanding that by that time, the bill now being considered by the Banking and Currency Committee, the measure involving the war effort, probably will be ready to be placed before the Senate. Certainly we wish to handle that measure as quickly as possible.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator that there is such an urgency, but I wonder why the Senator is planning to have the Senate take a recess so early this afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware is trying to embarrass me, as usual, when he rises to ask a question.

I would just as soon stay here, and we are going to stay here this afternoon and proceed with chapter XI; we shall remain here until 6 o'clock or a little later, which is about the time we have been staying in session right along.

Of course, if I were to ask the Senate to remain in session until 9 o'clock in the evening, the Senator from Delaware or some other Senator would say, "Why do you keep us here so late? I had a dinner engagement, and I should be home with my family, instead of being here." On the other hand, when I am willing to have the Senate end its session for the day at approximately 6 o'clock in the evening, I am pilloried for that.

Of course, Mr. President, that is what one gets for being majority leader. However, I can take it. I think I understand my friend the Senator from Delaware fairly well.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to discuss an amendment which I have, if I may have the floor in my own right.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, for expenses of referees, the budget estimate was in the amount of \$1,035,400, and the

House allowed \$960,000. The amount authorized for this purpose last year was in the amount of \$886,000, and the amount of increase granted by the House was for within-grade salary advancements and part-time personnel. No additional funds were allowed for additional full-time positions. The Senate committee concurred in the recommendations of the House.

I have now received evidence of the increase in bankruptcy cases. Chief Justice Vinson has written to me, requesting that the bill be amended to include the full amount of the budget estimate of \$1,035,400. This would be an increase of \$75,400.

Mr. President, in view of this additional evidence presented, I move that on page 103, line 11, the figure "\$960,000" be stricken and the figure "\$1,035,400" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that unanimous consent must be given in order to take up the amendment at this time. Does the Senator request such unanimous consent?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think it would be clearer to ask such unanimous consent after I have made the motion.

I now ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Chief Justice Vinson be read by the clerk. The reading of the letter will make this matter clearer.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator just what he desires me to note.

Mr. McCARRAN. In view of the additional evidence presented and in view of the request made by the Chief Justice, I have moved that on page 103, in line 11, the figure "\$960,000" be stricken out, and the figure "\$1,035,400" be inserted in lieu thereof.

If the Senator from Tennessee will permit the letter from the Chief Justice to be read, it will give enlightenment to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to have that done.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read the letter from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., July 20, 1950.
HON. PAT McCARRAN,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee,
United States Senate, Washington,
D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: As chairman of the Judicial Conference of the United States, I feel impelled to call your attention to an item in the general appropriation bill for 1951 (H. R. 7786) as reported to the Senate from your committee. This item affects the appropriation for the expenses of the referees in bankruptcy.

You will recall that the legislation under which our present system was established was effective July 1, 1947. Inasmuch as the new bankruptcy system was to be on a self-sustaining basis and funds for its operation until such a financial condition should exist were necessary, the Congress authorized an advancement from the general funds of the Treasury in the amount of \$500,000 to the expense funds of the referees. This fund contemplates expenditures incidental to pro-

viding for necessary office space, clerical and other office assistance, supplies and equipment, travel, etc.

As of June 30, 1950, there was a cash balance on hand in the expense fund of \$599,986, with a remainder unpaid of the \$500,000 advanced by the Treasury of \$100,000. This leaves a net balance in the expense fund on the first day of the current fiscal year of \$499,986. In addition to this net balance, there was a sum of \$623,376 paid into the general receipts fund of the Treasury by the clerks of the various courts resulting from the clerks' fee of \$8 per filing of 77,922 cases.

In the fiscal year next preceding the effective date of the act (July 1, 1947) filings numbered 13,170; in the past fiscal year there were 33,391 filings, more than two and one-half times the filings in fiscal 1947; and for fiscal 1951 it is estimated that there will be 7,000 more cases filed than in the past fiscal year, or a total of approximately 40,000 cases. If this estimate becomes a reality, there will be filed in the present fiscal year more than three times the number of cases filed in fiscal year 1947, the year next preceding the establishment of the new system. I feel that I should add that Mr. Covey, who is the Chief of the Bankruptcy Division of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts last January, estimated the filings for the past fiscal year to be 33,400; the actual number of filings was 33,391. I mention this to demonstrate the accuracy of the estimates for fiscal 1951.

The Judicial Conference of the United States estimated that the total cost for the 34 additional full-time clerks in the referees' offices needed to handle this increase in the volume of business would be \$77,656, and this figure was included in the budget estimates. The House of Representatives Appropriations Committee reduced this item \$75,400, and the bill came to the Senate with this reduction. If the Senate does not restore this amount, the referees will be seriously handicapped in the handling of this new business. These additional full-time employees will have a classification rating of GS 2, with an entrance salary of \$2,450 per annum under the existing salary structure.

Naturally, I am interested in seeing an efficient and expeditious administration in the bankruptcy field. Not only will there be more respect for its administration if it is efficiently and expeditiously handled, but I feel certain that we will agree that benefits will accrue to the creditors by such handling of these cases.

The Referees' Salary Act was signed by the President on June 28, 1946, and became effective July 1, 1947, so I have lived with the new system during its entire operation. The judicial conference has given particular attention to its operation, and takes some satisfaction out of the fact that it is one segment of governmental operation in which the intake is greater than the outgo and at the same time there has been an efficient and expeditious handling of an enormous case load.

The receipts in the expense fund in the three fiscal years have exceeded the disbursements by \$499,986.

I certainly hope that you may feel inclined toward further consideration of this item and that the sum of \$75,400 will be added to this item in the bill. I feel that without this additional money, and the additional personnel to be provided thereby, the efficiency of the system will be substantially affected. I know that neither you, your committees nor the Congress would have any desire that such would be the result.

Sincerely,

FRED M. VINSON.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada requests unanimous consent that the amendment be now considered, being an amendment on page 103, in line 11, to strike out "\$960,000" and insert "\$1,035,400."

Is there objection? Without objection, the amendment is considered and agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, in connection with the amendment which has just been agreed to by the Senate, two letters from Henry P. Chandler, Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, be printed in the RECORD in furtherance of the amendment just adopted.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1950.

Mr. THOMAS J. SCOTT,
Assistant Clerk of the
Senate Appropriations Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: We have now received reports from all of the district courts regarding the number of new bankruptcy cases filed in May 1950. The total for the month is 3,256, which is a new high in the current trend of increased filings. It represents an increase of 423 cases over the preceding month, when 2,833 cases were filed, and an increase of 693 cases as compared with the month of May 1949, when 2,563 cases were filed.

On a percentage basis the increase over April 1950 was 14.2 percent and over May of 1949, 27 percent. During the first 11 months of the fiscal year 1949, there were 23,491 cases filed. In the corresponding period of the current fiscal year, 30,326 cases were filed, an increase of 29.1 percent.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY P. CHANDLER.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., May 31, 1950.

Mr. THOMAS J. SCOTT,
Assistant Clerk of the
Senate Appropriations Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: The reports received from the district courts disclose that a total of 2,833 bankruptcy cases were filed during the month of April. This is an increase of 11 percent over the filings in the month of April 1949, when 2,544 cases were filed. There were 20,928 cases filed in the first 10 months of the fiscal year 1949. During the corresponding period of the fiscal year 1950, 27,059 cases were filed, an increase of 29.3 percent.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY P. CHANDLER.

REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

Salaries paid from referees' salary fund
Offices served by single part-time referee 109
Offices served by single full-time referee 88
Offices served by two or more referees, consolidated offices (see below) 7
Total offices 154

Consolidated offices

Location	Full-time referees	Part-time referees
Birmingham.....	2	-----
Los Angeles (Dickson-Head).....	2	-----
Los Angeles (Brink-Hunt).....	2	-----
Chicago.....	4	-----
Boston.....	2	1
Detroit.....	2	-----
Cleveland.....	2	-----
Total.....	16	1

Total part-time positions..... 110
Total full-time positions..... 54

Total authorized positions..... 164

Clerical staffs of referees' offices

Salaries paid from referees' expense fund
Offices having no clerks (vacancies)..... 6
Offices having single part-time clerk..... 61
Offices having two part-time clerks..... 1
Offices having single full-time clerk..... 28
Offices having one full-time and one part-time clerk..... 11
Offices having two full-time clerks..... 23
Offices having three and four clerks..... 17
Consolidated offices (see below)..... 7

Total offices..... 154

Consolidated offices

Location	Number of referees	Number of clerks
Birmingham.....	2	11
Los Angeles (Dickson-Head).....	2	10
Los Angeles (Brink-Hunt).....	2	10
Chicago.....	4	15
Boston.....	3	8
Detroit.....	2	6
Cleveland.....	2	6
Total.....	17	66

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment to which I invite the attention of the Senator from Tennessee. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 89, between lines 21 and 22, it is proposed to insert:

Roads through public lands: For the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations pursuant to authority contained in section 3 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended by the act of June 24, 1930 (46 Stat. 805), the sum of \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available for expenditure on the basis of need, as determined by the Commissioner of Public Roads upon application of the highway departments of the respective States concerned and without regard to any law for the apportionment of such funds among said States.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be taken up and considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, most respectfully, I may say to the Senator from Nevada that, as I understand, this amendment came from the subcommit-

tee of the Committee on Public Works, of which he and I were members.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is a public works authorization pending before the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator, before he goes further, that the amendment I have just sent forward and which has been read, came from the Committee on Public Works and was approved, to be offered as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARRAN. The chairman of the committee is now addressing the Chair, and I yield to him.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts and also to my good friend, the Senator from Nebraska, that the history of this amendment is this: The Committee on Public Works, under the sponsorship of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], authorized this as an item in the regular road bill. Later on, the Senator from Utah appeared before the Committee on Appropriations in an effort to expedite the appropriation of the money authorized under the regular road bill. The only way it could be done was to have the Committee on Appropriations refer it to the Committee on Public Works, which committee in turn would refer it back to the Committee on Appropriations. Inasmuch as the Committee on Public Works had already approved the authorization, the only thing this does is that instead of waiting, as we did on the military money for the parkway road between here and Baltimore, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] made a showing before our committee that it possibly has something to do with the war effort, if we are to have a war. It was at the instance of the Senator from Utah, who made a proper showing, and at the insistence of the Senator from Oklahoma, that the Senator from Nevada eventually proposed the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Why does this have to come up ahead of the general road bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. There is one particular reason, which I emphasize, namely, that in the State of Utah, first of all, there is what is known as Highway 6, which is a highway extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The only gap in Highway 6 that is not completed is in the State of Utah, a stretch of about 43 miles. It is essential that this gap be closed now and the road constructed, because Highway 40, carrying the greater bulk of the traffic, is about the only military road available to the military establishments around Salt Lake City and in the Utah Valley. Moreover, if Highway 40 were put out of business, it would be a difficult matter to get through Utah and to the Pacific coast. So it is essential that the 43-mile gap be completed at once.

That is only one. There are other gaps in other roads in other States. For example, the State of Oklahoma has one highway in which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is interested. My

interest and the interest of the Senator from Utah is in the particular gap in Highway 6 to which I have made reference. And if this is included in this bill, being a part of the highway appropriation, which is carried in the pending bill, work can be begun on that road and completed at an early date.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the bill containing the authorization for the fiscal years 1952-53, in the amount of \$550,000,000 for each year, before the Senate?

Mr. McCARRAN. That bill is to come from the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is a new authorization bill. As I understand it, it is coming from the Committee on Public Works, and this additional appropriation would add about \$5,000,000 to the present 1951 authorization, and the Senate would be asked then to appropriate that \$5,000,000, to be expended for public roads this year, out of the 1951 appropriations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is exactly correct. The bill for 1952-53 also contains some \$13,000,000 for the parkway road. A showing was made before the committee that under the present circumstances it was essential to proceed with the parkway road between here and Baltimore. It is connected with a new area outside Fort Meade. It was done as a matter of military necessity, though that was not the only reason. For the Committee on Public Works now to report this item and have it referred to the Committee on Appropriations, would be the only possible way that it could be considered in connection with the appropriation bill in a manner parallel to that in connection with the parkway item.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Why is it not a question of including this item in an authorization bill, and allowing this amendment to come in as a supplemental appropriation this year, and then having the Appropriations Committee consider how much to appropriate for it?

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the Senator that, in connection with the bill on which we are now working, he and I were members of the subcommittee which dealt with the highway appropriation. That highway appropriation was for the current year, on which we are now going forward, 1950-51. If we can get provision made for this item, it will come under a specific law. Some years ago Congress passed a specific law with respect to a public highway to run exclusively through public domain, appropriations then to be made for its construction. It is under that law that this appropriation was approved by the Committee on Public Works. It is under that law that we are offering this amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, what bothers me in connection with this matter is that as I remember, we cut down by some millions of dollars the appropri-

ation for assistance to the States which was requested by the Public Roads Commissioner, and this would add \$5,000,000 and would penalize other States. Would it not penalize other States?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But it would take something away from other States, and then add \$5,000,000, would it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; the Senator is in error. It does not penalize other States or take away anything from them. It comes under a special law which applies directly, specifically, and exclusively to roads running through public domain, and that only.

If the Senator will recall, Mr. MacDonald, of the Bureau of Public Roads, came before the committee and testified that this was the way to get the money for the gap in Utah and for the other gaps which exist. On his testimony, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Nevada, and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] took the matter to the Public Works Committee so that the committee might pass on the question, because that was the proper committee to deal with it. We want to go forward this year with this all-essential project so that these roads may be improved and put in condition because of the national situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator's justification for this appropriation is that it is not a part of the Hayden-Cartwright bill, so-called, but is a completely separate bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. A separate law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And the Senator believes the appropriation to complete the link should be made in full on this authorization, which is a separate authorization.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Nebraska for a moment, I have before me House bill 7941, a road bill which is on the calendar and which will, we hope, be considered by this body very soon. Section 10 is the section which was sponsored by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and which refers to this particular item. Section 10 reads as follows:

SEC. 10. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended by the act of June 24, 1930 (46 Stat. 805), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, non-taxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the sum of \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending July 30, 1951.

So, Mr. President, all we are doing by this amendment is to provide for this particular item.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that, but the Senator is asking for \$5,000,000. How many different sections of road are there which are not complete? If there

is a State in the Union in which I would rather see a road built than in the State of Nebraska, it is the State of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico or the State of the distinguished Senator from Utah. I understand there are some incomplete roads in Oklahoma, and I should like to help the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma in that regard. What other units would be included in this \$5,000,000?

Mr. CHAVEZ. According to the information furnished by the Bureau of Public Roads, which has charge of the construction, planning, surveying, and all that goes with the construction of roads, the \$5,000,000 will take care of connecting the roads which are in this particular category.

Mr. WHERRY. Where are they located, other than in the States of Utah and Oklahoma?

Mr. CHAVEZ. There are some in Oklahoma, in public parks; there are some in national parks; there are some in Indian lands, and possibly some in forests. There are some in New Mexico. There are probably some in every public-land State in the Union.

Mr. WHERRY. Will \$5,000,000 take care of the situation?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what we have been advised.

I wish New Mexico were as lucky as is the State of Nebraska. Sixty-three percent of the entire area of my State belongs to the Federal Government and not to the State of New Mexico. That is the reason why the law was passed.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not quarreling with the basic law; but what the distinguished Senator is doing is requesting an appropriation of \$5,000,000, in addition to the one for the present fiscal year. Did the question ever go before the Appropriations Committee for a hearing?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to acquaint the Senate with the parliamentary situation.

This amendment was offered on July 19 and referred to the Committee on Public Works. It was supported by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] on July 28 and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. The matter comes under the purview of subsection 3 of rule XVI, which the Chair reads as follows:

All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least 1 day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and when actually proposed to the bill no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received; in like manner, amendments proposing new items of appropriation to river and harbor bills, establishing post roads, or proposing new post roads, shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The Chair understands that this amendment was offered pursuant to subsection 3 of rule XVI and has strictly complied in all respects therewith.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair for the information, but I do not believe the Appropriations Committee ever heard

testimony on the bill. It may have at a time when I was not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair invites attention to the fact that the rule requires that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations at least 1 day before consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the authorization perfectly, but I do not recall that the amendment ever came before the Appropriations Committee for justification. What we are doing is getting unanimous consent, after the authorization has been made, to bring the matter to the Senate floor and to appropriate \$5,000,000 for building roads, without consideration by the Appropriations Committee. That is the point I am raising.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that if we were starting originally with the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Nebraska would be correct. But when the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Nevada took the matter up with the chairman of the Committee on Public Works I consulted the Parliamentarian. I said, "How can this bill be handled for an appropriation?" He informed me of the parliamentary situation by which, if the amendment were referred to a standing committee which had charge of the authorization, the committee could report it adversely or favorably. That of itself would take care of the point of order that it would be legislation on an appropriation bill. That is what the Chair has tried to explain to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. McCARRAN. In no sense of the word is it legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not going to raise the point of order. But we are bypassing the Committee on Appropriations by coming straight to the floor of the Senate. I think that is the wrong way to obtain appropriations for road programs. If there is a military need, and there is a section of road which has to be constructed in order to get traffic through, if there is no other Member of the Senate who objects, I shall not offer an objection. But I think it is being brought to the floor of the Senate without having the appropriation justified in the committee. Many roads are authorized which are not built. Even though they are authorized, they still have to be justified for appropriation.

I am not going to object, Mr. President. It seems that I do most of the objecting. The Senate knows what it is doing. It is proposing to provide on the Senate floor an appropriation to the tune of \$5,000,000. We are going to vote \$5,000,000 worth of road construction. I believe we would be establishing a precedent. However, I shall not object.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is in error.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it is the wrong way to legislate.

Mr. McCARRAN. In my judgment the Senator is in error. This is not what the Senator claims it to be. This item is authorized by a statute which has been in existence for years.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the basic law.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the basic law in accordance with which we are offering the amendment to the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment is before the Senate. Any amendment can be offered.

Mr. WHERRY. It has not been considered by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McCARRAN. It has been considered by the committee. These [indicating] are the hearings which were held on the whole chapter.

Mr. WHERRY. Was there a hearing on this \$5,000,000 item for roads?

Mr. McCARRAN. It came before the Subcommittee on the Department of Commerce.

Mr. WHERRY. It did not come before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McCARRAN. It came before the subcommittee. The Senator from Massachusetts was present when we went into this whole matter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to state to the Senator from Nevada that he is correct in saying that this matter came before the subcommittee. I was not present. He is correct that it was heard by the subcommittee. However, I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that section 10 of the new Road Authorization Act, H. R. 7941, Calendar 2048, has not yet been considered. In section 10 of that bill the following provision appears:

The sum of \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, to remain available until expended.

Mr. McCARRAN. That \$5,000,000 would not become effective until 1951-52. The bill to which the Senator refers becomes effective in 1951-52.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are two authorizations; one for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and a like sum of \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

Mr. McCARRAN. That money cannot be used until it is available. This amendment would put the money into the pending appropriation bill. After the appropriation bill was passed the money would be available.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to correct the record. I did not know this item had gone to the Committee on Appropriations. I was speaking about the full committee. To my knowledge it never reached the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not wish to mislead the Senator. I do not know whether this particular item was dealt with by the full Committee on Appropriations. However, appropriations for roads came before the subcommittee on the Department of Commerce, and we dealt with it in that subcommittee. Then we reported it to the full committee and it was approved by the full committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not say that my memory is correct, but I respectfully suggest that it did not go quite that far. The matter was considered by

the subcommittee, but was not approved by the subcommittee. Therefore, it did not come before the full committee for its consideration. In the subcommittee we decided to drop it. That is my memory of it. I do not say that I am correct about it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Again I do not wish to mislead the Senator. What I am trying to say is that the whole subject matter was dealt with under chapter III, and we dealt with the whole subject matter of road construction for the year 1950-51. The matter is before the Senate now. All we are trying to do now is to take that which has been approved by the Committee on Public Works and put it into the 1950-51 appropriation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The authorization bill has not yet been approved by the Senate. It has been approved by the Committee on Public Works, but not by the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. This amendment I have offered has been approved by the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But not by the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is what we are trying to have done now.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what we are trying to have done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I come back to my original statement. Assume that we cut the authorization bill. The bill provides for \$1,100,000,000 for 2 years. If we were to cut that amount by half or by a quarter, and appropriate this amount in full, we would be going ahead faster on this piece of road and being unfair to many States, because the contributions to those States would be reduced.

Mr. McCARRAN. It does not affect the other States at all. It is not money which is distributed among the States. It is money that goes directly under a specific law to highways which run through public domain exclusively.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Supposing Congress authorized \$300,000,000—merely by way of using a figure—instead of \$550,000,000. The contributions to the States would be cut by \$250,000,000. At the same time we would be going ahead with the full \$5,000,000 on this piece of road in the State of Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I am very much interested in the colloquy on this particular amendment. The situation in Utah is one of national concern. We have only one highway running out of Utah to the West, to California and Nevada. We have another one running almost due north and south to southern Utah, southern Nevada, and southern California. In and around Odgen, Utah, we have Hill Field, army stores, naval stores, and a naval depot. We have other military stores at Tooele. We have the Geneva steel plant, which is just south of Salt Lake City. Highway No. 40, which runs west into Nevada, is the only road which

has been completed all the way through. That carried the big burden during the last war, as a result of which it has been ripped to pieces. We are trying to repair it and put it back into condition. Highway No. 6 runs from Provincetown, Mass., to Long Beach, Calif., and it is an improved highway all the way except for about 47 miles in western Utah near the Nevada border. Nevada has built a road to the border. It built an improved highway to the border, and this 47 miles of road is unimproved. That road runs entirely through public domain, and it comes up under a hardship situation. In a time such as we are now facing, the road is an absolute necessity from the national point of view, not from the standpoint of Utah or for the sake of Utah. Utah can get along for a while longer, if it must, without it.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the objection to bringing it up in the regular road bill? The Senate will be here next week.

Mr. WATKINS. We have had some experience during a war with getting roads built and getting other public improvement taken care of. The contractors are ready to do this piece of work, and they can undertake its construction. If it can be done now it can be done cheaper than it could be done during an emergency. Now is the time to do it, if we can get the appropriation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Personally, I have no objection to this appropriation going through at this time, providing the Senator from Nevada will accept an amendment to the effect that if the authorization is reduced this amount, even though it would not come within the authorization bill, being an exception to it, would likewise be reduced in the same proportionate amount.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is agreeable to me. I am willing to accept such an amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator object to including such proper language within his amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. In other words, if there is to be a cut made all the way through the bill, this item shall be subjected to the same cut.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I refer to the authorization in the road bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I agree to that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The bill contains specific language by which the President is directed in time of emergency, notwithstanding that he already has such authority, to cut it as much as he wants to cut it in order to meet the national emergency.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am entirely content with the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a while ago I asked the distinguished Senator from Nevada to yield so that I might correct the RECORD, but after hearing the discussion I do not think I need to correct it. I believe I was right in the first place.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would, then, offer a second proviso to the Senator's amendment, which, in sub-

stance, would state that if the authorization contained in H. R. 7941, Calendar No. 2048, is reduced for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953, then the appropriation involved in the pending amendment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, will be reduced in the same percentage.

Mr. McCARRAN. I accept that, if the Senator from Utah will accept it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am willing to accept that percentage reduction if the reduction referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts takes place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair may state the situation, the Senator from Nevada has asked unanimous consent for the consideration of this item at this time. Is unanimous consent granted?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am going to ask that this amendment go over until tomorrow, so that I may have a chance to study it further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator objects at this time, does he?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware objects.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I ask unanimous consent at this time to propose an amendment to chapter XI of the pending bill, and I ask that it be considered now. I do not believe there will be any objection to it whatsoever after the amendment is explained. It has to do with the antideficiency provision of section 1111 of the pending appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to the fact that under the agreement entered into a short time ago chapter XI is now the subject before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; and the reason why I suggest this amendment is that the provision which will be concerned with the suggested amendment is the important provision of chapter XI, and I thought possibly we could get unanimous consent to act on the amendment now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico asks unanimous consent that section 1111, chapter XI, page 468, be now considered. Is there objection?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest that unanimous consent is not necessary, if we proceed with chapter XI. There is no committee amendment before the place suggested for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the first amendment which would come up for consideration in chapter XI is on page 468 of the bill. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Under the heading "Departments and agencies," page 468, line 25, after the word "obligation", it is proposed to insert the words "or expenditure."

The amendment was agreed to.

JOINT SENATE AND HOUSE RECORDING FACILITY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair ask the Senator from Virginia whether his remarks will take some little time?

Mr. BYRD. About 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] has a conference report, and the Chair had agreed to recognize him to present it when the pending question was disposed of. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator, because I called the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] away from his office while I submitted this conference report.

I submit a conference report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 332) providing for the establishment of a Joint Senate and House Recording Facility, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 332) providing for the establishment of a Joint Senate and House Recording Facility, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That (a) there is hereby established a Joint Senate and House Recording Facility (hereinafter referred to as the 'Facility').

"(b) The Facility shall assist Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in making and utilizing disk, film, and tape recordings, and shall maintain and operate upon request a supplementary public address system for the convenience of the Senate and the House (including any committee of either House of Congress, and any joint committee). The recording facilities shall be for the convenience of the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

"(c) The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are hereby authorized, subject to appropriations made therefor, to appoint and fix the compensation of a Superintendent and such other employees as are deemed necessary to perform the functions of the Facility, and shall, subject to the approval of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and the House Committee on House Administration promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this joint resolution. The Coordinator and the employees of the Joint Recording Facility of Congress (appointed pursuant to the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948) shall continue in office until a Superintendent is appointed.

"(d) The Superintendent shall, subject to regulations promulgated under subsection (c), set the price of all recordings, services, and public address system rentals, and shall collect all moneys due the Facility. All purchase orders of more than \$100 shall, before

they are issued by the Superintendent, be approved by the Clerk of the House. The Superintendent shall maintain detailed records of all moneys collected, deposited, and expended, and shall file quarterly reports thereof with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House. Such records shall be audited annually, or at such lesser intervals as may be provided in regulations promulgated under subsection (c).

"(e) The Superintendent shall give bond to the Clerk of the House with one or more sureties. Such bond shall be approved by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House, and shall be in the penal sum of \$20,000, with condition for the faithful performance of the functions of the Superintendent and for the preservation and security of all property in his care.

"(f) There is hereby established within the contingent fund of the House of Representatives a revolving fund for the Facility. All balances of the Joint Recording Facility of Congress (established pursuant to the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948) on hand on the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and all moneys hereafter received from any source by the Facility established under subsection (a), shall be deposited in such revolving fund. The moneys in such revolving fund shall be available only for disbursement by the Clerk of the House for the care, maintenance, and operation of the Facility (including the purchase, rental, repair, upkeep, and insurance of such equipment and such other property as may be necessary for the operation of the Facility), upon vouchers signed by the Clerk of the House and approved by the chairman of the House Committee on House Administration; except that no such moneys shall be disbursed for the payment of salaries.

"(g) The Clerk of the House is hereby authorized to disburse from such revolving fund for the purchase of the recording equipment and other property which is now being leased by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House pursuant to an agreement dated August 1, 1947, such amount (not less than \$13,000 nor more than \$15,000) as the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the House Committee on House Administration may determine to be fair and equitable."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WILLIAM BENTON,
G. M. GILLETTE,
KARL E. MUNDT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

MARY T. NORTON,
THOS. B. STANLEY,
C. W. BISHOP,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

PROPOSED GRANT OF EMERGENCY POWERS TO PRESIDENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Mr. Ba-ruch has very admirably performed a great patriotic service in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. In all of his distinguished career, he has never received a greater tribute than the national response to his plan for mobilization of our industrial economy.

I am inherently opposed to unnecessary governmental regimentation, which, if incompetently administered over a long period, can do much to destroy our system of free enterprise. I have, however, reached the conclusion that I will

support stand-by powers to be given to the President, especially for such controls as will prevent disastrous inflation and prepare this Nation for the worst that may follow the crisis in Korea. This means I will support such legislation to be made effective upon proclamation of the President.

I do so, however, with an amendment, which I am offering today to the pending legislation, providing that such powers as are given to the President will expire on July 1, 1951. I offer this amendment because I do not believe such vast powers should be conferred on any Executive for an indefinite period without specific review by Congress. Without an expiration date, the President could veto repeal legislation. It would then require a two-thirds vote in each House to overcome such a veto.

It is by such all-inclusive powers given in time of emergency that democracies are destroyed if the powers extend beyond the period of the actual emergency. If an expiration date is provided in the legislation, it gives Congress an opportunity prior to the expiration date to reconsider the situation in the light of developments and determine whether the powers should be renewed or discontinued.

Let us not fool ourselves about this grant of power. If adopted, it will vest in the hands of the President powers more vast than any President ever had without a declaration of war. Under these powers the President can virtually take control of the domestic economy of our Nation and be an economic dictator.

One other exception I want to make is that if prices are fixed wages likewise should be fixed. All of us recall that in the last war prices were fixed without adequate wage control. Wages constitute 80 or 90 percent of the cost of most articles, and there must be adequate wage control if prices of products—industrial and agricultural—are to be controlled.

We are forced to proper controls now because blunders have precipitated this Nation into one of the most dangerous situations ever to confront us. Today we are fighting an undeclared war in Korea because the South Koreans, who were armed by us and trained by our officers, were unable to repel the North Korean invasion. The same kind of undeclared war can occur in other places throughout the world where we have undertaken to arm and train other nations who may or may not fight when D-day comes. Russia could start these undeclared wars in various parts of the world without firing a Russian gun or losing a Russian soldier, compelling us under the Truman doctrine, to send troops, with the result that we may be engaged in many conflicts of such a character thousands of miles apart. It is tragic to contemplate the results of such side-line wars.

To point out the utter stupidity and the unbelievable ineptitude of our actions with respect to the Korean conflict, I cite these instances:

On June 13, 1950, just 2 weeks before the invasion of South Korea, Mr. William C. Foster, Deputy Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration,

testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee and said:

I am happy to tell the Appropriations Committee that, in my judgment, the trend of events in South Korea is more favorable than it has been at any time since the liberation of that country in 1945. The reasons for optimism are military, political, and economic. It is my considered opinion that in the face of great difficulty the Government of the Republic of Korea is now steadily gaining strength in each of these three sectors. (1) A rigorous training program has built up a well-disciplined army of 100,000 soldiers, one that is prepared to meet any challenge by North Korean forces, and one that has cleaned out the guerrilla bands in South Korea in one area after another.

Twelve days later the North Koreans invaded South Korea and, with virtually no effort or resistance, captured a large part of the country. Had the South Koreans, who, Mr. Foster said, had a well-disciplined army of 100,000 soldiers prepared to meet any challenge by North Korean forces, courageously resisted, our reinforcements would have been spared the tremendous casualties which have resulted from lack of time to prepare an expeditionary force.

At the proper time it will be appropriate for Congress to investigate upon what grounds Mr. Foster, the Deputy Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, made this statement, and why the South Koreans in the first days of the invasion failed to resist.

I call attention further to the fact that since the American occupation forces were taken from Korea, there has been a substantial military mission there to train the South Korean army.

Still further, Gen. William L. Roberts, head of the United States Military Commission to Korea, told a news conference a few days ago that the South Koreans were not adequately armed because our leaders feared they would attack North Korea and thereby embarrass the United States. He said:

The South Koreans believed the best method was to attack. To prevent them from attacking we gave them no combat air force, no tanks, and no heavy artillery.

So we have two American leaders, one, Mr. Foster, who said the South Korean army was well trained and equipped and prepared to meet any challenge; the other, the head of the United States Military Commission, who said America did not adequately equip the South Koreans because they might attack the North Koreans.

It is just such contradictions and incompetence as this that have precipitated a crisis of great magnitude. In due time those responsible will be held accountable by the verdict of American public opinion. What we have done in Korea is to demonstrate the ineffectiveness of that part of the Truman doctrine in the protection of small or isolated nations by arming those who are not prepared or willing to fight when the issue comes, and thereby accepting on the part of the United States a commitment to fight such wars wherever and whenever they may occur. I repeat, a dozen

sideline wars may occur without Russia showing her hand.

Since the end of World War II we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in South Korea for relief, occupation and military training. In addition we have transferred great quantities of military equipment, which has not been evaluated. The war that Russia is conducting against America is a war of economic attrition. We have walked into her trap. We have committed ourselves to be involved in civil wars throughout the world and to exhaust our resources, regiment and tax our people while Russia can, and I believe will, remain on the outside.

The free-enterprise system cannot long operate under drastic police controls inefficiently administered. A democracy cannot remain on a war basis for a long period of time and still preserve the stimuli of free enterprise and fiscal solvency.

But today we are faced with facts. We have been driven into a situation in Korea from which we must not retreat, but in all prudence we must consider the possibility, if not the probability, that similar wars will be started elsewhere.

It is for these compelling reasons that I will vote for the Baruch proposals for stand-by power to the President, limited to July 1, 1951. This does not mean, of course, that Congress cannot renew these powers, but such dictatorial economic power over the lives of our citizens should be subject to review by Congress at stated periods.

We are in another emergency which is developing some of the aspects of hysteria, and we hear much about huge new taxes, about all-out regimentation, huge additional expenditures, but we hear little about a reduction in nondefense spending. Reduction of nondefense spending should be placed No. 1 on our mobilization program. Financial preparedness is the source of all preparedness.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment, to lie on the table and to be considered when the proposed legislation comes before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has requested unanimous consent to take up at this time for immediate consideration an amendment to section 1111 on page 468 of the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Will the Senator offer his amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and myself I offer the amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 473, after line 23, it is proposed to insert:

(5) grants to the States under title I, IV, or X of the Social Security Act, or under any other public assistance title in such act.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this amendment would make definite and certain, in a way which I think the House language perhaps does not, that the Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance, for the blind, and for dependent children, will not be subject to any finding or determination or any action by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, but that such contributions, being fixed specifically by statute, by statutory formulas, will be paid to the States in the future just as they have been paid in the past.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In substance the amendment provides that where Federal statutes guarantee that the Federal Government will match certain funds for old-age assistance, and matters of that character, such as mothers' aid, and health matters, the antideficiency provision shall not apply?

Mr. HILL. No; it simply applies to the three categories, of old-age assistance, dependent children, and the blind. But it says where there is a statutory commitment to the States, where the amounts are fixed and determined by statutory formulas, such commitments will be met, and shall not be subject to any finding or any determination by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who was on the other end of the stick for some time in the capacity of Governor, and because of the uncertainty of the Federal appropriations, not always knowing what we should do in the States, I should say that I certainly approve of the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to the adoption of the amendment and to taking it to conference. I have not gone into it yet, and will have to go into it and see what it would do, but I shall be glad to study it. The amendment is certainly very praiseworthy in its purpose. It seems to me at first blush it should be adopted. But before finally agreeing to it, I should like to look at it.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for himself and other Senators on page 473, after line 23.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XI—General provi-

sions," on page 469, line 13, after the word "in", to strike out "requirements", and insert "requirements or"; and in line 14, after the word "operations", to strike out the comma and "or other developments."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 473, line 7, after "(f)", to insert "(1)"; and in line 9, after the word "apportionments", to insert "trust funds and working funds expenditures from which have no significant effect on the financial operations of the Government, working capital and revolving funds established for intra-governmental operations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 473, after line 23, to strike out:

(5) contingent expenses of the Senate or of the House of Representatives.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Alabama whether the figure "(5)" in line 24 should not be included in order to cover his amendment. That is on page 473.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The figure "(5)" is included in the amendment adopted a few minutes ago.

Mr. HILL. Yes; it is included in that amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 474, to insert:

(2) The provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to appropriations to the Senate or House of Representatives or to any Member, committee, Office (including the office of the Architect of the Capitol), officer, or employee thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 474, line 15, after the word "any", to strike out "other"; in line 17, after the word "obligations", to insert "or expenditures"; and in line 21, after the word "obligation", to insert "or the making of any expenditure."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 474, line 24, after the word "obligation", to insert "or make any expenditure."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 475, line 23, after the word "act", to insert "including the government of the District of Columbia"; and on page 476, line 1, after the word "on", to strike out "December 31, 1950" and insert "June 30, 1951."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I understand we are now considering section 1112, beginning on page 475.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. We have just adopted a committee amendment at the top of page 476 in that section.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have at the desk an amendment to that section, and I offer it at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is required in order to have the amendment considered at this time.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may offer the

amendment for consideration at this time.

This section deals with annual leave, and places a limitation on the amount of leave which can be accumulated. My amendment will take care of paying for annual leave when a civilian employee of the Government goes into the armed services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I have not had time to go over the amendment. However, I shall be glad to let it go into the bill at this time, and very carefully examine it and consider it in conference.

Mr. GURNEY. I may say that I have taken up the amendment with the staff of the Appropriations Committee. I am very sorry that I did not have the idea at the time when this section was being considered by the Appropriations Committee. However, at that time the Korean situation had not developed.

I should like to have the Members of the Senate now present hear the amendment stated, if that may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 475, in line 25, before the word "officer", it is proposed to insert "civilian."

On page 476, before the period in line 4, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "And provided further, That this section shall not apply with respect to the payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave in the case of officers or employees who leave their civilian positions for the purpose of entering upon active military or naval service in the Armed Forces of the United States."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator briefly explain the purpose of the amendment and what is intended to be accomplished by it?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the section as reported by the committee limits the amount of annual leave which can be accumulated. If a civilian employee of the Government leaves that service to enter the armed services, then, as I would have the section written, it would allow such a civilian employee to be paid, before he enters the armed services, for the amount of leave he has accumulated.

Mr. BRIDGES. That would be done in view of the fact that he would not be able to take the leave. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. The amendment would give such employee the money before he enters the armed services.

Mr. McKELLAR. What would be the cost of putting the amendment into effect?

Mr. GURNEY. I do not know, and I do not think anyone can tell, because I do not believe anyone can say how many civilian employees of the Government will enter the armed services. However, I know that if a person enters any branch of the armed services, he has

many extra financial obligations. If he enters the armed services, he will not have time in which to take annual leave.

I know such a person would like to leave a little money at home, and I believe that the Government wants to pay him in cash for leave he cannot take under such circumstances.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Let me ask the Senator if he has considered whether the language used in his amendment would permit a civilian employee simply to fail to take his leave during the period mentioned in the amendment—that is to say, up to the middle of next year, and perhaps go into the next year, as well—and then at the time when he entered the armed services, he purged of any obligation which would rest upon others.

It seems to me the language of the amendment is broad enough to permit that to be done. I shall not object to the amendment, but I hope it will be carefully considered in conference, and I hope there is included in the amendment language which will effectuate the purpose as outlined by the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say that we shall carefully consider it in the conference.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the purpose is not to give the privilege the Senator from Oregon has mentioned, but only to permit the payment of accumulated leave in case such a person joins the armed services at any time between now and June 30, 1951.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, what is the amount of accumulated leave which such a person might have?

Mr. GURNEY. Whatever is now provided under Federal law in that respect. I believe it is either 60 or 90 days.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think the amendment is a worthy one. I think accumulated leave should be paid for under such circumstances. I think a person in that situation will need the money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the amendment of the Senate from South Dakota?

Without objection, the amendment is considered and agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 476, after line 20, to strike out:

Sec. 1114. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position under the United States Government which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1950: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

(a) to not to exceed 10 percent of all such vacancies in any agency caused by separation from such agency,

(b) to positions filled from within the agency,

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,

(d) to scientific and technical positions in the Atomic Energy Commission and the Armed Services,

(e) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration,

(f) to law enforcement officers,

(g) to temporary, emergency, seasonal, or cooperative positions,

(h) to commissioned, commissioned warrant, warrant, and enlisted personnel, and cadets of the Coast Guard, and the undergraduates of the United States Military and Naval Academies, or

(i) to any agency in the legislative or judicial branches of the Government, or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is at the desk an amendment which I should like to call up for consideration. The amendment is proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself and 35 other Senators. I wish to call it up at this time, with the following modification: At the bottom of the first page, instead of the words "in lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out on pages 444, 445, and 446," insert "in lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out on pages 476 and 477."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that this is not the proper time to take up that amendment, at this point in the bill. That amendment comes in chapter X.

Mr. BYRD. However, I am offering it to this section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has offered the amendment heretofore prepared to chapter X of the bill; and it is now offered as an amendment to section 1114, beginning on page 476.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, certain technical changes will be necessary in order to change the chapter numbers appearing on pages 2, 3, and 4 of the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, does this amendment take the place of the committee amendment on page 477?

Mr. BYRD. It takes the place of the part of it which would be stricken out by the committee amendment on pages 476 and 477.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is offered to take the place of the committee amendment which is designed to strike out section 1114 as it appears in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, it amends that committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly; and it does so by including the language which is proposed to be stricken out by the committee amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this amendment is in order, I am sure. Although it contains legislation, yet it amends a provision which contains legislation, that provision having been placed in the bill by the House of Representatives.

I should like to have a ruling by the Chair as to whether or not the amendment is in order. I am advised by the Parliamentarian that the House provision, which is thus proposed to be stricken, is legislation, and likewise this amendment contains legislation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, of course, this amendment will take some time to dispose of. It was not known that it would be offered today. I think the amendment should go over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no objection to having the amendment go over until tomorrow and be considered then. But I think the ruling of the Chair should be made now.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know about that, Mr. President. I have not had an opportunity to study the amendment. I may wish to offer a point of order. So I think the ruling on the amendment should go over until tomorrow. I do not propose that it be ruled upon at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the Chair calls attention to the fact that he is one of the sponsors of this amendment, as originally offered; and he would prefer to have the ruling on it made by the Vice President.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment has been offered, and the amendment will come up at such time as the Senator may request the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BYRD. Under the unanimous-consent agreement adopted today, when will this amendment come up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment just offered by the Senator from Virginia will come up immediately after the disposal of the so-called McCarran amendment, relating to aid to Spain.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. This afternoon I asked that very question. The majority leader stated that he intended to finish the ECA chapter, not only to vote on the McCarran amendment, but also to vote on the entire chapter, before returning to the pending chapter. It so happens that the point of order which has been raised is the pending question. But certainly it would be my understanding of the request of the majority leader, before we entered into the unanimous-consent agreement, that the chapter on ECA, including the McCarran amendment, would be completed before we returned to the pending chapter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that, under the new unanimous-consent agreement entered into today, after the disposal of the McCarran amendment, the Senate will then immediately dispose of chapter X-B, as amended.

Mr. WHERRY. That is according to the understanding of the Senator from Nebraska, who also understands that the Senate will thereafter return to the chapter now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After which time the amendment just offered by the Senator from Virginia would become the order of the business.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. So as I understand the statement of the present occupant of the Chair, what he said a moment ago was correct, except that the complete chapter on ECA would be voted on, as amended, and the Senate would then return to the point where it leaves off tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. That was not what the Chair stated. The Chair stated that we would return to chapter X-B, after completing the chapter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. X-B is the chapter on ECA, the Chair will state to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is it not chapter X-A?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it is X-B.

Mr. McFARLAND. Has not chapter X-A been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Chapter X-A has gone over for later consideration. The Chair feels it is only fair to state that his understanding is that the McCarran amendment will be voted on first, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into this afternoon, which is a modification of the earlier unanimous-consent agreement; that, following that, the entire section, chapter X-B, which deals with ECA and allied subjects, will be disposed of, and that, thereafter, the pending question will be on the proposal made by the Senator from Virginia to amend section 1114 of chapter XI of the bill.

REDUCTION OF EXCESS PROFITS TAXES— AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the pending tax bill. I should like to call this amendment the Korean Excess-Profits Tax Amendment. The purpose of the provision which I am now offering is to help the Government of the United States pay as it goes on the very expensive adventure upon which it has been launched by the aggressive actions of the Communists in Korea. I do not need now to take the time of the Senate to explain the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the amendment, together with a copy of the statement which I am releasing to the press this evening, may be printed at length in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance; and, without objection, the amendment and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment and statement are as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new title:

"TITLE VII—EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

"SEC. 701. Reapplication of excess-profits tax.

"(a) Reapplication: Section 122 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1945 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) In general: The provisions of subchapter E of chapter 2 shall not apply to any

taxable year beginning after December 31, 1945, and ending prior to January 1, 1950. The provisions of part III of such subchapter shall not apply to any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1945."

"(b) Rate of tax: Section 710 (a) (1) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(A) Sixty five percent of such part of the adjusted excess profits net income as exceeds 75 percent but is less than 90 percent of the excess profits credit determined under section 712, plus

"Seventy-five percent of such part of the adjusted excess profits net income as exceeds 90 percent but is less than 100 percent of the excess profits credit determined under section 712, plus.

"Ninety percent of such part of the adjusted excess profits net income as exceeds 100 percent but is less than 125 percent of the excess profits credit determined under section 712, plus

"One hundred percent of the adjusted excess profits net income as exceeds 125 percent of the excess profits credit determined under section 712; or."

"(c) Exemption: Section 710 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Specific Exemption.—A specific exemption of \$25,000."

"(d) Excess profits credit: Subsections (a) and (b) of section 712 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to allowance of excess profits credit) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Domestic Corporations.—In the case of a domestic corporation which was in existence before January 1, 1950, the excess profits credit for any taxable year shall be computed under section 713 or section 714, whichever amount results in the lesser tax under this subchapter for the taxable year for which the tax under this subchapter is being computed. In the case of all other domestic corporations, the excess profits credit for any taxable year shall be an amount computed under section 714.

"(b) Foreign corporations: In the case of a foreign corporation engaged in trade or business within the United States, the first taxable year of which under this subchapter begins on any date in 1950, which was in existence on the day 36 months prior to such date and which at any time during each of the taxable years in such 36 months was engaged in trade or business within the United States, the excess-profits credit for any taxable year shall be an amount computed under section 713 or section 714, whichever amount results in the lesser tax under this subchapter for the taxable year for which the tax under this subchapter is being computed. In the case of all other foreign corporations the excess-profits credit for any taxable year shall be an amount computed under section 714."

"(e) Definition of unused excess-profits credit: Section 710 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by striking out the last two sentences thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'For the purposes of the determination of the taxes imposed by this subchapter for taxable years beginning before January 1, 1946, there shall be no unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1946. The unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947 shall be an amount which is such part of the unused excess-profits credit determined under the preceding provisions of this paragraph as the number of days in such taxable year prior to January 1, 1947, is of the total number of days in such taxable year. For the purposes of the determination of the taxes imposed by this subchapter for taxable years ending after December 31, 1949,

there shall be no unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year ending before July 1, 1950. The unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year beginning in 1949 or 1950 and ending after June 30, 1950, shall be an amount which is such part of the unused excess-profits credit determined under the preceding provisions of this paragraph as the number of days in such taxable year after June 30, 1950, is of the total number of days in such taxable year.'

"(f) No carry-back to 1946, 1947, 1948, or 1949: Section 710 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) No carry-back to 1946, 1947, 1948, or 1949: For purposes of the determination of the taxes imposed by this subchapter for taxable years ending after December 31, 1949, the term "preceding taxable year" and the term "preceding taxable years," as used in this subsection, do not include any taxable year ending prior to January 1, 1950."

"(g) Amount of excess profit credit: Section 713 (a) (relating to the amount of excess profits credit) is amended by striking out '95 percent' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "75 percent."

"(h) Definition of 'base period': Section 713 (b) (1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Definition: As used in this section the term "base period"—

"(A) If the corporation was in existence during the whole of the 36 months preceding the beginning of its first taxable year under this subchapter after December 31, 1949, means the period commencing with the beginning of its first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1946, and ending with the close of its last taxable year beginning before January 1, 1949; and

"(B) In the case of a corporation which was in existence during only part of the 36 months preceding the beginning of its first taxable year under this subchapter after December 31, 1949, means the 36 months preceding the beginning of its first taxable year under this subchapter."

"(i) Taxable years beginning in 1949 or 1950 and ending prior to June 30, 1951: Section 710 (a) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(8) Taxable years beginning in 1949 and ending in 1950: In the case of a taxable year beginning in 1949 and ending in 1950, the tax shall be an amount equal to that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year after June 30, 1950, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year.

"(9) Taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949, and ending prior to June 30, 1951: In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1949, and ending prior to June 30, 1951, the tax shall be an amount equal to that portion of a tentative tax which the number of days in such taxable year after June 30, 1950, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year."

"(j) Technical amendments: The following sections of the Internal Revenue Code are restored to read as such sections read immediately prior to the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1945, to be effective as so restored, with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1949, as if section 122 (g) of the Revenue Act of 1945 had not been enacted:

"(1) Section 26 (a) (relating to the credit for income subject to the excess-profits tax);

"(2) Section 102 (d) (1) (defining terms for the purpose of the tax imposed by section 102);

"(3) Section 131 (b) (prescribing certain limitations on the foreign tax credit);

"(k) Taxable years to which amendments applicable: The amendments made to the

Internal Revenue Code by this title shall be applicable with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1949.

"(l) Technical changes: The Commissioner is authorized to make such changes in the dates and the periods of time appearing in subchapter E of chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code as may be necessary to conform to the amendments made by this title."

On page 50, line 18, before the period insert the following: "reduced by the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 provided in subsection (e)."

On page 88, strike out lines 24 and 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 provided in section 26 (e) and the credit for dividends received provided in section 26 (b)."

On page 89, strike out lines 24 and 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 provided in section 26 (e) and the credit for dividends received provided in section 26 (b) (computed by limiting such credit to 85 percent of the net income reduced by the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 in lieu of 85 percent of the adjusted net income so reduced)."

On page 94, strike out lines 22 through 25, and on page 95, strike out lines 1 through 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(7) Section 204 (a) (2) (relating to definition of normal tax net income and corporation surtax net income of foreign insurance companies other than life or mutual) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Normal-tax and corporation surtax net income of foreign insurance companies other than life or mutual and foreign mutual marine: In the case of a foreign insurance company (other than a life or mutual insurance company) and a foreign mutual marine insurance company, and a foreign mutual fire insurance company described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the normal-tax net income shall be the net income from sources within the United States minus the credit provided in section 26 (a), the credit provided in section 26 (b), and the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 provided in section 26 (e), and the corporation surtax net income shall be the net income from sources within the United States minus the credit provided in section 26 (b) (computed by limiting such credit to 85 percent of the net income reduced by the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 in lieu of 85 percent of the adjusted net income so reduced) minus the credit provided in section 26 (j), and minus the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 provided in section 26 (e)."

At the end of the table of contents, on page 7, insert the following:

"TITLE VII—EXCESS PROFITS TAX

"Sec. 701. Reapplication of excess-profits tax.

"(a) Reapplication.

"(b) Rate of tax.

"(c) Exemption.

"(d) Excess-profits credit.

"(e) Definition of unused excess-profits credit.

"(f) No carry-back to 1946, 1947, 1948, or 1949.

"(g) Amount of excess-profits credit.

"(h) Definition of base period.

"(i) Taxable years beginning in 1949 or 1950 and ending prior to June 30, 1951.

"(j) Technical amendments.

"(k) Taxable years to which amendments applicable.

"(l) Technical changes."

Exports of ECA participating countries to eastern Europe, fourth quarter 1949 and first quarter 1950

[Thousands of dollars]

Commodity	Austria		Belgium/Luxemburg		Denmark		France		Greece		Germany		Iceland		Ireland	
	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter
Bread grains.....						18	0						0	0		
Oils and fats.....		(1)	259	687	(1)	2,620	7	(1)	3	6	253	(1)	0	0		(1)
Sugar.....				13			0						0	0		
Meat.....			48	2		284	5				2		0	0		
Milk products.....				5		233	0						0	0		
Tobacco.....						2	0		742	668			0	0		
Fish—fresh, frozen, or smoked, dried, canned.....						670							1,842	1,173		
Eggs.....						1	0						0	0		
Coarse grains.....						1,835	0						0	0		
Oilcakes, meal, other feeding stuffs.....						2	95						0	0		
Fertilizers.....	1,504		111	1,216			197				11		0	0		
Dyestuffs.....	2		198	388		55	0				889		0	0		
Raw materials for plastics.....	4		629	2		33	0				221		0	0		
Refined liquid fuels and products.....	0		11	22		12	88						0	0		
Raw materials for steel and iron products (pig iron and ferro-alloys).....	661					5	2				1,858		0	0		
Crude and semifinished steel and hot finished steel and end products.....	6,979		2,549	791		53	3,099				3,825		0	0		
Raw wool.....			1,181	2,254		5	599				39		2	0		
Natural fibers (except cotton, wool).....			1,149	1,779		48	29						0	0		
Artificial fibers, continuous filaments.....	167		1,305	1,184			358				24		0	0		
Softwood: Sawn timber except sleepers.....	514			1			0						0	0		
Pitprops.....	223						0						0	0		
Pulpwood.....							0						0	0		
Newsprint.....	347						0						0	0		
Other paper, board and wallboard.....			13	4		21	20				65		0	0		
Leather.....	568		29	66		1	149						0	0	1	
Generators, motors, electrical machinery.....	1,024		1,392	1,406		243	813				1,204		0	0		
Nonelectrical machinery.....	1,154		2,474	2,276		1,690	3,069				6,465		0	0		
Transportation equipment.....	865		976	192		83	2,863				2,255		0	0		
Manufactured leather (except fur).....	1		13	14		4	3				13		0	0		
Zinc ore.....							0						0	0		
Anthracite and hard coal.....			101	154			0						0	0		
Coke (except petroleum coke).....			581	108			0				1,770		0	0		
Brown coal briquettes.....							0						0	0		
Aluminum primary metal.....	134						0				16		0	0		
Copper metal, unwrought.....			502	920			0						0	0		
Lead primary metal.....			313	162			0				33		0	0		
Zinc primary metal.....			615	210			0				4		0	0		
Cotton fabrics.....							196						0	0		
Raw hides and skins (except 7140).....							1						0	0		
Sulfur.....							0						0	0		
Tracklaying and wheel tractors.....							132						0	0		
Rubber manufactures.....							822						0	0		
Pulp.....	220												0	0		
All other commodities.....	9,426		5,627	5,746		4,400	9,484		803	557	7,879		122	316	46	
Grand total.....	23,793		20,077	19,603		12,818	21,731	18,694	1,548	1,231	26,836		1,966	1,489	47	

Commodity	Italy		Netherlands		Norway		Portugal		Sweden		Switzerland		Turkey		United Kingdom	
	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter
Bread grains.....									0	123					0	
Oils and fats.....	15	13	1,001	631	(1)	(1)			1,527	778	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	120	(1)
Sugar.....			862	72					0						0	
Meat.....		1							14	44					3	
Milk products.....		5	5	113					207	46					0	
Tobacco.....	1,245	932		1											8	
Fish—fresh, frozen, or smoked, dried, canned.....			453	568					998	382					862	
Eggs.....			7	11					39	128					0	
Coarse grains.....	7														0	
Oilcakes, meal, other feeding stuffs.....	104		7	78						0					0	
Fertilizers.....															34	
Dyestuffs.....	66	261							1	1					316	
Raw materials for plastics.....	17	30	168	126					34	58					283	
Refined liquid fuels and products.....	572	233	289	368					174	79					154	
Raw materials for steel and iron products (pig iron and ferro-alloys).....	25	27	211	63					3,199	1,458					53	
Crude and semifinished steel and hot finished steel and end products.....	1,210	2,401	705	263					2,638	1,343					3,046	
Raw wool.....			0					56							386	
Natural fibers (except cotton, wool).....	2,126	682	518	393					50	3					3	
Artificial fibers, continuous filaments.....	1,906	1,189							23	66					11	
Softwood: Sawn timber except sleepers.....																
Newsprint.....		36								1						
Other paper, board and wallboard.....	82	50	13	1					388	401					20	
Leather.....			8	28												
Generators, motors, electrical machinery.....	2,117	3,979	752	1,007					3,144	2,525					4,749	
Nonelectrical machinery.....	7,213	6,741	290	592					7,962	8,690					8,980	
Transportation equipment.....	1,577	1,161	2,016	343					208	483					2,316	
Manufactured leather (except fur).....		2	89	23					4	0					16	

(1) Not available.

Exports of ECA participating countries to eastern Europe, fourth quarter 1949 and first quarter 1950—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

Commodity	Italy		Netherlands		Norway		Portugal		Sweden		Switzerland		Turkey		United Kingdom	
	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter	1949, fourth quarter	1950, first quarter
Zinc ore	625	544							67	0					0	
Anthracite and hard coal															1,358	
Coke (except petroleum coke)			456	43											493	
Brown coal briquettes															0	
Aluminum primary metal															0	
Copper metal, unwrought															0	
Lead primary metal															0	
Zinc primary metal															0	
Cotton fabrics	283	387													680	
Raw hides and skins (except 7140)															0	
Sulfur	256	288													3	
Tracklaying and wheel tractors	125	635							56	39					717	
Rubber manufactures															809	
Pulp									421	733					0	
All other commodities	6,675	7,209	10,287	11,023			499	317	3,897	4,063					14,023	
Grand total	26,246	26,897	18,137	15,747	11,615	8,255	501	373	25,050	21,541	21,135	14,016	12,057	3,651	39,497	42,682

Source: Fiscal and Trade Policy Division.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 12:30 having arrived, for 1 hour and one-half hence the time is divided equally between the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 448, line 7, after the word "specified", it is proposed to insert the following: "Provided further, That of this appropriation \$100,000,000 shall be used only for assistance to Spain, to be extended upon credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada a question. I think I understood the reading of the amendment, but I believe the intent of the proposal should be made indelibly clear. If I correctly understand the Senator's amendment, the \$100,000,000 referred to in it is to be spent out of the proceeds of this appropriation, and is not an amount in addition to the appropriation. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that is a question I was going to ask. I object to that procedure. I would not object to an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for aid to Spain under the present circumstances, but I do not believe it is wise to rob Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. WHERRY. That is exactly the reason why I am going to support the amendment, because I think the funds for ECA are ample. So it is perfectly agreeable to me to take \$100,000,000 out of this appropriation and give it to Spain.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say in response that the watchdog committee has reported to the Approp-

riations Committee and to the Senate that the appropriation contained in the bill is in the neighborhood of \$240,000,000 more than is needed by ECA. That is set forth in the report referred to in no mean manner. The fact remains that last year we analyzed the requirements of ECA, and our prediction, if we may call it such, was almost correct.

Again this year we analyzed the requirements to the Appropriations Committee, and we suggested that there be an appropriation of \$2,200,000,000 plus the carry-over. Now the appropriation is much more than that.

In my judgment, today the ECA fund is \$300,000,000 larger than will be needed at all by the ECA, following out the principles and the program and arrangement adopted by ECA.

So the Senator from Arizona need have no fear that we are borrowing from Peter to pay Paul, as he has seen fit to state. The fact is that Peter has too much money now, much more than he will need; and he could just as well let Paul have a little of it, because Peter is going to need Paul's help before very long.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The situation, as I understand it, last year was that we were very fortunate in being able to acquire commodities in the United States at quite reasonable prices. In my judgment, the savings are due to the fact that we did not have to pay as much for the commodities supplied to Europe as it was anticipated we would have to pay. So that is where the saving was made.

However, this year that situation is exactly reversed. It is clearly evident that in order to buy the commodities required for ECA in Europe, the cost, by reason of advancing prices in the United States, will be from \$200,000,000 to \$300,000,000 more than it would have cost last year. Everyone knows that the prices of commodities have risen.

So I merely point out that the Appropriations Committee considered this matter very carefully, and we arrived

at a conclusion; and I do not like to depart from that conclusion by so much as \$100,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at the outset let me say that it is time for the United States of America, confronted, as it is, by a threatening enemy of no mean magnitude, to remember that it needs friends and allies now and will continue to need them in the future.

If there is one nation of the world which has consistently through all the ages and through all the years fought, opposed, and indeed defeated communism, it is Spain. Today communism is not known in Spain. It does not dare raise its head in Spain. But the United States of America, although confronted with communistic enemies all over the world, seems for some reason or other to desire to isolate and to lend neither succor, support, nor encouragement to the one nation in the world which has positively defeated communism and refused to yield to it. Only yesterday, the leading citizen of Spain, in the course of a dedicatory address, drew to the attention of his people the fact that it was better to die physically than to die spiritually, that any country which yielded to the onslaught of communism would die spiritually, and that Spain was not going to yield to that, either now nor at any other time.

So, Mr. President, all that Spain is asking, all that she will accept, is not a gift but a loan—a credit, if you please—whereby she may be enabled to buy our commodities and may, after buying our commodities here or wherever else she can get them, strengthen her own internal economy, to prepare for the emergency of war; to prepare her organized army, now in existence and only recently alerted to the conditions prevailing in Korea, because of which Spain might become involved at any moment. Spain only recently alerted her young soldiers to respond immediately to the centers where they are under the law required to respond, because the leadership of Spain sees the imminence of war and, seeing the imminence of war, is ready to join us and to stand at our side and, at the side of all the democracies of the world, so that freedom may prevail in the world.

Mr. President, it is time that we lay aside the little things that have entered into this question for so long and so lastingly. It is time that the little things which have from time to time swayed or colored our judgment be laid aside. Our boys today are dying in Korea. It is not a question of whether they may die: they are dying. We know they are dying, and we know why. We may be called upon for additional sacrifices. Today, all over America we are being alerted to the imminence of war. It is not a war against Korea. If it were, it would be a small thing and easily handled. It is a war against a greater enemy and a more deadly foe than could possibly be found in Korea.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact, as the Senator has already stated, that this war is not necessarily against Korea, but is essentially against communism? Am I correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Undoubtedly, that is the question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That being the case, how can we moralize to the world, if we deny the kind of help that will stop communism to the only country in Europe that has fought communism?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator raises a question that can only be answered by the categorical statement, that we should stand at the side of Spain. Spain is ready to stand at our side, and all she now asks is an opportunity to buy—what? Let me recite what she wants for her own internal improvement. This has been laid before the Export-Import Bank as a statement of Spain's necessities, for which she wants, not a gift but a loan, financed under the rules and regulations of the Export-Import Bank. The statement of her necessities is as follows:

Distribution and application of a credit in United States dollars to meet most urgent and important activities of Spanish reconstruction

For the production of nitrogenous fertilizers.....	\$13,000,000
Machinery and equipment for coal production in mines working at present.....	3,000,000
Machinery and equipment to promote mineral production.....	6,000,000
Commercial planes for international lines and ground installations for airports and air traffic.....	6,000,000
Equipment for electric-power plants.....	5,000,000
Railroads and equipment.....	15,000,000
Tractors and fertilizers.....	20,000,000
Construction of airports and improvement of runways.....	12,000,000
Cotton.....	20,000,000
	100,000,000

Those are all items looking to the stabilization of the economy of a country which is ready to die at the side of the democracies of the world.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield further to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator agree with me that if the philosophy of ECA is correct—and I personally believe it is—and if the idea of ECA is to place the democracies of the world on an economic basis so that they can exist, the geography of Spain lends itself to the very idea of stabilizing the economy of western Europe?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, my answer to that is in the affirmative: Certainly it is.

Mr. CHAVEZ. How can we have economic stability in what we call the anti-communistic area of Europe, which is western Europe, without taking into consideration Spain and Germany?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say that Spain, occupying the Iberian Peninsula, occupies the most strategic place in all the world. The country that would control Gibraltar would control the Mediterranean, and the country or agency that would control the Mediterranean would control northern Africa and southern Europe; and there, right in the midst of it, projecting out into the Mediterranean, is one of the signatories to the North Atlantic Pact—Italy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield further to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that in discussing this particular item of the appropriation bill, pertaining to ECA, we must consider two different bases upon which to justify our votes; one of which is whether what we are doing now with the American taxpayers' money is going to stabilize the economy of western Europe; the other, whether by carrying out that program we are going to do something against communism? I ask the Senator whether, in trying to stabilize the economy of western Europe—which is the only legal justification we have for this appropriation—and in fighting communism, Spain is not as much a part of the scheme of things as any other country of western Europe?

Mr. McCARRAN. I would say more so, because Spain has consistently at all times lent her aid and her arms to the defeat of communism.

Mr. President, I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada, because I think that we are at a point in world affairs where we have to be very realistic, where we have to be very wise, and where we have to be reasonably imaginative in order to comprehend the dangers which beset democracy, meaning our own country and those associated with us, at this critical hour. It is important that we keep the Marshall plan in full force, because, as we know in our own country that no nation, militarily, is any stronger than the economic machine behind it which supports it. Military machines

must have food, weapons, clothing, transportation, and all the other things which are necessary to succeed. They cannot have these things unless there is an economy sufficiently strong to produce the taxes to support a military organization. That is true in the United States, and it is true in the nations of western Europe which are associated together primarily in what we call the North Atlantic Security Alliance. If those countries are weak economically, they will be correspondingly weak militarily. If they are strong economically, they will be stronger militarily.

Mr. President, I supported the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada when it was last offered, and I shall again support it, because I believe that Spain is a very integral part of the defenses against communism in this country and in the world. Militarily, Europe is weak. Only 5 years ago most of the nations in the North Atlantic Security Alliance were occupied by an enemy for a period of four and a half years, during which time their governments were secondary to that of the invader's. Their revenues were practically nil. Their factories were destroyed. Their harbors were full of sunken ships. Their railroad bridges had been torn down. Eighty percent of the machinery in most of the democratic countries had been removed and used for war purposes by the Axis power, so that when the day of deliverance came those countries were very weak economically and, of course, were tremendously weak militarily, because most of them had no armies during the four and a half years of enemy occupation. In fact, the only remnants of the armed might that remained were those forces which had escaped and had gone to Africa or to Britain, and they were but a small part of the armed might with which those nations were equipped when they were invaded by Hitler.

Mr. President, we may as well be frank about it. It is idle to claim that we in the United States must be strong economically if we are to be strong militarily, and say that the nations of western Europe need not be strong economically if they are to be strong militarily. We must take one or the other; we cannot blow hot and cold. Just as it is necessary for us to be strong economically so that we can be strong militarily, so it is necessary for the nations of western Europe to be strong economically in order to be strong militarily.

I dislike to make the remark which I am about to utter, but it ought to be made, in truth. The nations of western Europe are not as strong militarily as they should be to confront the peril which everywhere looms over them. The countries of western Europe are not as strong economically as they should be in order to produce the sinews without which they cannot be strong militarily.

Approximately 2 months ago, on this floor, I made the statement in an address that the worst thing this country and the other democracies of the world could do would be to underestimate the military and economic power of Soviet Russia. I pointed out that Russia had the greatest artillery pool in the world—

more artillery weapons than had any other nation on the face of the earth—that Russia had the greatest tank pool in the world—more tanks than had any other nation on earth—and I pointed out that a great many of those tanks were the equal of, if not superior to, any tanks in the world. I believe there are tanks now being produced in this country which are superior to the Russian tanks, but they are not in great numbers as yet, because it has been difficult to construct them in the period since World War II when we already had so many other tanks on hand.

We have been trying to build up the nations of western Europe under the Marshall plan, not primarily because of any detached altruism, not because of any generosity, although that was a part of our undertaking, but because it was essentially in our own national welfare that Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, and France recover from the condition of the weakness into which they had fallen because of the impact of war, so that they could gain an economic momentum and secure sufficient taxes to produce the revenue which would enable them to supply the military necessities for their own defense. I have spoken several times with reference to it. I think that every dollar we spend under such conceptions as the Marshall plan is a dollar for national defense. The more we weaken the nations of western Europe militarily, the more we weaken the United States militarily, because we must rely upon these nations for a large measure of the military effort which must be made if war shall come to western Europe. In my humble judgment, at the pace at which we are proceeding, I do not believe western Europe can be made sufficiently strong militarily in less than 5 or 10 years to meet the threats which exist. We have got to make up our minds that \$1 spent now is worth \$50 spent after war breaks out. Now is the time to make the fortress of western Europe so strong that any aggressor will hesitate to attack it, for fear of ultimate defeat.

The \$4,000,000,000 which I understand will be asked for in order to furnish aid primarily to western Europe as well as to other nations associated in this democratic effort is a great start in that direction, but I should like to see the sum increased. At the same time, I should like to see pressure put upon the nations of western Europe to take the Marshall plan money, which is primarily appropriated to build them up and make them strong economically, and do all they can possibly do in connection with what we are doing to make the sum total of the two efforts sufficient to amass military strength that would assure us of victory in Europe and the United States if a world war should come. I should like to see the \$4,000,000,000 for arms aid increased, in the firm conviction that every dollar which is wisely spent to build up the democracies of western Europe militarily is equivalent to \$10 we will spend ultimately if they are weak and we have to carry the full load in meeting the onslaught of Russia in the event of war.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield five additional minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it would be idle to conceive of a strong western Europe without some stress upon Spain. Spain occupies a strategic position. It is a great peninsula, to start with, and its northern boundary is one of the most natural defenses in all the terrain of all countries of the world. The Pyrenees Mountains were designed by the Almighty as if to form a barricade against any advance from the north into the peninsula of Spain which runs along the Mediterranean and finally comes to its termination at Gibraltar.

There is no question in the world that the Spaniards are strongly anti-Communist. They have the will to fight. They are strongly opposed to any totalitarian doctrine of the kind which Russia has embraced, with its attack on religion, with its attack on human rights, with its attack on democracy. In cooperating with other western European countries in building up a strong wall of defense against communism, I believe it would be short-sighted if we did not strengthen Spain at the same time.

I wish to repeat once more that in my humble judgment, at the rate we are going, it will take probably from 5 to 10 years to make western Europe sufficiently strong militarily to perform the role it must perform for quick victory and ultimate success. It is my firm conviction that if we increase the \$4,000,000,000, which is the amount which will be asked for, and provide more and more armament for western Europe, while at the same time putting all reasonable pressure on western European countries to do their utmost to supply themselves, it will be the cheapest money we have ever appropriated. To go through with this plan without putting Spain in the picture, with her great national army, with her great geographic advantages, and with her great antipathy to communism, is to lose one of the great assets of national defense without which the picture is not complete.

I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will prevail. It is a step in the right direction. It is necessary to the people of the United States. It is necessary to build an additional bulwark against Russian communistic imperialism and expansion.

Of course we could try to equip the remaining countries of Europe bordering on the Atlantic and leave Spain out of the picture. However, in sheer realism and in sheer self-defense we should bring Spain within the orbit of the western European countries associated with us in opposition to Russian communistic imperialism.

I wish to commend the Senator from Nevada for his persistent fight to bring this condition to pass. I supported him

when he offered the proposition the last time, and I offer him my support in behalf of his amendment now.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I have listened with very keen interest to what the very able Senator from Maryland has said about national defense and the fact that Spain should be brought in as a security measure for ourselves. I have long had the same conviction. With some of my colleagues I flew across Spain and landed at the airport which was being developed at Madrid. I would say that having Spain allied with us probably would give us greater strength in western Europe if we had to meet Russia on the western European continent.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator and I agree thoroughly. I should like to make a concluding observation. Even a man who has but a rudimentary knowledge of geography and location can look at the map of Europe and see that, should war come to western Europe, there is in all that area no bastion which would be of more importance in bringing about ultimate defeat of an aggressor than Spain. She is put there as if by the Almighty. With her geography, her mountains, and bordering on the Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean, indeed at the very entrance to the Mediterranean, she occupies a position of strategy second to no other country in Europe. If we were to build up European countries economically and militarily and leave such a gem outside the fortress, we would only be deluding ourselves. Mr. President, the truth of the matter is we need Spain and we should incorporate her into this chain of support to hold Russian communistic imperialism in check.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to express my gratitude to the very able Senator from Maryland for his kind expressions and for his able utterances on a just and outstanding cause. As usual, when the Senator is really interested in something, I find him to be vehement, able, and efficient.

Mr. President, I desire at this time to read to the Senate an expression that comes to us directly from the Spanish representative in Washington:

Questioned by correspondents on Spain's attitude toward the Korean conflict, a spokesman of the Spanish Embassy stated:

"Spain has never had any doubt about the danger of communism, the warlike intentions of Communist countries. It knows likewise that the only remedy to this menace is the moral and material preparation of peace-loving nations and their armed resistance to aggression, as the United States is now doing."

Continuing, he said:

"Spain's present and future stand is governed by this conviction. And side by side with those nations opposed to violence, Spain was always willing to make sacrifices comparable to theirs."

"Spain reserves her free action. However, she is always ready to reach agreements with

other peace-loving countries. Like them she respects present laws of international relations, and it is within the framework of these that Spain's action would take shape."

Mr. President, I have utilized practically one-half of the time. As I recall, the agreement was that between 12:30 and 2 o'clock the time would be divided between the Senator from Tennessee and myself. It was understood that the Prime Minister of Australia would be received, and following his reception we would proceed for an additional hour and a half, the time also to be divided between the Senator from Tennessee and myself.

I have practically used all the time that I wish to use, unless some other Senator wishes to speak on my side for 5 or 6 minutes.

If the Senator from Tennessee wishes to take his time, I shall of course yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask if there is any Senator who desires to speak against the amendment. If so I am perfectly willing to yield time to him. I am in this position simply because I am the chairman of the committee. I have voted for the Spanish amendment every time it has come before the committee, or whenever it has come before the Senate. I am not on the opposing side. I am on the side of the Senator from Nevada. I think Spain ought to be treated like other western European nations, and I think it is very important that that be done. However, as chairman of the committee I would be perfectly willing to yield time to anyone who would like to speak on the opposite view. I am merely dividing the time; that is all.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would the Senator be willing to divide the time between us for a quorum call?

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed I would.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

During the call of the roll the following occurred:

Mr. McKELLAR. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is there any reason why, during a roll call, I cannot ask if there is any Senator opposed to the amendment, and if so, whether he will take some time in debating it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the Senator may make that request by unanimous consent, since the absence of a quorum has not yet been announced.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well. I have already indicated what I desired to find out, and I am satisfied. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a member of the committee has asked me for time to make some remarks. I with-

draw my point of the absence of a quorum, and yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I would prefer, if it is all right with the Senator, to have the roll call continued, because I do not desire to take the floor at this moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee withdraw his request?

Mr. McKELLAR. I withdraw the request.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	Hendrickson	Malone
Bricker	Hill	Martin
Butler	Holland	Morse
Capehart	Hunt	Myers
Chapman	Kem	O'Connor
Chavez	Kerr	Sparkman
Cordon	McCarran	Stennis
Ellender	McClellan	Taft
Ferguson	McKellar	Thye
Flanders	Magnuson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the names of the absent Senators, and

During the call of the names of the absent Senators, the following occurred:

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have made diligent search and inquiry for any Senator who is opposed to this amendment. I find none at all. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Tennessee cannot at this time obtain unanimous consent, since the absence of a quorum has already been announced.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that, in the absence of a quorum, it is not in order to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has offered an amendment which is very popular. I can find no Senator who wants to speak against it; indeed, I have not found any Senator who opposes it and who wants to vote against it. So I am in a quandary. I suppose it will be necessary to continue calling the names of the absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call is not complete.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded calling the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of

Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

RECESS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Malone
Anderson	Hendrickson	Martin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Hunt	Myers
Capehart	Ives	O'Connor
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Connally	Kefauver	Robertson
Cordon	Kem	Russell
Douglas	Kerr	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Leahy	Sparkman
Ellender	Lehman	Stennis
Ferguson	Lodge	Taft
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarran	Thye
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tydings
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Graham	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Young

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT GORDON MENZIES, PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. As has been previously announced the honorable Robert Gordon Menzies, Prime Minister of Australia, is to be the guest of the Senate immediately. He is now waiting for the committee to escort him into the Chamber. The Chair appoints the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] as the committee to escort the Prime Minister into the Senate Chamber.

At 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m. the Prime Minister of Australia, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, entered the Chamber, and was

greeted with prolonged applause, Senators rising.

The members of the party accompanying the Prime Minister of Australia on his visit to the Senate were:

The Ambassador of Australia, Hon. Norman V. O. Makin.

Mr. Allen S. Brown, Secretary, Prime Minister's Department.

Mr. Fred K. H. Wheeler, First Secretary, Treasury.

Mr. Francis Anthony Meere, Assistant Comptroller General, Department Trade and Customs.

Mr. Trevor W. Swan, Prime Minister's Department.

Mr. J. R. Willoughby, personal assistant to Prime Minister.

Mr. Henry G. Rourke, Australian Military Forces.

The Viscount Bruce of Melbourne, Director of Council of FAO.

Hon. Jack K. McFale, Assistant Secretary of State, also accompanied the Prime Minister.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate, we have with us today a very distinguished statesman from almost the other side of the world. He has been honored by the people of his country in a signal way, but in a way no more signal than his ability and his character merit. He was for 5 years Prime Minister of the Province of Victoria. He has been for 16 years a member of the Australian Parliament. He has been Prime Minister of his country, and is now again serving as Prime Minister. He was also the Attorney General of Australia. Not only on that account, but on account of his ability and his brilliance as a lawyer, he ranked as one of the heads of the Australian bar. Not only because of his political achievements and the honors which he has borne so gracefully, but because of his high moral character, his intellectual integrity, and his sympathetic attitude toward the problems which face us all, it is a great privilege for me to present to the Senate the Honorable Robert Gordon Menzies, Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRIME MINISTER of Australia. Mr. Vice President, for all I know, you may have a rule in this Congress similar to the one which exists in my own Parliament, namely, that one must never refer in one House to a debate in the other House. If you have such a rule, I shall now proceed to break it by telling you that this morning it was my privilege to address the House of Representatives. There, of course, I was rather on my home ground, because I am a House of Representatives man. Indeed, you will understand my feelings in addressing the Senate when I tell you that at this very moment in my own country I am conducting an internecine war with the Senate, which has the bad taste to disagree with me. I hope I shall secure some unanimity here, even though I cannot at the moment secure it in my own country.

Sir, I want to talk for a very few minutes today about my own country and about its relation to some of the acute problems of the world, but before I do

I should like to remind you of something in your own history. A little more than 80 years ago the United States of America had survived the immense crisis of internal war, with all its profound disturbances which might have wrecked the future of a nation less endowed with tenacity, vision, and a sense of destiny. You, sir, in this country set about the task of rebuilding and of expansion. In the next 40 years you brought from the Old World no less than 15,000,000 migrants. You pushed out the frontiers of settlement. You began a new and epic period of pioneering. You laid the foundations of a remarkable and unparalleled industrial power. To adapt the famous phrase of George Canning, "A new world was created to redress the balance of the old."

In the last generation you have assumed and mightily discharged your responsibilities on the world scale.

But, Mr. Vice President, I venture to think that you have not forgotten your own past. It is for that reason that I am confident that we in Australia, beginning as we have since the war what I hope and believe will be a great immigration movement and a great and corresponding period of expansion of our own, will have your friendship and your encouragement—above all, your understanding.

We have, sir, I believe—and I am sure that many, many thousands of your magnificent soldiers will testify to it—done what we could to be your friends. That friendship we are determined to nourish and to promote. [Applause.]

Sir, I venture to say that the world needs friendship. Most of its troubles arise from a decay of the basic human faith that hatred is a killer; that it is friendship alone that gives life; that freedom matters; that governments exist for the people; that our duty and privilege are to encourage the power, the significance, and the responsibility of the individual and immortal human spirit.

Sir, it is in that mental atmosphere that I accept this remarkable honor of being, as I believe, the first representative of Australia ever to address the Senate of the United States of America.

I have spoken in another place, and I do not need to repeat it, of our cooperation in the great war, our present and growing cooperation in Korea. All I want to say about it is that so far as Australia is concerned, we have given and are continuing to give everything we can to the Korean campaign alongside your own people. [Applause.]

Sir, if I may intrude an observation of my own, I believe we must not allow our minds to become concentrated on one incident, however grave and important it may be, to the exclusion of having a clear conception of the world problem as a whole. Korea is symptomatic. It is not in itself definitive. It indicates and proves to us, if we needed to have proof, that there are problems in this world which can be solved only by high intelligence, great imagination, and continuing preparation and courage.

Let me look at it from the point of view of an Australian. Surely we must be charged with the duty of resisting Communist military aggression. Com-

munist aggression is not always military, but there is military aggression of a Communist kind to be found in this world, and I, for one, believe—and that is why I speak about it quite plainly to you—that if we are to meet that kind of threat in our various homes, in our various democratic countries, we must always remember that it is concerted defense that is needed against concerted aggression; that we must think together, we must work together; we must, so far as possible, plan together. We must not assume that we may go on our separate paths regardless of each other until the time comes, and then suddenly coalesce into effective force. I am all for the closest and most intimate exchange of ideas, of plans, and of everything that goes into preparation between countries like yours and mine. [Applause.]

In the second place, Mr. Vice President, I believe that we have the duty of resisting the Communist war of ideas and world Communist propaganda and, from our point of view in Australia, particularly in southeastern Asiatic countries, because that area of the world is very, very near to us in every sense. If we are to meet that kind of propaganda, we are not to do so merely by having blank minds. We must do it by positive means. I believe that we all have the responsibility to do what we can to encourage true, honest, and free national development in those countries, to encourage rising standards of living, to help in every way in the development of those lands. We cannot do it merely by pious resolutions. We cannot do it merely by benevolent words. We can do it only by first of all developing our own resources of material, finance, and trained manpower.

In other words, paradoxical as it may seem, our duty in Australia is to develop our own country to the full as the precondition of our rendering any real benefits to these other countries who are less fortunately placed. In the third place, we must, as indeed we are trying to do, accept heavy obligations in the way of military preparation. We are at the moment engaged in the preliminary organization for the creation in Australia for the first time in peace of a complete scheme of national service training on a compulsory basis for adequate periods of time, calculated to produce in the future something that unfortunately we lack at the moment, and that is a great reservoir of trained manhood and a substantial reserve of trained manhood, so that if the time should unhappily come when we must resort to arms on a great scale, we shall find ourselves there ready and competent.

All these things are existing in our minds and in our policies against the background of two very remarkable series of events. The first of them relates to migration. I said something about your own great movement of population in the concluding 35 or 40 years of the nineteenth century. We in Australia have a population of 8,000,000, and yet we are bringing into Australia, and have been doing so for the past 2 or 3 years, migrants from the Old World at the rate of 200,000 per annum. This represents a migratory movement pro-

H. R. 6458. An act for the relief of Maj. Roy E. Bevel;

H. R. 6505. An act to legalize the entry of Mrs. David Munson Osborne (nee Janet Mary Tole), a native of New Zealand;

H. R. 6066. An act for the relief of Cheng Sick Yuen;

H. R. 6173. An act for the relief of Sun Yip Chin and Chung Lum (Lum Chung);

H. R. 6363. An act conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Patuxent Development Co., Inc.;

H. R. 6758. An act for the relief of Ruby Thaw and Hla Sein;

H. R. 7071. An act for the relief of Mrs. Masa Iyoki;

H. R. 7228. An act for the relief of Kazuko Kamada;

H. R. 7812. An act for the relief of Martha Aporta Strickland;

H. R. 8117. An act for the relief of Yoshiko Emory;

H. R. 8245. An act for the relief of Dr. Alessandro Rizzo; and

H. R. 8655. An act for the relief of Toshiko Kikyo and Francis Kikyo.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1991. An act for the relief of Alexander Stewart;

H. R. 4528. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Louis J. Marx;

H. R. 5566. An act for the relief of Dr. Agostino DeLisi;

H. R. 6461. An act for the relief of Jirina Zizkovsky; and

H. R. 8440. An act for the relief of Noae Kawashima.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2655) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn M. Hryniak.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9109) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress; the Agricultural Act of 1949; and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 249) authorizing the Clerk of the House to make a change in the enrollment of H. R. 6538, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 298. An act for the relief of John Rowland;

S. 442. An act to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 568), as amended, to provide for the application to civil air navigation of laws and regulations related to animal and plant quarantine, and for other purposes;

S. 503. An act for the relief of Solly Manasse;

S. 648. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, section 705, to protect the badge, medal, emblem, and other insignia of auxiliaries to veterans' organizations, and for other purposes;

S. 920. An act for the relief of Ellen Rodriguez Moreno;

S. 1059. An act for the relief of John W. Wagner;

S. 1169. An act for the relief of Christina Shalfeieff;

S. 1419. An act for the relief of Wilhemus Johannes Marie Van Der Kooy;

S. 1491. An act for the relief of Rudolf Meinhard and Irene Hallinger;

S. 1529. An act for the relief of Amy L. Hefington;

S. 1551. An act for the relief of Jose Augusto Pereira;

S. 1573. An act for the relief of Anastacia Roshani;

S. 1654. An act for the relief of Kyra Kite Riddle;

S. 1760. An act to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 734; 7 U. S. C. 429);

S. 1942. An act for the relief of Isabel Alba Casas, Concepcion Garcia Perez, Maria del Carmen Fernandez Matesaenz, Maria Santos Zuniga, Felipa Casado del Blanco, Mercedes Rodriguez Villanueva, Selina Milan Gonzalez, Teresa Duque Saenz, Martina Equiza Garces, and Teresa Baztan Elizalde;

S. 1963. An act for the relief of Augusto Segre;

S. 2053. An act for the relief of Vivienne Joy Wilson and minor daughter Mary Ann Vaughn;

S. 2016. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles R. Proctor;

S. 2080. An act to authorize the regulation of whaling and to give effect to the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling signed at Washington under date of December 2, 1946, by the United States of America and certain other governments, and for other purposes;

S. 2183. An act for the relief of Nicholas J. Chicouras;

S. 2240. An act to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the United States Coast Guard and the United States Public Health Service to accept certain gifts tendered by foreign governments;

S. 2242. An act for the relief of John E. Dwyer;

S. 2253. An act for the relief of Dr. In Sung Kwak;

S. 2264. An act for the relief of Juliana Sosa de Solis;

S. 2297. An act for the relief of the estate of Lee Jones Cardy;

S. 2314. An act to provide for holding a term of the United States District Court for the District of Oregon at Eugene;

S. 2357. An act to amend the act of May 26, 1936, authorizing the withholding of compensation due Government personnel;

S. 2442. An act for the relief of Yone T. Park;

S. 2565. An act for the relief of Edward E. Duff;

S. 2608. An act for the relief of Dr. Kun Ken Hu;

S. 2723. An act for the relief of Maria del Carmen Moreno-Elorza, Maria Luisa Asin Luri, Rafaela Garcia Casini, Giovanni Importa, and Teresa Campagnoni;

S. 2774. An act to amend section 2113 of title 18 of the United States Code in order to include certain savings and loan associations within its provisions;

S. 2866. An act for the relief of Egbert G. Gesell;

S. 2934. An act for the relief of Julius Elzas;

S. 2990. An act for the relief of Amy Louisa Shier;

S. 2991. An act for the relief of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad Co.;

S. 2996. An act to authorize loans to make available in any area or region credit formerly made available in such area or region by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation;

S. 3012. An act for the relief of Mrs. Osa J. Petty;

S. 3098. An act to amend section 104 of title 28 of the United States Code so as to create a Greenville division in the northern district of Mississippi, with terms of court to be held at Greenville;

S. 3163. An act for the relief of Mrs. Houora Redman;

S. 3253. An act for the relief of Lyon F. Hibberd and the estate of George T. Erb;

S. 3377. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 3585. An act for the relief of Dodge County, Wis.;

S. 3652. An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government;

S. 3657. An act to provide for financing the operations of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 3832. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the Ogden River Water Users' Association, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes;

S. 3833. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the South Cache Water Users' Association, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1991. An act for the relief of Alexander Stewart;

H. R. 2225. An act for the relief of William B. Bond;

H. R. 3464. An act to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of alien John Michael Ancker Rasmussen;

H. R. 3805. An act for the relief of Yuk Onn Won;

H. R. 4188. An act for the relief of Dr. Ferdinando Schiappa;

H. R. 4528. An act conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Louis J. Marx;

H. R. 4628. An act for the relief of John G. Essenberg;

H. R. 4806. An act for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago;

H. R. 4942. An act to regulate the collection and disbursement of moneys realized from leases made by the Seneca Nation of Indians of New York, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Dalla Rosa Prati and her minor son, Rolando Dalla Rosa Prati;

H. R. 5566. An act for the relief of Dr. Agostino De Lisi;

H. R. 6066. An act for the relief of Cheng Sick Yuen;

H. R. 6173. An act for the relief of Sun Yip Chin and Chung Lum (Lum Chung);

H. R. 6225. An act for the relief of Mrs. Aimee Hoyningen-Huene;

H. R. 6363. An act conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Patuxent Development Co., Inc.;

H. R. 6458. An act for the relief of Maj. Roy E. Bevel;

H. R. 6461. An act for the relief of Jirina Zizkovsky;

H. R. 6505. An act to legalize the entry of Mrs. David Munson Osborne (nee Janet Mary Tole), a native of New Zealand;

H. R. 6758. An act for the relief of Ruby Thaw and Hla Sein;

H. R. 7071. An act for the relief of Mrs. Masa Iyoki;

H. R. 7228. An act for the relief of Kazuko Kamada;

H. R. 7764. An act to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7812. An act for the relief of Martha Aporta Strickland;

H. R. 8117. An act for the relief of Yoshiko Emory;

H. R. 8139. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Navy Band at the annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held in Biloxi, Miss., September 27 through September 30, 1950;

H. R. 8245. An act for the relief of Doctor Alessandro Rizzo;

H. R. 8440. An act for the relief of Naoo Kawashima;

H. R. 8655. An act for the relief of Toshiko Kikyo and Francis Kikyo;

H. R. 9178. An act to suspend restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution authorizing the return to Mexico of the flag, standards, colors, and emblems that were captured by the United States in the Mexican War; and

S. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of Missouri and the State of Kansas establishing a boundary between said States.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 9109) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress; the Agricultural Act of 1949; and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

MRS. EVELYN M. HRYNIAK—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the bill (S. 2655) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn M. Hryniak, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2655) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn M. Hryniak, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum passed by the House insert \$6,250; and the House agree to the same.

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
WILLIAM T. BYRNE,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate of the United States and the good citizens of the country who were fortunate enough to have been present in the Senate Chamber as our guests, listened to what in my opinion were words of wisdom from an honored guest of this body, the Prime Minister of Australia. It is my purpose this afternoon to speak in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada. I wish to recall to the Senate some of the words of wisdom uttered by the great man who appeared before us and addressed us this afternoon, and to say that in keeping with his advice it would be well for this body this afternoon to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

The Prime Minister of Australia said, in effect: The world needs friendship. Friendship gives life. Concerted efforts affect results in the right manner. We will have to have a sense of partnership, and trust each other.

Mr. President, there are several justifications for the amendment upon which we are about to vote. There are several justifications and reasons why the amendment should be included as one of the items of the ECA appropriation. What is one reason why Congress passed the ECA authorization? It is because the world needs friendship, it needs economic betterment so countries can be put back on their feet again, so the standards of living of peoples can be improved. If that does not fit in with what the Senator from Nevada has in mind nothing else will.

What is another reason? Why is this body going to vote hundreds of millions of dollars for ECA? Because Congress authorized ECA. That is a legal authorization. It is the law of the land. Hence it is the duty of this body and of the House to take the taxpayers' money and appropriate from it whatever is needed to carry out the law of the land.

What is another reason? Stern reality, again keeping in mind that the world needs friendship, and that friendship gives strength.

What is the idea of the moment? What is the concern of the world? What did our good guest of today talk about, and what was the advice he gave us? To fight with united effort against Communists. Very well; that being the case, the amendment of the Senator from Nevada is in order. It is in keeping, first, with carrying out the purposes of ECA, and next in fighting Communists.

Let Senators visualize in their own minds the map of Europe. Visualize what is referred to now as western Europe. Look at the geography of that area of the world, and look at the history of the countries involved, and of the peoples of those countries. Has any country in western Europe or elsewhere done anything more against communism than has Spain? I am not talking now of governments. I am talking about peoples. If there is any one race of people that has fought against communism it is the people of Spain.

Oh, I know it will possibly be said, "Of course, there is nothing in the ECA law that will keep Spain from participating,

provided the participating countries invite her." If we are to fight communism, let us once in a while try to analyze for ourselves why it is that Spain is not invited. That is due to communistic influences pure and simple. The fact that 180 Communists sit in the French Parliament is bound to have some effect on the Government of France when it comes to the question of inviting Spain. As was stated by the Senator from Nevada, and as was stated by the Senator from Maryland, even if we were to forget ECA and the economic development of Spain, even if we were only to think about our own national interests, Uncle Sam's interests, we should adopt the amendment. It is to our interest at this time to remember what was said by our good guest who addressed us this afternoon, that the world itself needs friendship, that we need friends, that friendship gives life, that faith can preserve life. By adopting the amendment of the Senator from Nevada we will be carrying out the purposes of the concerted effort our guest of today spoke about, which will bring about the results we need.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be adopted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I rise to voice my support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to earmark funds for aid to Spain. A change in the policy of our Government in this respect is long overdue.

If anything were needed to point up the lack of reality which has so consistently marked the United States attitude toward Spain, the Korean crisis and the return of Communist Russia to the deliberations of the United Nations today do so in dramatic fashion.

The whole world is shaping up into two hostile camps, and the United States should not ignore any possible supporter in the critical situation forced by Communist aggression. Nevertheless, our policy makers continue to spurn the friendship and support of the very nation which first and successfully repulsed the forces of communism in one of the few setbacks any free nation has been able to give to the common enemy.

Spain geographically, ideologically, and economically would be vital and necessary in defending western civilization against any advance from totalitarian or Communist enemies.

Our defense authorities have long recognized and conceded the strategic and military value of Spain. It takes in most of the Iberian Peninsula, and is a natural fortress in western Europe. Its geographic position at the entrance to the Mediterranean, where it straddles the Straits of Gibraltar, is of unusual military importance.

Military strategists declare that Spain's natural naval anchorages in the northwestern section are superior to those of any European nation; and the Pyrenees are the only uninterrupted bul-

wark between the Urals—Russia—and the sea.

The attitude of our State Department toward Spain is difficult to understand. We poured billions of dollars and the most critical machinery and materials into Russia only a few years ago, to help her, even though we had reason to believe that her Government was and is the most ruthless dictatorship the world has ever seen, more ruthless than Genghis Khan or any of the other despoilers of all history.

With regard to Yugoslavia, our Nation has ignored the injustices, the massacres, and the annihilation of religious practices by its despotic ruler, and has given economic and financial help, even though Tito and his followers have lined up consistently on the side of our enemy, world communism.

Billion after billion of dollars have been poured into England, which has repudiated principles which are the essence of the economic system which has brought our country to its present high estate.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that I venture the assertion that if Spain had received a proper share of assistance and had received treatment equal to that accorded the United Nations members, Spain would have responded more promptly and more helpfully than the great majority of the other nations have done in the Korean crisis.

We have gone around the world giving funds here, there, and everywhere; and yet we refuse to aid a country which could be of real service to us, a country whose people are friendly to us, and whose present needs stem directly from their valiant fight against communism.

Mr. President, the United States policies with regard to Spain should be completely revised, I am convinced. Adoption of the McCarran amendment would be a first step in that proper direction.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if one were seeking a text today in furtherance of the amendment I am submitting, he need go no further than to recall to mind the expressions of the able Prime Minister of Australia, who addressed this body just a few minutes ago: "Hatred is a killer; friendship gives life. All of us need friendship. The hatreds which have been extended toward Spain from certain influences, must of necessity disappear, because this is a moment when America and the other democracies of the world require life; and friendship gives life, whereas hatred is a killer."

The United States of America, of all countries on the earth, and the other countries which have joined with us in striving for the welfare of civilization, need today, and will need tomorrow and in the tomorrows thereafter, more and more friendship.

Mr. President, this, however, is not a question of sentiment; neither is it a question of theories. It is a condition, rather than a theory, which confronts the world today. We may say that the Korean War—and it is a war, because it is resulting in the death of our boys over there; it can scarcely be called a police activity any longer—may be only

a flash in the pan, and it may subside after Korea has been cleaned up. However, I need not call the attention of the Members of this body to other places in the world where other disturbances are likely to break out.

Mr. President, another text which might be taken from the expressions of the able Prime Minister of Australia, who spoke to us a few minutes ago, is that we must in each instance, and in each nation, build internal strength, so that we may be of assistance to each other and may lend strength to each other in the struggles which may lie ahead. That statement is true, regardless of whether there lies ahead of us either a shooting war or a cold war.

All that is sought by means of this amendment is an opportunity to render to a friendly country, which today is holding itself ready to do battle with us against a common foe, assistance in building up its internal strength, so that it may be of worthwhile aid to us in a greater struggle. The only purpose of this amendment is to allow that nation to obtain credit, not a gift. She does not request a gift. All she is asking for is credit, in order that she may build herself to such an extent that she will be able to aid us in the hour of struggle. When we are threatened with war, Mr. President, any country which says to us, "We are ready to stand at your side" certainly should have our succor and support. Even if in times past that country had been our most deadly enemy, yet if it were to say to us, in a time of need, "We are going into this struggle, and we will stand at your side," would we deny to that former enemy support to enable it to stand with us tomorrow?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada whether he can inform us as to the present status of the application by Spain for assistance from the Export-Import Bank? I understand an application has been made, and, unless I am erroneously informed, that is now being considered. I do not know the amount, but I understand there is such an application.

Mr. McCARRAN. The application has been made, and it has been standing for 4 or 5 months without any action whatever. I may say, in furtherance of that suggestion, that hoping something would be done, communications have gone from some of us to the Secretary of State, even by telegraph, in an effort to get relief by way of processing the application.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am not going to take much time. I think the temperament of the Senate is pretty well made manifest when no Senator seems to be inclined to speak against this worthy amendment. If we were not confronted with a condition which threatens our very life, and which

threatens the civilization of the world, one might then pause, and, if he held a hatred, might give vent to it; but no one can afford to take that position today with reference to any country which will give succor and support to us in the days to come, if war should befall us.

Mr. President, I need not invite your attention to the fact that others are thinking along the same line, because in a very recent expression made by a great British statesman, he in substance said: "I see no reason why Spain should not be taken into the North Atlantic Pact. I see no reason why Spain should not be fully recognized in diplomatic circles." Neither can anyone in this Chamber say why we have not recognized fully in diplomatic circles the great nation of Spain, a great Christian people, a great liberty-loving people, desirous of helping themselves and thereby of helping us. Spain is asking now not alone for recognition—that is a matter of diplomacy, a matter which addresses itself to the Executive—but is asking now that she may obtain credit from us in order that she may buy our commodities which are in surplus, that she may build for herself an internal structure economically sound, that tomorrow she may stand with her soldiery at the side of our boys, to die together with them for the freedom of the world. Are we to say "No"? Are we to say to that Government, to those people who seek liberty, "No; we will give aid to all the world under the point 4 program, we will spend money all over the world; we will send it to South America, to central Africa, and to Siam—we will send it everywhere, but, no, Spain, you cannot have it, although you are willing to send your soldiers to be with us at any minute that you may be called upon"?

Mr. President, that is inconsistent with American ideals. It is inconsistent with the American way of life. It is inconsistent with our history. It is inconsistent with the very things we are doing on the floor of the Senate in appropriating nearly \$3,000,000,000 for aid to western Europe, to refuse aid at the one strategic point in all Europe, the one point of greatest military strategic position, the Iberian Peninsula, which, if it should fall to an enemy, would mean that Gibraltar would be gone, the Mediterranean would be gone, north Africa would be gone, Italy would be gone—gone from the North Atlantic Pact, gone from everything.

Mr. President, it is impossible that the Senate should today reject this amendment; it is inconceivable, in view of what we are doing.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Maine such time as he may wish. Will the Senator indicate about how much time he will want?

Mr. BREWSTER. About 10 minutes. How much time, may I inquire, has the Senator from Nevada remaining?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to take 10 minutes, if I may.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. BREWSTER. I trust the Senator from Nevada will then reserve some time for the conclusion.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well; let the Senator take 10 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I share the sentiments and the judgment which have been so effectively and forcefully presented by the Senator from Nevada, with whom I am happy and proud to have been associated in seeking to secure the restoration of more friendly relations with Spain, which, in the judgment of the Senator from Maine, are very vital to our future security although I would not put this action upon a merely mercenary ground. I believe that many other considerations may be most persuasive. I believe that the attitude which we have hitherto adopted has proved itself utterly bankrupt, as have the policies which we have been pursuing in the Far East, which have resulted so disastrously there and which have compelled a reorientation of our policy in that area, a reorientation which I trust will also take within its purview the situation on the European Continent, where Spain is an infinitely more vital and strategic spot than is Korea in the Orient.

There is no military authority in this country, nor in fact anywhere else in the world, but what will testify to the profound significance of the Iberian Peninsula in the strategic map of the world. There, behind the Pyrenees, is the one spot in Europe which might, before a Russian avalanche, be wiped out. There is the key to the Mediterranean, as Winston Churchill has always recognized. There is the spot where airfields are available, if properly equipped. They are not now properly equipped, as I learned, myself, when flying there, when, in an American naval plane it was impossible at 5 miles from the Madrid airport to communicate with the airport because of their utterly inadequate communications facilities. Tomorrow, unless we resume friendly relations with the Spanish regime, American planes may be seeking safety and salvage there, and not have the facilities which would be provided if we would simply normalize our relations with the Spanish Government and carry out the policies which have been urged not only by our military authorities but by many of the diplomatic authorities most intimately concerned.

This is no time to hash over ancient grievances, but rather it is time to recognize the future rather than the past. We have done that in seeking to rehabilitate the people of Germany, Italy, and Japan. Why are we so concerned when it comes to normalizing relations with a government which, at any rate in our modern history, has never been our foe?

I want to read briefly, in the course of my remarks, a portion of an address by the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of *The Americas* and

World Affairs, delivered at Le Clerc Hall at the College of Notre Dame of Maryland, and then to ask permission to have the remainder of it printed in the *RECORD*. Father Thorning spoke as follows:

The Spaniards want none of the so-called liberation, to which the Poles, the Czechs, the Slovaks, the Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Austrians, Albanians, and East Germans have been subjected. The Spaniards were eye-witnesses of the first, futile attempts of Soviet imperialists to dominate all the people of the world. The Spaniards won their victory over home-grown traitors such as Francisco Largo Caballero, who called himself the Spanish Lenin, and Dr. Juan Negrin, who never explained what happened to the \$600,000,000 gold reserve of the Spanish people. Perhaps Mr. Acheson does not know that most of the gold is now in the hands of Soviet Politburo and that this stolen property is financing the Soviet Party line against Spain, to which a United States Secretary of State, rather naively, contributed his mite.

Mr. Acheson ought to know that you cannot beat something with nothing. We, the citizens of the United States, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, have a right to know his candidate for leadership in a non-Soviet Spain. If Mr. Acheson is dissatisfied with the policies of the present head of the Spanish state, who led the crusade against Bolshevism and who conquered our enemies, what manner of man can be presented by our State Department as the ideal Spanish ruler, whether he is to be called President, Chief of State, or King? Allowing for the moment, simply for the sake of discussion, that we have any right to suggest Spain's form of government or the name of her Chief Administrator, who is the paragon of virtue and executive skill to be recommended by Mr. Dean Acheson and the little clique in the State Department that continues to wage a vicious rear-guard action against 28,000,000 decent people?

President Roosevelt quickly accepted the administration which now rules as the de facto and de jure government in Madrid. Furthermore, in November 1942, he gave assurances to the head of the Spanish state that have been more honored in the breach than in the observance. For Mr. Acheson to join the Soviet-inspired, Soviet-engineered smear campaign against Spain and the Spanish people is a failure in honor and gratitude which future historians will record and assay. Moreover, it is a blow at the security of the free world, because every department in Washington except the State Department, headed by Mr. Dean Acheson, recognizes the vital interest of our country in the Iberian Peninsula.

At a time when freedom and democracy need fearless moral leadership and a foreign policy divorced from cant and hypocrisy, Mr. Dean Acheson, who once before misjudged the true nature of Soviet imperialism, has turned up with a species of "double talk" which in effect, maintains the Soviet-initiated boycott of a friendly nation and a noble people. Is this the way to gain friends and to inspire loyalty?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete address of Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning be inserted at this point in the *RECORD*, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

BALTIMORE.—Addressing the Parents and Friends of Notre Dame in Le Clerc Hall at the College of Notre Dame of Maryland, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of *The Americas* and World Affairs, de-

clared that "the present Spanish Government shows a liberal, generous attitude toward those of diverse religious faiths by allocating funds raised by national taxation to Jewish and Moslem schools in the Protectorate of Morocco." This tax money, Dr. Thorning added, is "distributed on the basis of the number of Jews and Moslems in the population. Consequently, Spain, although according official protection to the Catholic faith, proclaims to the world, through its tax and educational policies, that its government is quite as enlightened, socially, as that of the United Kingdom, or Canada, or Australia, and other English-speaking countries where it has long been understood that without Divine revelation our youth will slip into the morass of dialectical materialism."

"In Spain as well as in other Catholic countries, such as Ireland and Portugal," Dr. Thorning emphasized, "it is clearly perceived and widely taught that the enemy of modern man is totalitarian Marxism, not Protestantism, nor Judaism. Within the past few months, for example, the Spanish Cabinet ratified two decrees favoring the Jews: one, which provided a new synagogue for Madrid and its respected Jewish community numbering at least 5,000; the other, granting Spanish citizenship to Sephardic Jews in Greece and Egypt. Presumably, other Jews in the Near East, descendants of those exiled from the Iberian Peninsula in 1492, will be able to avail themselves of this privilege. It may prove to be an opportunity of inestimable value in case the Soviets, 'the Collectivizers par excellence,' succeed in their drive to occupy the Greek Archipelago and then seize control of the eastern Mediterranean. At any rate, this is one illustration that, so far as Christians are concerned, 'time heals all wounds.'"

"Everywhere under the Spanish flag today, religious people are authorized to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience, while Jews and Moslems, because of their historic connection with the country and because of their relative numbers in the total population, enjoy benefits that are not conceded to religious minorities in the United States. In some Spanish cities, Jewish synagogues, Moslem mosques and Christian churches exist side by side. For that reason, Spaniards still speak of their country as 'the land of the three religions,' although Catholics constitute the bulk of the population. Indeed, much of the charm and poetry of southern Spain springs from the fact that, as in the tales of Washington Irving, three streams of history and culture, Jewish, Moorish, and Christian, have become interwoven, romantically and artistically.

"If contemporaneous Spain has a predominant mood, it is that of spiritual reconciliation. Above all, the people crave unity, understanding, and peace. The only foe Spaniards recognize, and it must be admitted they were alert to the peril before the rest of the Western World, is the Soviet Union. Not only did the Spaniards identify the Soviet monster; they are the one people in the world who can claim to have defeated, at least temporarily, the designs of the totalitarian tyrants in the Kremlin.

"Why then does Mr. Dean Acheson, United States Secretary of State, fail to see the importance of the Iberian Peninsula in the limited war which is being waged against us by the Soviet Union? Why does Mr. Acheson, repeatedly snub, rebuke, and inflict slights upon Spain and the Spanish people? Why does Mr. Acheson fail to accept the hand of friendship extended to him by the Spanish Cabinet in Madrid?

"The fundamental reason for Mr. Acheson's cool attitude and air of pretended indifference with respect to an exchange of Ambassadors with Madrid is that he and

many others of his kind consider Spain so surely and firmly in the democratic camp that Spain is the one country in Western Europe that does not need to be wooed, courted, or flattered in order to remain free from Soviet influence. In other words, Spain and the Spaniards, because of their fierce individualism and fervent Catholic faith, cannot be won over by Moscow. In a world of uncertainty, Madrid is like the Vatican, an uncompromising champion of personal freedom and an irreducible bastion of Christian civilization. Why worry about the devout Catholics, Jews, and Moslems of the Spanish State? They can be counted upon at all hazards. They have seen the international traitors, the Soviet sympathizers of every land, hard at work in Barcelona, Madrid, Albacete, Valencia, and Teruel, at their familiar trade of arson, rape and murder.

"The Spaniards want none of the so-called 'liberation', to which the Poles, the Czechs, the Slovaks, the Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Austrians, Albanians and East Germans have been subjected. The Spaniards were eye-witnesses of the first, futile attempts of Soviet imperialists to dominate all the people of the world. The Spaniards won their victory over home-grown traitors such as Francisco Largo Caballero, who called himself 'the Spanish Lenin,' and Dr. Juan Negrin, who never explained what happened to the \$600,000,000 gold reserve of the Spanish people. Perhaps Mr. Acheson does not know that most of the gold is now in the hands of Soviet Politburo and that this stolen property is financing the Soviet party line against Spain, to which a United States Secretary of State, rather naively, contributed his mite.

"Mr. Acheson ought to know that 'you cannot beat something with nothing.' We, the citizens of the United States, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, have a right to know his candidate for leadership in a non-Soviet Spain? If Mr. Acheson is dissatisfied with the policies of the present head of the Spanish state, who led the crusade against bolshevism and who conquered our enemies, what manner of man can be presented by our State Department as the ideal Spanish ruler, whether he is to be called president, chief of state, or king? Allowing for the moment, simply for the sake of discussion, that we have any right to suggest Spain's form of government or the name of her chief administrator, who is the paragon of virtue and executive skill to be recommended by Mr. Dean Acheson and the little clique in the State Department that continues to wage a vicious rear-guard action against 28,000,000 decent people?

"Does Mr. Acheson favor Indalecio Prieto, the leader of Spanish Marxists who have not yet fallen under the shadow of the Kremlin? Does the United States Secretary of State imagine that the good religious people of Spain want a follower of Karl Marx in the place of her one-time 'Catholic Kings'?

"Are we to understand that Mr. Dean Acheson has forgotten, so quickly, the fate of Jan Masaryk and the tragic end of Edouard Benes in what is now Sovietized Czechoslovakia? Why would Mr. Acheson propose a left-wing candidate for supreme power in Spain? Would the Secretary of State consider Sr. Julio Alvarez del Vayo, who writes pro-Soviet international news analysis for the left-wing 'nation', a suitable leader for Spaniards who remained in Spain in order to rebuild their country? Or does Mr. Acheson have some Marxists in mind who, like wanklings in Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania, simply served to pave the way for Matyas Rakosi, Vassily Koslov, and Ana Pauker? In short, does Mr. Acheson have to learn, the hard way, that the Marxist variety of agnostic is merely a stop-gap and a push-over for the Soviet Gauleiters

at work on every continent, including our own?

"Is it necessary, or even expedient, to offer passive cooperation to Generalissimo Josef Stalin in his feud with Christian Spain? Is it wise to allow the Marxists to take over the Iberian Peninsula and, in that way, to warm the chair of high office for another Klement Gottwald? Do we have to see Dolores Ibaruri (La Pasionaria) bedecked in scarlet raiment in the Royal Palace at Madrid before we awaken to the realities of power politics? Are Mr. Dean Acheson and his intimates waiting for the revival of civil strife in Spain in order to install some agnostic, Marxist stalking-horse in Madrid who will play his puppet role until the advent of the real Soviet Gauleiter, a counterpart of Jacob Ber- man in Warsaw?

"Mr. Acheson, in his wierd document about Spain (May 11, 1949), describes a possible Ambassador in Madrid as 'a symbol of the fact that after all we don't care much about these rights * * *'. Mr. Acheson was referring to the writ of habeas corpus, the right of trial by jury, and religious liberty.

"Although Mr. Acheson overlooked the fact that the judiciary is free in Spain and that no one can be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, he can be judged, in the light of his own principles, by comparing the facts of life behind the Soviet iron curtain with the true conditions in both Portugal and Spain, which have authoritarian governments.

"In the Soviet satellite states as well as in the Soviet Union itself, the most brutal violations of these rights mentioned by Mr. Acheson occur every day. The Honorable Selden Chapin, United States Minister to Hungary, where a prince of the church, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, was tortured before the eyes of the whole world, was recalled for consultation, not withdrawn as a public protest against the kangaroo-court injustice of the trial. In Sovietized Prague, the Honorable Joseph E. Jacobs remains as Ambassador of the United States of America. Does not the United States Secretary of State know that he maintains a chief of diplomatic mission in Soviet Poland as well as in Tito's totalitarian Yugoslavia? Indeed, when Mr. Acheson took office, he expressed the hope for better relations with Yugoslavia, without a single word of criticism of the wave of civil and religious persecution which rolled over the Protestants, Moslems, Jews, orthodox people, and Catholics under the police-state rule of Tito. Or is the tyrant Tito excusable for violations of civic rights because of his Red services in the leftist forces which tried to subdue Spain?

"On the other hand, there is no iron curtain at the Pyrenees or along the Mediterranean. President Franklin D. Roosevelt had heard all the clap-trap about Fascist Spain when, on March 31, 1939, he recognized the same government Mr. Acheson criticizes.

"President Roosevelt quickly accepted the administration which now rules as the de facto and de jure government in Madrid. Furthermore, in November 1942 he gave assurances to the head of the Spanish state that have been more honored in the breach than in the observance. For Mr. Acheson to join the Soviet-inspired, Soviet-engineered smear campaign against Spain and the Spanish people is a failure in honor and gratitude which future historians will record and assay. Moreover, it is a blow at the security of the free world, because every department in Washington except the State Department, headed by Mr. Dean Acheson, recognizes the vital interests of our country in the Iberian Peninsula.

"At a time when freedom and democracy need fearless moral leadership and a foreign policy divorced from cant and hypocrisy, Mr. Dean Acheson, who once before misjudged the true nature of Soviet imperialism, has

turned up with a species of doubletalk, which, in effect, maintains the Soviet-initiated boycott of a friendly nation and a noble people. Is this the way to gain friends and to inspire loyalty?

"The religious people of the world are awakening to the underlying agnostic motivation of the Soviet and left-wing persecution of Spain. Spain won the first battle against the Soviet Union; Mr. Acheson is not only attempting to nullify that victory, the only one of its kind, but he is also contributing to the confusion and chaos on which Bolshevism feeds. At an hour when the United States should have shown leadership and a respect for the plighted word, Mr. Acheson joined the pro-Soviet clique that triumphed at San Francisco in the exclusion of Spain, Ireland, and Portugal from the United Nations.

"Either Secretary Acheson was talking for Marxist satisfaction in Paris and London; or he meant what he said. If his document was intended to appease the non-Soviet followers of Karl Marx, he must reckon with the damage he did to the good-neighbor policy among descendants of the Iberians in the other American Republics; if, on the other hand, he really believed what he put forth on May 11, 1949, he produced a so-called state paper without parallel in the diplomatic history of the United States, from the standpoint of unfairness, inconsistency, and insincerity. What Mr. Acheson said added up to a hodge-podge of discrimination, inherent contradictions, and hypocrisy. No better caption for this failure of policy, as embodied in Mr. Acheson's remarks, can be devised than that published over a powerful editorial in the Washington Star, Tuesday, May 17, 1949, 'Perpetuating a Fraud.'

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a more complete text of my remarks, prepared by myself and entitled "Should We Resume Friendly Relations With Spain?" be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, Mr. BREWSTER's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD WE RESUME FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH SPAIN?

(By Senator OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine)

Every military authority with whom I have discussed the subject at home and abroad agrees in the importance of Spain to American security if we consider communistic Russia as our potential foe.

The emphasis varies according to the service concerned.

The Navy believes the Mediterranean vital in any conflict with the Soviet and points out the obvious impossibility of holding the Mediterranean if Spain is controlled by an unfriendly interest.

The Air Corps looks at Spain from the standpoint of operational bases in the European littoral.

The Army looks at Spain from the standpoint of its defensive position behind the Pyrenees as the only spot in Europe it might be possible to hold with a minimum of cost.

With this in mind more and more thoughtful Americans are pondering the implications of our policy in apparently seeking to starve out the Franco regime. The Moscow-dominated Spanish government in exile, is still functioning in Paris with the assistance of the \$500,000,000 in gold removed from Spain—partly to Moscow and partly to Mexico.

The representatives of this Government in exile presented themselves at the recent meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union at Stockholm and were accepted under the leadership of the British delegation. The Communists are operating a sabotage school

at Toulouse in France near the Spanish border and infiltrating their representatives at every opportunity into adjacent industrial areas in Spain to stimulate unrest.

Spain goes by extremes, as was demonstrated in its civil war. The comfortable assumption that the Franco regime might be succeeded by a more moderate and more democratic regime is utterly unwarranted and one of the false hypotheses upon which our policy is apparently predicated.

Spain would very much like to install modern ground equipment on its rather excellent airports to enable the commercial planes of America and other countries to operate safely and conveniently through this main airway for world travel.

At present the airports are supplied only out-moded equipment which made communication almost impossible even at a distance of 5 miles from the airport. In time of peace the safe and constant operation of American airlines overseas would be tremendously assisted by proper ground equipment on the Spanish airports and our subsidies to our overseas airlines would be materially reduced. In time of war the security of America might immeasurably assisted by proper operating equipment on the Spanish airports on the very easy assumption that any movement by Moscow toward world domination would inevitably involve Spain.

Stalin is not likely to make the mistake of Hitler so far as Spain is concerned. How far the United States should go in assistance to the Spanish economy is naturally a matter for prudent and careful consideration as events develop. The continuing failure to normalize relations with Spain by the sending of an Ambassador is a crime against the security of America and against our sons who must perhaps pay the price of our neglect.

To suggest that we cannot send an Ambassador because there is not complete religious freedom such as we are familiar with in the United States flies in the face of our sending an Ambassador to Czechoslovakia where the Roman Catholic Church today is being deliberately taken under absolute control by legislation and the clergy purged.

The United States has just sent a Minister to Hungary where Cardinal Mindzenty is being crucified for standing up for his religious convictions.

Meanwhile, we have an Ambassador in Moscow where human rights of every character—religious and otherwise—are entirely subject to the decrees of the politburo with no semblance of regard for the traditions of Anglo-Saxon respect for the rights of the individual.

We have a Minister in Saudi Arabia where King Ibn Saud is the law and where no Jew is even allowed to enter the Kingdom—even to do work in connection with the American oil concession which has been fostered by American money and protected by the American State Department.

Under the present Spanish constitution freedom of worship is pledged for Protestant sects and recent American visitors have attended services in Protestant chapels which have been operating freely for sometime with police protection furnished by the Government whenever there was any indication of possible interference.

There are reported to be from 10,000 to 30,000 Protestants in Spain with approximately 160 Protestant chapels listed.

The Government has undoubtedly moved slowly in issuing permits for some of the chapels to open for operation, but the same moderation is evident in many other fields in the Government as we were pointedly reminded by businessmen concerned with the delays in the functioning of the Government in connection with purely business matters.

Occasional delays are sometimes evident even in Washington officialdom. Undoubtedly proselyting as distinct from worship pre-

sents a problem which has not yet been solved in a country which is 99 percent Roman Catholic exactly as we have certain social problems in the United States in certain areas. To say that Spain was neutral during the war is no more than America sought to be until Pearl Harbor settled our participation.

To say that the Spanish regime favored the Germans or the Italians is to ignore the fact that we are spending more than \$1,000,000,000 a year to assist the Germans and the Italians in their rehabilitation because we believe it is the most effective way to check the spread of communism.

The Franco regime is the one government in all the world which has been successful thus far in dealing with communism and is least likely to succumb to its blandishments or its domination.

After our recent experience in China, it would seem more desirable that we do not permit any unsettlement in Spain to serve the cause of Communist expansion and yet our present policy seems well calculated if not designed to serve no other end.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in conclusion, I desire to invite attention to what Winston Churchill has said regarding this matter, in his statement on the situation, in which he made it perfectly clear that the policies pursued by the Spanish Government during the course of World War II were of a character which, in his judgment—and certainly he was in a position to judge—were best calculated to serve the interests of the great enterprise in which we were then engaged. This is why it is my earnest hope that the Senate may accept the amendment of the Senator from Nevada and thus do this belated act of recognition of a people whose friendship with us may be more and more vital as the years pass on.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before I yield to the next speaker I desire to make a brief statement.

This amendment was before the Senate last year. I voted for it, and I think probably every other member of the Committee on Appropriations voted for it, but it was defeated in conference. This year the committee has again endorsed the amendment and authorized it to be submitted to the Senate.

Because I happen to be chairman of the committee I was designated to control the time on behalf of those Senators who are opposed to the amendment. I have faithfully tried to get some Senator to speak against the amendment, as I thought it was my duty to do, but up to this time I have not found any Senator who wished to speak against it. I am therefore put in the embarrassing position of announcing the names of the speakers against an amendment of which I am in favor and for which I expect to vote. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and after that I should like to yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I were to give a title to my remarks this afternoon, I think I would choose as a title "A Wrestle With One's Conscience."

I have voted consistently against the so-called Spanish loan amendment up

to this time. I have waited all day for an argument which could convince me that I should vote for the amendment on this occasion, but up to this moment I have heard none. I shall keep my ears open until the final argument is made.

However, Mr. President, there are three or four points which disturb me very much in regard to this amendment. I want to say that I hate, with all my soul and being, everything that is communistic. But likewise, I hate with an equal hatred, and with all my soul and being, everything that is Fascist.

We are confronted, Mr. President, with the fact that Spain is a Fascist nation. So far as I have been able to find, Mr. President, that great essence of democracy, which is the exercise of a freedom of choice at a truly free ballot box, is as nonexistent in Spain as it is in Communist Russia.

It has been argued on the floor of the Senate, however, that world conditions have so changed that we should now loan money to Franco Spain as a matter of military defense, because we are in need of some great air bases in Spain. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. President, that argument has tremendous weight with the junior Senator from Oregon, but another principle has great weight also, namely, that I do not think we are ever going to win the fight for freedom around the world if we proceed to support totalitarian principles, whether they be Communist or Fascist. I have not up to this time been able to bring myself in this wrestle with my conscience to vote in favor of what I think looks like a bribe to Franco for military bases, and thereby give support to what I think is anything but freedom of choice in Spain. I cannot bring myself to think that we strengthen freedom by bribing either fascism or communism.

The next point I want to make is that I supported the North Atlantic Pact and have supported, without exception, the United Nations program. But I wonder what the effect of our proposal to loan millions of dollars to Franco Spain will be upon public opinion in England and in France, and what it will be on governmental opinion, also, in those countries. Senators know what I think the State Department ought to have been doing within the United Nations procedure in trying to work out a satisfactory understanding with Spain that would permit her to join the United Nations. I want to say, in criticism of the State Department, that I do not think the Members of the Senate should have been allowed to get into the position in which we find ourselves at this time over this Spanish issue. I think that negotiations should have been carried on with Spain which would have resulted in her admission into the United Nations, provided she permitted the exercise of freedom of choice at a free ballot box in Spain.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall not yield at this time. I want, in the interest of continuity, to complete this brief statement for the RECORD. I think the State Department should have been taking the steps necessary to bring about an under-

standing between Franco Spain and the United Nations.

I think the first test to our making a loan to Spain is whether or not Franco Spain can meet the tests of the United Nations for membership. I should like to see her in the United Nations. I wonder why our State Department has not been using its influences and its good offices to bring about the healing of the breach which apparently has existed between the United Nations and Franco Spain.

We are a member of the North Atlantic Pact. We are a member of the United Nations. I have great reservations, Mr. President, about our proceeding with unilateral action in regard to Spain when we know the attitude in regard to Franco Spain, at least, up to this date, of our compatriots and allies in the North Atlantic Pact. I want to know, Mr. President, what is going to be the effect of our action upon our allies in the North Atlantic Pact and in the United Nations. It has been argued that by this proposed loan we may help put ourselves in a position where Spanish boys will stand shoulder to shoulder with American boys to fight this great fight we are in against communism. Well, I would say, Mr. President, that they were not standing with American boys in the last war. I cannot escape the fact that there are thousands of American boys lying buried in Europe today because of the behind-the-scenes support that Franco gave to Mussolini and Hitler. What proof has been advanced in this debate that there has been any change in the philosophy of the Government of Spain in regard to freedom and the great cause of freedom for which we are fighting? Not any. O Mr. President, if I thought that by this loan we would save the life of a single American boy, I would pay a bribe to Franco to save that life. However, I fear that this loan will be an aid to lying Russian propaganda about us. I fear that this loan will raise doubts as to our devotion to the principles of freedom. I fear that this loan will not stand the judgment of history.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. If I may have time to finish just one sentence: Unless something can be said in the closing minutes of this debate is unanswerable justification of this loan, the junior Senator from Oregon, irrespective of political consequences—and there is a powerful lobby supporting this loan, Mr. President—will hold fast to what he thinks is a basic principle in opposition to the loan, namely, the need for supporting freedom the world around and fighting communism and fascism wherever they rear their heads in challenge to freedom and the dignity of the individual.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon said he would like to know what Great Britain was thinking about aid to Spain. Great Britain is our partner. Will the Senator listen

to Great Britain's greatest statesman? He said:

I see no reason why Spain should be excluded from the United Nations any longer, or why our vote should be cast in favor of their exclusion. No British or Americans were killed by the Spaniards. The indirect aid we received from Spain throughout the war was immense service. Spain refused to facilitate the movement of Germans to attack Gibraltar and to enter Africa. It cannot be said that Spain injured us or the United States in the late war. Then why should we say that the Spanish people must be treated as outcasts just because they are governed by General Franco?

That was said by none other than Winston Churchill on the 10th day of December 1948.

The Senator from Oregon said Spain was not protecting our boys in the last war. I read the following from Admiral William D. Leahy's book entitled "I Was There" about Spain's contribution to World War II:

Mussolini had first asked to come to Spain to discuss passage of German troops through that country, presumably for an attack on Gibraltar. Franco proposed instead that he himself proceed to Italy. When he arrived in Rome, Franco told Mussolini that the Spanish people would never permit the Germans to pass through Spain, even if he, Franco, wished to authorize such a movement, and that he himself was opposed to the proposition. After the war, it was learned that Hitler had been much irritated in October 1940, when Franco refused to join actively in the Fuehrer's plans for a pincer movement against the British in the Mediterranean involving Gibraltar and an invasion through Spanish Morocco.

Similar evidence appearing from time to time led me to believe that General Franco, while desiring to appear neutral in the war, really was on the side of the Allies.

I wonder, Mr. President, who knows more about it, the Senator from Oregon or Admiral Leahy? I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada. I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. After the word "That", in line 2 to strike out the remainder of line 2 and all of line 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the Administrator is authorized and directed to issue notes from time to time during the fiscal year 1951 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to make such purchases, in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate \$100,000,000 for the purpose of assistance to Spain."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate in the past and at the present moment have been doubtful of supporting the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada, not because they are opposed to economic aid to Spain but because they do not want to subtract any economic aid from the other nations of western Europe in which the Economic Cooperation Act has

been working. The amendment of the Senator from Nevada provides that of the appropriation contained in the bill \$100,000,000 shall be used only for assistance to Spain. Therefore that amendment would subtract \$100,000,000 from the appropriation which is sorely needed to carry out our national policy with respect to other countries of western Europe. In last year's economic-aid appropriation bill I find a provision which I think completely answers the dilemma which has plagued the Members of the Senate who want to support economic aid to Spain because of the realities of the situation but who do not at the same time wish to take away anything from the other nations in which we are trying to accomplish economic rehabilitation.

In Public Law 327, Eighty-first Congress, first session, the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1950, there appears, on page 2, this proviso:

Provided further, That the Administrator is authorized to issue notes from time to time during the fiscal year 1950 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate \$150,000,000 for the purpose of allocating funds during such fiscal year to the Export-Import Bank of Washington for assistance on credit terms under the provisions of said act.

That is precisely what the Senator from Nevada wishes to do—provide export-import credit aid to Spain. It can be done, it seems to me, more successfully by adopting the technique in the bill which was passed last year rather than by cutting anything out of the appropriation for the rest of western Europe. So the amendment which I have offered is patterned on the act which was passed last year, and provides a public-debt transaction, instead of appropriating new funds or cutting out any part of the appropriation.

Mr. President, Senators may be interested to know what was done with this \$150,000,000 of credit aid through the Export-Import Bank authorized last year. I cite this particularly because of the suggestion that we should not grant any aid to any country which might be called a dictatorship.

Of the \$150,000,000 which we authorized in this manner last year, \$27,500,000 has already been allotted to the Government of Portugal. If the ruler of Portugal, Señor Salazar, is any less a dictator than others whose names have been mentioned, I am certainly unaware of it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is not clear to the junior Senator from New York how this proposal of the Senator from Wyoming changes the situation. Is it not a fact that the Export-Import Bank today has full authority and full power to make loans to Spain?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will show the Senator precisely how it changes it. I think that as a matter of realism we have to come to the conclusion now we should no longer be dependent upon vague promises which are not fulfilled,

and here is a directive of the Congress to perform an act the failure to perform which in the past has been defended on the ground, "Well, we have the legal power and we need no more." Yes, the Export-Import Bank had the power, but for reasons which are difficult to explain on any theory that does not conflict with our announced policy to contain communism the loans have not been made.

So, Mr. President, in the language which I propose to substitute for two lines of the amendment of the Senator from Nevada, I provide that the administrator "is authorized and directed to issue notes from time to time during fiscal year 1951 for purchases by the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to make such purchases in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate \$100,000,000 for the purpose of assistance to Spain." The proceeds of these notes in the words of the McCarran amendment are to be used in assistance to Spain "upon credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended."

Mr. President, knowing, as I do, and as every Senator who has examined the history of World War II and what has been going on since knows, that in Spain there are deposits of strategic and critical materials which this country sadly needs, and which can be secured as security for this loan, I feel this amendment should be adopted in the form I suggest.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not true, however, that the policy which the Export-Import Bank has followed, it has followed because of the position of the State Department?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I very much fear the Senator is correct but I think the State Department has been wrong.

Mr. ANDERSON. Are we to go through this appropriation bill and write amendments which reverse the State Department policy in Korea, or reverse the State Department policy in Spain, or reverse the State Department policy elsewhere? Is this the place to reverse the State Department?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that with respect to the policy toward Spain, if the State Department has opposed Export-Import Bank loans, this is precisely the place to reverse it, because if the Spanish peninsula is not held in the affairs which are now rapidly developing in western Europe, much if not all of our economic aid to ECA countries will have been lost. If the arguments which are being made today at Lake Success, in the Security Council, under the Presidency of the representative of the Soviet Union and on behalf of the Kremlin policy—if those arguments and those tactics should prevail, it seems to me that there could be no possible question that refusal to deal realistically in Spain will only help to handicap our program. We should match realism with realism, and meet the issue as it is.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that by this device, which might appear to some to make the transaction somewhat more palatable, the United States Government would be taking unilateral action, not in consultation with its friends and allies and fellow members in the United Nations, but purely on its own initiative, even going so far as to overrule the policies of the State Department?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from New York has already answered himself, when a moment ago he rose and interrupted me to ask me a question. His question was: Does not the Export-Import Bank now have the authority to do this? The inference from the Senator's question was, of course, "We are ready to lend this money now. The Export-Import Bank can do it." But the sad fact is that the authority of the Export-Import Bank is not being used and we were told this afternoon the State Department is responsible.

If we can extend Export-Import Bank credit to Portugal, we can extend it to Spain. The formula I propose takes nothing from the ECA appropriation, but it will provide economic rehabilitation we have extended by virtue of a similar proviso in last year's bill to France, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, and the United Kingdom, as well as others. Let us no longer exclude Spain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

COMMENT ON ADDRESS BY PRIME MINISTER ROBERT GORDON MENZIES TO THE SENATE

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I do not want the most moving and important address which Prime Minister Menzies delivered to the Senate today to go without comment on the floor of the Senate. I have, therefore, asked the Senator from Tennessee to yield me a few minutes in order that I may point out to the Senate three important key points brought out by Prime Minister Menzies which I hope we shall remember.

First, Mr. President, Prime Minister Menzies warned us to keep in mind the fact that Korea is an incident, that it is merely an incident against the far greater world-wide problem we are facing. He warned us not to become "pre-occupied" with Korea.

Implicit in that warning, and a question in the minds of all of us at this time, is the question of what we shall do if our boys are literally thrown out of Korea; if we suffer, indeed, a Dunkerque in Korea.

Should we then necessarily pick Korea, an unfavorable battleground, militarily difficult and disadvantageous to us, should we necessarily thereafter engage

in the vast investment of resources and manpower which would be involved in a reinvasion of Korea?

This question will be discussed in at least 5,200 Connecticut homes tonight. At 4 o'clock this afternoon came the announcement that the Forty-third Division of the National Guard, with 5,200 Connecticut boys in it, is being called up to the colors.

It is obvious to all who read the papers that we are losing a battle in Korea, a most important battle. But I hope our pride will not influence our good judgment if we lose this battle, and that we will heed the warning of the Prime Minister of Australia, and remember that Korea is an incident and that we must not allow ourselves to become preoccupied with it. Perhaps we should not carry this particular battle further. That will be a very grave decision.

Now to his second point which I wish to emphasize. What did Mr. Menzies pick as his main illustration of the world-wide battleground now spread out before us? Mr. Menzies—and this is a matter of life and death to his Australians—picked the propaganda war as the main war, and he used for his illustration the propaganda war in Southeast Asia.

Here, said Mr. Menzies, here in the field of propaganda is the main fight, and not in Korea. The big war is the propaganda war. That is what he said, and I want to reemphasize it today to my colleagues in the Senate.

We must not, he said, turn to this war "blank faces." At least I thought that was what I heard him say, blank faces. Yet for the last 10 days the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives has been debating the request of the State Department for \$89,000,000 for additional facilities for the Voice of America. There has been little if any discussion of this in the papers or on the floor of the Senate, relatively no public notice, yet I was told by a member of the committee last night over the telephone that a considerable part of that request is going to be turned down by the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, this is a very modest request, one formulated by the State Department long before Korea. It is pre-Korean thinking. It should be examined, not to cut it back but to step it up and very greatly. It is a request far too small in line with the urgent current problem. I call on the State Department and the Congress to recognize that fact.

We have witnessed in the last 10 days a request for \$10,500,000 for military armament. I am told that another four billion, which this week is to be added to that sum for further armament, will not be the last such request. Yet at the very time we are debating this \$14,500,000 for armaments, I fear we shall ignore what Prime Minister Menzies has stated to us today—that the main war and the principal front on which the victory will really be fought out is the war of ideas—the war for the minds of loyalties and men.

His third point which I wish to call to the attention of the Senate, was his comment on the need for developing a dynamic economy within Australia and throughout the rest of the world.

We here in the United States have learned that the best answer to the Communist propaganda is a healthy and prosperous economy. Prime Minister Menzies, in his comments today, applied that same principle to the goals and ambitions of the 8,000,000 people of Australia.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I rise on the floor of the Senate to commend the Senator from Connecticut for what he is trying to do. For a long time he has been a sort of lone soldier fighting for his proposal. He has not met with much success. I certainly hope the Senator from Connecticut will continue to talk, will continue to harass, will continue to annoy, will continue to do everything that is within his power to make the Congress see the light with respect to appropriating the money needed for propaganda purposes.

Mr. President, the newspapers disclose what the northern Koreans are doing at this very moment to our soldiers whom they have captured. No doubt through threats against their lives they are compelling our soldiers to speak over the radio and advise the American troops who are now fighting in Korea what they should and what they should not do; they are advising them to desert the American forces, they are telling them what good treatment they are receiving, and so forth. That is propaganda of a type which is being spread constantly throughout the whole Russian orbit and to all the satellite countries they control. We do very little to counteract such propaganda. We sit back, and, apparently because of the few dollars we would have to expend, we are afraid to go forth and meet the challenge. Communist propaganda represents one of the most serious challenges we have to meet. Congress should act quickly on this problem instead of fooling around with it.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his comment. May I again remind the Senate that the majority leader was one of the first Members of the Senate, when I was serving as Assistant Secretary of State, to see the importance of this issue I am discussing today, and again and again the Senator from Illinois assumed leadership when it was so badly needed in those dark days?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BENTON. Let me see if I have time to yield to the Senator from New York when I have finished my brief comments. Or if the Senator from Tennessee will give me further time, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, it is no longer enough for us merely to stimulate our dynamic economy at home, as called for by Prime Minister Menzies this afternoon. He outlined a similar goal and applied it to

the South Pacific. Such a goal, of course, applies also to Latin America, and also to other areas throughout the world. We must give technical assistance as called for under the point 4 program to help stimulate other countries to a far greater dynamic development of their own economies. We must do this as one of the strongest arms of our propaganda effort in countering the attacks of the Soviet Union.

Because of the power of the propaganda put out by the Communists in North Korea, I remind the majority leader that the North Koreans throw themselves so passionately into the fighting against our soldiers that, as I read in one newspaper dispatch the North Koreans move into the fire from our machine guns with such a passion that they are shot down so that their bodies are piled up like cordwood. Why do they fight this way? They fight because they are pumped up with the Soviet propaganda. They have never had anything presented to them which would give them a reasonable answer or a counterargument against the Soviet propaganda. They move in against our machine-gun fire as they do because the Soviet propaganda ties itself to historic background and to their legitimate aspirations. The Soviet propaganda promises them land reform. Yes, it promises the peasants the land. It, of course, does not mention the progress of land reform in South Korea.

It says, "We will get rid of your age-long exploiters. We will rid you of the greedy people to whom you have been turning over such a high percentage of your production." The small peasant farmers know that their aspirations for land are legitimate. They feel they have little to lose, that perhaps the Marxist slogan is right that they have nothing to lose but their chains. They believe these promises of the U. S. S. R. and move against our boys and into the fire of our machine guns with reckless abandon. Due in large part to the Soviet propaganda they have been fired with such zeal that they have gone through South Korea, I am told, as rapidly as the German panzer divisions ever went through France.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am glad to have been able to emphasize those three points. I am sorry I cannot summarize my conclusions, which I hope are self-evident.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield time to any Senator?

Mr. McKELLAR. I first yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not desire any time, I will say to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 15 seconds?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to correct an omission in my statement. The amendment which I offered, I offered on behalf of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from

Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and myself.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that I have been very much interested in hearing the remarks of the majority leader complimenting the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. I, of course, associate myself with these words of praise for what the junior Senator from Connecticut has been doing. I believe in the kind of propaganda which spreads knowledge of America and her ideals, and I am proud that I am a cosponsor of the bill which would provide the necessary machinery for that purpose. I do not think there is anything more important than that kind of propaganda. But how can we spread throughout the world that kind of propaganda for democracy when, by statute, we provide that the State Department or other agencies of government shall give money to a regime which is as completely totalitarian and intolerant as any within my knowledge in the last quarter of a century?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have only a few minutes.

The chief of that state has completely stifled freedom of action, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of thought. Our only chance to advocate freedom and democracy in the world today and to oppose totalitarianism is to show the world that we are for freedom everywhere and against tyranny and oppression everywhere. We cannot preach democracy while at the same time we enact legislation such as this—legislation to aid an enemy of freedom and an avowed advocate of Fascist totalitarianism.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee will yield me a couple of minutes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am possibly as much against totalitarianism as is the Senator from New York. But we are trying to do something in this particular instance. I ask the Senator from New York if it is not as important to help hungry people in Spain as it is to help the French to kill Indonesians in Indonesia.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the able Senator from New Mexico that when I addressed the Senate 2 or 3 months ago, I expressed the deepest sympathy and affection for the Spanish people.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That does not help the hungry Spaniard. Sympathy does not help Spain to obtain an economic adequacy. The Senate has voted to furnish help to the French, and then the French shoot down people in Indochina. Sympathy alone does not help to feed

the hungry Spaniards. But if we vote to give the Spanish people aid, as we give aid to the French, we will accomplish something that sympathy alone cannot accomplish.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from New York will say that he will gladly support any bill the Senator from New Mexico wishes to introduce to provide direct aid to starving or needy people in Spain. That is very different from what is proposed in the amendment we are now discussing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What is proposed is what the Senator from New York has been talking about ever since I remember him as a Member of the Senate. We are trying to make western Europe self-sufficient, to bring about economic self-sufficiency in western Europe. The only reason I can see, in many instances, for opposition to aid to Spain is communistic influence in the United States; many Senators are afraid of a few votes in New York City or elsewhere, and I do not like that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, let me say that in advocating economic assistance for western Europe, as I have done, and as I shall continue to do, I have advocated this assistance in order to help nations and regimes which have a philosophy of government and of life similar or analogous to ours. I believe that the Spanish people have such a philosophy, but I do not believe the head of the Spanish state and his intolerant regime do. This legislation will help keep that man and that regime in power. It will not help the Spanish people for whom I have such a deep regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], my good friend on the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, some statements have been made today on the floor of the Senate in regard to lending money or giving assistance to a dictatorship or a Fascist government. Last year we passed a law identical with the measure we are endeavoring to enact now; and with that law passed and on our statute books, we loaned to Portugal \$27,500,000. If there is a dictatorship anywhere in Europe or if there is a Fascist form of government anywhere in Europe, it is in Portugal. No one who is familiar with that situation will deny the accuracy of that statement.

Mr. President, it has also been said, both by way of implication and otherwise, that we should not lend this money, no matter what Spain would do for us, because Spain, so it is said, was against us in the Second World War, the recent conflict. Let me read from statements which are to be found in the book, *War-time Mission in Spain*, by Ambassador Carlton J. H. Hayes:

It is very unfortunate that propaganda of the Soviet Union, and of its conscious or unconscious apologists and appeasers in this

country, has served, especially during the last 3 years, to conceal from the American people the signal services which Spain rendered us in the critical war years from 1942 to 1945, and to induce our Government to adopt toward Spain a policy which I can only regard as contrary to American interests and derogatory of American honor. Our fellow citizens should be enlightened, not deceived, about the actual facts in the situation.

Mr. President, I am sorry that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has seen fit to leave the Chamber while these statements are being read, because they would be enlightening to him.

I quote further from the ambassador:

Under Senor Lequerica, as under his predecessor Count Francisco Jordana, the Spanish Foreign Office, with the obvious approval of the head of the Spanish State, granted us more favor than did any other neutral government, whether Sweden, Turkey, Switzerland, or Portugal. Not only did the Spanish Government pledge itself not to interfere in any way with our fateful landings and campaign in North Africa. Not only did it assure us as early as February 1943 that it would join us in the war if the Axis should attempt an invasion of Spain. Not only did it permit us to use Spain as the base for invaluable espionage of Axis activities in France and the Mediterranean. It also accorded us important positive favors. It allowed us to get over 1,200 American airmen safely across the peninsula, without any internment. It permitted the transit and exit of over 25,000 members of the French resistance movement as reinforcements for the allied armies in North Africa. It choked off export of strategic war materials to Germany before any other neutral had done so. Spain, too, was the first country to conclude a permanent air agreement with us, and one whereby we were enabled to obtain landing rights for military as well as civilian planes. In the light of all such facts, it is simply hypocritical to countenance the notion that Spain has been hostile to us and should therefore be treated as a pariah among the nations. It certainly belies the solemn assurances which President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave to the head of the Spanish State in writing in November, 1942.

The policy which we have latterly been pursuing toward Spain has had, I believe, still another unfortunate effect. It has retarded the natural, and otherwise inevitable, evolution of the Spanish domestic regime toward greater liberty and democracy. No nation likes to be dictated to by foreigners, and when our Government joins Marshal Stalin in telling the Spanish people that they must get rid of the head of the Spanish State, the natural response is popular reaction in support of the existing regime. And how silly it is to allege that Spain—or the head of the Spanish State—is a threat to world peace. The real threat to world peace is in Moscow and not in Madrid.

Spain is vital, as I see it, to American interests. The late war has abundantly demonstrated the great strategic importance of the Iberian Peninsula for any way in which the United States, unhappily, may henceforth be involved. Nor can the United States have enduring proper understanding with Spanish America without proper understanding with Spain.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the authorities who have been on the ground, as was Ambassador Hayes during the Second World War, and who know the attitude of Spain, and have known Spain all these years, should have weighty influence with those who think otherwise.

Mr. President, one last word: All that this amendment would provide would be to permit a freedom-loving, liberty-loving, God-fearing people to enhance their own internal economy, so that when we call on them, they will not be found wanting. The day will come, I am sorry to say—but everything indicates it—when we shall be calling on all the freedom-loving peoples of the world. However, some of them are not responding too rapidly just now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let us vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], for himself and other Senators, to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Anderson	Hill	Millikin
Benton	Hoey	Morse
Brewster	Holland	Mundt
Bricker	Humphrey	Murray
Bridges	Hunt	Myers
Butler	Ives	O'Connor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chavez	Kefauver	Robertson
Connally	Kem	Russell
Cordon	Kerr	Saltonstall
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworschak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Leahy	Sparkman
Eaton	Lehman	Stennis
Ferguson	Lodge	Taft
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarran	Thye
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tydings
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Graham	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Young
Hayden	Malone	
Hendrickson	Martin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, for himself and other Senators, to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. In the event the O'Mahoney amendment is agreed to, there will be a second vote, will there not, on the McCarran amendment as amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. If the O'Mahoney amendment is agreed to, the question will then recur on the McCarran amendment as amended by the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, may we have the O'Mahoney amendment stated, as modified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the O'Mahoney amendment, as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. The amendment, as modified, reads as follows:

On page 448, line 7, after the word "specified", insert the following:

"Provided further, That the Administrator is authorized and directed to issue notes from time to time during the fiscal year 1951 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to make such purchases, in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate \$100,000,000 for the purpose of assistance to Spain, to be extended upon credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota was wondering whether, with the offering of the O'Mahoney amendment, additional time would be allowed for debate on that particular amendment, in view of the fact that the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into pertained to the McCarran amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The O'Mahoney amendment having been offered before the time for debate expired, it is the opinion of the Chair that there is no time now for debate on the O'Mahoney amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, for himself and other Senators, to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is absent because of the death of a close personal friend.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from New

Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—52

Aiken	Holland	Murray
Brewster	Hunt	Myers
Capehart	Ives	O'Connor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cordon	Kefauver	Robertson
Eastland	Kerr	Russell
Ferguson	Knowland	Saltonstall
Flanders	Leahy	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
George	Lucas	Sparkman
Green	McCarran	Stennis
Gurney	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McKellar	Thye
Hendrickson	McMahon	Tydings
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Wiley
Hill	Maybank	
Hoey	Millikin	

NAYS—27

Anderson	Frear	Malone
Benton	Gillette	Martin
Bricker	Graham	Morse
Bridges	Humphrey	Mundt
Butler	Kem	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Watkins
Douglas	Lehman	Wherry
Dworshak	McCarthy	Williams
Ecton	McClellan	Young

NOT VOTING—17

Cain	Jenner	Taylor
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Darby	Kilgore	Tobey
Donnell	Long	Vandenberg
Downey	Neely	Withers
Ellender	Schoeppel	

So the amendment offered by Mr. O'MAHONEY for himself and other Senators to Mr. McCARRAN's amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] as amended by the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is absent because of the death of a close personal friend.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], and the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea,"

and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—65

Aiken	Hunt	Millikin
Brewster	Ives	Mundt
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Bridges	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Butler	Kefauver	O'Connor
Capehart	Kem	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kerr	Pepper
Connally	Knowland	Robertson
Cordon	Langer	Russell
Dworshak	Leahy	Saltonstall
Eastland	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	McCarran	Sparkman
Fulbright	McCarthy	Stennis
George	McClellan	Taft
Gillette	McFarland	Thye
Gurney	McKellar	Tydings
Hayden	McMahon	Watkins
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Malone	Wiley
Hoey	Martin	Young
Holland	Maybank	

NAYS—15

Anderson	Flanders	Humphrey
Benton	Frear	Lehman
Byrd	Graham	Morse
Douglas	Green	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	Hill	Williams

NOT VOTING—16

Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Chapman	Kilgore	Tobey
Darby	Long	Vandenberg
Donnell	Neely	Withers
Downey	Schoeppel	
Jenner	Taylor	

So Mr. McCARRAN's amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3380) to amend the act of August 9, 1939, to redefine the term "contraband article" with respect to narcotic drugs and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2160) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize annual and sick leave with pay for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, to authorize the payment of accumulated and accrued annual leave in excess of 60 days, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2591) to amend the Public Health Service

Act to support research and training in arthritis and rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy and blindness, and other diseases, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1293. An act for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co.; and

H. R. 5074. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 7695. An act to provide a 5-day week for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force; and H. R. 8909. An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2234) for the relief of Mrs. Gladys J. Senyohl McCarthy; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BYRNE of New York, Mr. DENTON, and Mr. KEATING were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the committee amendment, chapter X-B, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and other Senators as a substitute for the language proposed to be stricken by the committee beginning on line 21, at page 476.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In lieu of the language proposed to be stricken on pages 476 and 477 by the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment as a substitute for the language proposed to be stricken by the committee I move to insert the following language, which I send to the desk. I have been joined in this amendment by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and also the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. I should like to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by Mr. BYRD (for himself and others) as a substitute for the language proposed to be stricken out by the committee on pages 476 and 477 (embraced in sec. 1114), insert the following:

SEC. 1114. Reductions in appropriations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of \$1,000,000,000. Such reductions shall be made in the following manner:

(a) Funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, for lands and structures, and for Federal-aid postwar highways shall be reduced by \$500,000,000: *Provided*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

(b) Funds appropriated in this act for personal services, travel, transportation of things, communications services, rents and utilities, printing and reproduction, other contractual services, and equipment shall be reduced by \$500,000,000, which reduction shall be made among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government on a pro rata basis: *Provided*, That reductions in personnel shall, where practicable, be made by eliminating a total of 5 percent of the personnel provided for in the President's budget and the filling of a total of not more than one-half of all vacancies which occur by reason of death, resignation, or otherwise: *Provided further*, That the reductions provided for in this subsection among the departments shall be made on a department-wide basis and the Secretaries of the Departments are empowered, by means of transfers and adjustments, to keep the agencies within their respective departments at a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered by means of transfers and adjustments to administer the reductions provided for in this subsection among the nondepartmental and independent agencies in such a manner as to provide for a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, That hereafter the amount of annual leave for Government employees, including employees of the postal services, shall be at the rate of 20 days per year and the amount of sick leave shall be at the rate of 12 days per year for classified and wage board employees (except that no annual leave nor sick leave shall be granted to any Government employee who has not been in continuous Government service at at least one calendar year).

SEC. 1115. The reductions provided for in this chapter shall not apply to the following (except that the annual- and sick-leave provisions shall apply to all classified and wage board employees):

(a) Chapter X, chapter X-B, and the amount appropriated to the General Services Administration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of July 23, 1946;

(b) Appropriations in title I of chapter VIII for the Executive Office of the President under the headings "Compensation of the President," "The White House Office," "Emergency Fund for the President," and "Executive Mansion and Grounds";

(c) Appropriations for the atomic energy program;

(d) Trust funds;

(e) Funds of Government corporations, excluding those made available in this act (1) for administrative expenses and (2) by appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury;

(f) Amounts (other than under the Veterans' Administration) for furnishing medical and hospital services and domiciliary care, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, or clinic, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

(g) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations, or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations;

(h) Appropriations of, or measured by, receipts;

(i) Amounts appropriated by this act for the operation of law-enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Customs, Immigration and Naturalization Services, and the Secret Service; or for the payment of compensation and expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and such other officers and employees of other agencies whose duties primarily pertain to intelligence operations (including funds transferred pursuant to section 6 (a) of the act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 211), or to the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States;

(j) Amounts provided for any program of the Veterans' Administration, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, clinic, or facility, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

(k) Grants (other than those for Federal-aid postwar highways), subsidies, and contributions where amounts are determined by law;

(l) Amounts provided to make payment of or contributions toward pensions, retirement and disability annuities and benefits, employee's death or injury benefits, or other items of a similar nature;

(m) Appropriations for refunds, awards, and indemnities;

(n) Appropriations for the Coast Guard; and

(o) The amount appropriated to the Post Office Department for transportation of the mail.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is the same amendment that was offered last Friday, July 28, and at that time I made a brief statement explaining the nature and purposes of the amendment. It is not my purpose to speak at any great length today, but for the benefit of those Senators who were not here at the time the amendment was offered, or who perhaps have not read the RECORD, I may say that this is a proposal to make a total reduction in the appropriations of \$1,000,000,000.

This reduction is divided evenly between two portions. Five hundred million dollars of the reduction is to be on construction, materials, and supplies, and \$500,000,000 on personnel, transportation of persons and things, equipment, communications, printing, and so forth.

Mr. President, the need for an appreciable reduction should, I think, be evident to all. The budget was out of balance by from four to five billion dollars before the Korean hostilities broke out. Even had there been no war in Korea it would have been necessary for us to have reduced our expenditures in order to decrease the deficit and in order to diminish the need for Government borrowing, and therefore to reduce the danger of inflation. But the coming of the Korean war,

with its added expenses—how great, we do not know—has intensified the need for governmental economy.

Thus far in my attempts to make selective cuts there have been virtually no reductions. I have only goose eggs to show for my efforts. It now appears, therefore, that the only possibility for an effective reduction in the budget is through some general cut of the type now proposed.

The reduction in outlay of a billion dollars, would put us in a much better condition of financial health, and it would be a reassurance to the people that we mean business, and want to take in the slack. If this were accompanied by a vigorous tax program which would meet the added cost caused by the hostilities in Korea, we might well be able to get through the difficult months and the difficult year ahead of us without appreciable price inflation. If we do not take in sail, if we do not tax, the governmental deficit will be large. We will be forced to borrow from the banks, the banks will create more credit, and the amount of money and credit in relationship to goods will grow greater and greater. The result inevitably will be a large rise in prices, with all the difficulties which that causes to people with fixed incomes, and with all the unsettling effect it has upon labor relations.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that we should reduce our expenditures and this reduction of a billion dollars in our civilian budget is aimed in that direction. We have made this general reduction as careful in nature as possible. No reductions are to apply for anything connected with the national defense.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield for a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Many of us share the desire to cut down at this time some nondefense expenditures, and the junior Senator from Tennessee would like very much to join in support of the amendment.

There is one matter which bothers me, namely, that in connection with the expenditures, there is an appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority, for a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., and one at Widow's Creek, Ala., and for three or four hydroelectric dams, some of which are under construction. These are vitally necessary, and they have been certified as necessary in order to furnish power for the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge, and for the Arnold Air Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma, Tenn., for the Aluminum Co. at Alcoa, the Reynolds Metals Co., at Listerhill, Ala., the Red Stone Arsenal at Huntsville, and many other vital defense establishments in that section of the country.

Looking at the language at the end of page 1 and the beginning of page 2, where it is provided the Director of the Budget must first take into consideration the defense of the country in considering reductions of appropriations. I wonder if the Senator thinks that these

necessary defense expenditures by the TVA would be exempted from the proposed cut.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his question. He has very properly called attention to the language beginning on line 9, page 1, and continuing to line 5, on page 2, namely, "the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy."

Therefore, while the decision on any particular project would have to be in the hands of the Director of the Budget, where power is needed for atomic energy and for other war needs, it would certainly seem to me that that would be in the interest of an adequate national defense, and that therefore such an expenditure would be exempt. But the final ruling would have to be made by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In view of the fact that these steam plants and some of these dams were particularly recommended by the Defense Establishment for the purpose of furnishing electricity to these projects, some of which I have named, which have a direct and very important bearing upon our national-defense effort, does the Senator feel, as a sponsor of the amendment, that the money for such electrical projects should and would be excluded from the reduction which the Senator is seeking?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is my own personal feeling, but of course the determination is placed in the hands of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The Senator has stated my own feeling.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wonder if the Senator would consider amending—of course by agreement of the other sponsors of the amendment—the amendment he is offering, so as to cover the point I have raised.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are about five sponsors of the amendment, and it is somewhat difficult to get agreement on such points on the floor, but it would certainly seem to me that such expenditures as those referred to would be exempt. The difficulty is that when we start making exemptions in terms of specific projects, then a whole series of exemptions will be demanded by differing Senators, and the logic and symmetry of the amendment itself is destroyed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I could phrase the question a little differently, can the Senator tell us where he thinks the first

five hundred million would be cut or should be cut—where the cut would be made, primarily?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can give the Senator the totals. The total of construction items for the nonexempt agencies is about \$1,040,000,000. The total budgeted amounts for supplies and materials is about \$320,000,000. The total amount in the bill for Federal aid postwar highways would be three hundred and eighty-five million, and four hundred and five million, depending on the final figure which is adopted in conference. This makes a total of about two and a quarter billion dollars from which the \$500,000,000 reduction provided for in paragraph (a) would be drawn.

In other words, there would be an aggregate average reduction of about 22 percent distributed over the items for construction, materials, and supplies.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question. Pardon me. I do not think the Senator from Arkansas has finished his questioning. After the Senator from Arkansas has finished his questioning I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to get further enlightenment. I recall the Senator's views about certain rivers and harbors projects which were particularly the object of his disapproval. I wondered if this particular item primarily would come out of that program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not passing judgment as to what should be eliminated from the program. That is up to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. From the whole range of projects, of highways, rivers and harbors, public buildings, materials and supplies, and so forth, he is merely directed to make a reduction of \$500,000,000, but not to eliminate anything which in his judgment is necessary for the national defense.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire wants to know how much the Senator from Illinois is cutting on the highways.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The question is left up to the Bureau of the Budget. What I am saying is that the items from which this \$500,000,000 reduction can be drawn will total approximately \$2,250,000,000. Approximately one billion and forty million dollars for land and structures, about \$820,000,000 for materials and supplies, and somewhere around \$400,000,000 for highways, or a total, as I have said, of \$2,250,000,000. Then from this, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget would take the \$500,000,000 least essential items, the 22 percent which is least essential, leaving in the 75 to 78 percent which is most essential.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator from Illinois be surprised, after the statement he has made about highways—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me interrupt the Senator. It is not merely highways. It is all public works.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well. In the second paragraph of the amendment appears the following:

(a) funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, for lands and structures, and for Federal-aid postwar highways shall be reduced by \$500,000,000.

Now having put that in his amendment and then explained it, would the Senator be surprised if he found that he provides no reduction whatsoever in his amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Unless there is some catch here, I should be greatly surprised, because the funds for these items are specifically reduced to make a total reduction of \$500,000,000 for those categories. The Senator from New Hampshire may have some subtle catch in mind, but I am not aware of it. I shall be much interested in having the jack-in-the-box come out.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not want to say that I think the amendment has not been properly drafted or that the Senator does not realize what is in it. But paragraph (g), on page 4, says:

Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations.

I have here, from the Bureau of the Budget, an analysis of what paragraph (g) provides, and included in it is everything for postwar construction, Federal-aid program. In other words, what the Senator has done is to insert in one paragraph and in another paragraph take out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I urge upon my good friend from New Hampshire, since he is interested in a detailed analysis of the bill, to consult paragraph (k), on page 5 of the amendment. Among the items exempted are grants other than those for Federal postwar highways. So that the Federal-aid postwar highways would be included in the two and a quarter billion dollars from which the \$500,000,000 reduction could be made. But let me emphasize again that there is no direction to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget as to what projects he will eliminate in order to make the \$500,000,000 reduction. He is to take the \$500,000,000 from what is least essential, but not to interfere with what is necessary for the national defense.

Mr. BRIDGES. But under paragraph (g) the Senator takes it entirely out. He exempts the whole thing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. Funds for Federal-aid postwar highways are provided under the appropriation for the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, and are in the form of grants to States for highway construction. Therefore, in including highways I have specified that these funds are not exempt.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUNT. Is the Senator from Illinois aware of the fact that under expenditures for 1950 and anticipated expenditures in 1951, even the full amount is not maintaining our highways, and repairing damage caused to them, and does the Senator think it is economy further to allow our highways to de-

teriorate, which would mean in the future a tremendous additional outlay in order to bring them back to the condition they are in at the present time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good and esteemed friend from Wyoming that I am not the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The final decision is not to be made either by an individual Senator or by the Senate as a whole. It is to be made by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Now in practice this is about what will happen anyway. The amendment gives the President power to suspend construction of that which in his opinion is not in the national interest. But the present situation is that we take credit amongst our constituents for making the appropriations, and then we throw upon the President the onus of canceling the contracts and the work. Under my proposal the Senate and the Congress would help to assume the responsibility with the President for an act of national economy, the necessity for which I think we all admit, namely, that it is better to put our resources into tanks, guns, and ammunition than into some of the public works for which we have made appropriations.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an additional question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. Does the Senator feel that in the amendment he has suggested he is placing tremendous authority in the Executive?

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a matter of fact, so far as the suspension of public works is concerned, that is already given to the Executive. He does have the power to suspend construction of public works if in his judgment such construction contributes to inflation, and so forth. The President exercised that power in the summer of 1946 when, with the sharp rise of prices, he shut off the construction of some public works. He is doing that now. But the point is that by this appropriation bill we join him in that effort, and we give him a mandate that at least \$500,000,000 is to be cut, instead of leaving him all alone to hold the fort against the demands not only of bureaus but of localities. We would say: "Good work. Cut \$500,000,000. And you can do it by legislative authority, and not mere Executive discretion, and we will take the 'rap' along with you." If there is popular indignation, we will take the "rap" too, instead of claiming for ourselves all the benefits for appropriations and throwing upon the President all the opprobrium for cuts.

Mr. HUNT. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that that does not maintain American highways, which we need in our war effort.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If it is necessary to spend \$500,000,000 for American highways, the money will be spent. The amendment does not say that there must be proportionate cuts for each of these purposes. It merely says that there shall be a total cut of \$500,000,000 among the items which aggregate \$2,250,000,000.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take too much time, but I should like to point out also that another \$500,000,000 is to

be drawn from reductions in personnel, equipment, transportation of persons and transportation of things, printing, and communications. The total items in this connection amount to about \$4,600,000,000 in the nonexempt agencies. The average cut on these items would be around 11 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Illinois proposes to reduce the appropriations by \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In total; yes.

Mr. BYRD. Total. How is he to accomplish that reduction?

Mr. DOUGLAS. For the \$500,000,000 of construction, the Bureau of the Budget will make the reduction. For the \$500,000,000 of other items, those amounts are to be prorated amongst departments and independent agencies in the same ratio as their total sums for these purposes, as the Bureau of the Budget has already indicated in an analysis.

Mr. BYRD. But the amendment does not say that. Let me ask the Senator this question. The amendment says:

That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

Yet the amendment does not direct the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to do that; the amendment would simply empower him to do it.

The amendment covers a much broader field than the question of making a reduction in the amount of \$500,000,000, for the amendment goes into the question of the Nation's manpower and resources, the language being—in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

That includes the entire field.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia will consult the first sentence of section 1001 (a), he will see that the reduction to be made by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is to apply to "supplies and materials, for land and structures, and for Federal-aid postwar highways." On the other hand the executive departments and agencies will make the reductions in the case of funds for "personal services, travel, transportation of things, communications services, rents and utilities, printing and reproduction, other contractual services, and equipment"—according to subsection (b). In other words, this latter reduction is to be prorated among the various departments and agencies.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Illinois is not reading from the amendment now, for the amendment simply says that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to do it. He is not directed to do it; and in that connection, under the provisions of the amend-

ment, he can proceed on whatever basis he regards as best or most suitable in connection with the purpose of the amendment—

To provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

The amendment does not direct the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to proceed in any particular way; but it gives the Director the power to make reductions of the appropriations in the case of any or all of the departments, so long as he proceeds—

In such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use—

I do not know just what that means—of the Nation's manpower and resources—

And so forth. So in this amendment the Senator from Illinois is not directing the Bureau of the Budget to do anything specifically, but the amendment would simply give him a power which has never been given to any official of the Government, so far as I have ever heard.

I should like the Senator from Illinois to explain these things. For instance, just what is "the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources"?

I may say that this amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia does not direct any cuts—it authorizes the cuts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would also say that the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with needs for national defense is to have men work at those public works which, in comparison with defense needs and civilian needs, will have the greatest beneficial effect on our defense effort. In other words, only nonessential projects would be eliminated.

Mr. BYRD. That is the Senator's interpretation and definition, but it is not written in the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know how it could be made plainer.

Mr. BYRD. As I read the language of the amendment, it is so broad that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget could do anything he wished to do or anything he might decide to do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment reduces construction funds by \$500,000,000 and gives the Bureau of the Budget the power to allocate this reduction among the projects which are regarded as least necessary, and the amendment would permit them to be eliminated. The amendment gives that power; and in that connection the national defense and the total productivity of the Nation are to be considered.

Mr. BYRD. But I submit to the Senator from Illinois that the amendment does not say that. The Senator may have that in his mind, but there is nothing in the amendment to indicate that in any way whatever.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the amendment says that—

Funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, for lands and structures, and for Federal-aid postwar highways shall be reduced by \$500,000,000—

Mr. BYRD. Very well; let the Senator from Illinois read the rest of the

amendment, rather than to draw upon his own thoughts or imagination in this connection. I ask the Senator to read the entire sentence.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It has been read many times. I am perfectly willing to strike out the word "empowered," and substitute for it the word "directed", although the Senator's own amendment merely uses the word "authorized."

Then the amendment would read as follows, at that point:

Provided, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is directed to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget would be directed to proceed in that way to the extent of making reductions of appropriations in a total amount of \$500,000,000 although, since the reduction is already made by the amendment, it seems obvious to me that the word "empower" merely provides a vehicle for the allocation of the reduction.

Mr. BYRD. However, the amendment says nothing about the 22 percent the Senator from Illinois has been discussing. Under the amendment, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget could cut out all of the funds for roads; he could cut out the entire \$380,000,000 for roads, for the amendment would not limit him to making a 22 percent reduction in any particular item.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; but the figures which I gave were based on an analysis of the budget made by the Bureau of the Budget and with particular respect to the expenditures proposed to be made on the basis of the available materials. I should like to have parts of this memorandum inserted at the end of my remarks.

Mr. BYRD. However, all that is not set forth in the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; but from this it will be seen that a reduction of \$500,000,000 will mean that the average reduction will be approximately 22 percent. That does not mean that the appropriations for each project will be reduced by 22 percent, but it does mean that there will be a reduction in the aggregate of 22 percent in the appropriations we have made thus far for these purposes for the non-exempt agencies and those which are regarded as the least necessary and the least efficient would be eliminated.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Illinois contends, does he not, that the amendment does apply to the road fund?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, certainly.

Mr. BYRD. The bill appropriated \$380,000,000 for the road fund for the coming year. Is it not true that under the amendment the Director of the Bureau of the Budget could cancel the entire appropriation for the road fund, if he chose to do so?

Mr. DOUGLAS. However, he certainly would not do so.

Mr. BYRD. But could not he do so?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course he could make a reduction of \$500,000,000 in total amount from a variety of projects.

Mr. BYRD. And could not he take \$380,000,000 from the road fund, as a part of the total reduction of appropriations? Nevertheless, the road fund is a contractual obligation, because the States are authorized by law to contract for that purpose and to issue obligations in that connection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator suggest that the entire cut would be directed at the highway funds?

Mr. BYRD. I do not think it would be done, but I say that under the amendment it could be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. However, I am sure the Senator from Virginia knows perfectly well that it would not be done.

Mr. BYRD. I do not know what would be done. I have seen many things done in the Government which I thought never would be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a matter of fact, what is proposed by the amendment is really the situation today, for under acts passed by the Congress prior to 1946, the President has the power to suspend those public works which he thinks would contribute to inflation and are not in the national interest.

I remember that in the summer of 1946 the President called off the commencement of all new projects. I also know that in the last few days the President has sent to the Government departments a letter asking them to list the projects the construction of which in their opinion is not essential; and that list, when prepared, will go to the President, and he will strike out those projects. Furthermore, the Army engineers have called a conference to eliminate some of their items.

So this amendment will not give to the President any more power, insofar as eliminating construction is concerned, than he already possesses.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me ask him another question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. All these amendments—whether they call for percentage reductions or any other kind of reductions, other than specific ones—are very technical. Has the Senator from Illinois submitted his amendment to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget or the Legislative Drafting Service or to the General Accounting Office, to have the amendment approved by them?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Legislative counsel helped to draw up the amendment and members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget have been contacted, and they say that technically the amendment can be administered although it probably would not be easy. I may say that a meat-ax cut of 10 percent would probably be easier to administer. However, I have always thought that the Congress, not the Bureau of the Budget, is the legislative body, and that Congress should at least specify the areas where the cuts are to be made.

Mr. BYRD. Of course, Congress is the legislative body. However, I am sure the Senator is well aware of the fact that the Congress has learned the wisdom of submitting technical matters for expert advice.

Does the Senator from Illinois have a written statement to the effect that the amendment is workable? Let me ask also who in the Office of the Bureau of the Budget says the amendment is workable?

Mr. DOUGLAS. A man by the name of Donald MacPhail; but the statement is not in writing. I should make it clear that I do not claim the support of the Budget Bureau and that Mr. MacPhail only indicated that the amendment was technically workable. I may say that the Budget Bureau has not endorsed the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia, either.

Mr. BYRD. Then let me ask another question, if the Senator will yield further.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Illinois proposes a general reduction of appropriations, and by his amendment the Director of the Bureau of the Budget would be directed to accomplish a reduction of \$500,000,000. However, the Senator's amendment states, in the first few lines, that a total reduction of \$1,000,000,000 is to be made. Who is to make the other reduction?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The other reduction is to be made in the funds appropriated "for personal services, travel, transportation of things, communications services, rents and utilities, printing and reproduction, other contractual services, and equipment."

Mr. BYRD. However, the details in regard to those items are not set forth in the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Bureau of the Budget has made a classification of those items, based on the appropriations bill; and I hold that classification in my hand at this time. It is a classification on a functional basis for these items, and it is classified by departments, as well, showing the amounts spent for these purposes by the various departments. In that way we can determine the proportionate reduction to be made in the case of each and every department and independent agency. Then the head of each department or agency is to determine that matter for his particular department or agency; and the Bureau of the Budget is to make the determination for the combined independent agencies. I ask unanimous consent to insert this study at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be inserted as requested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, this cut, which averages around 11 percent, can be applied within each department according to the judgment of the head of that department, picking out those items he regards as least necessary. It is the most scientific across-the-board cut that we could have.

Mr. BYRD. Let me ask the Senator this question: He says the Director of

the Budget only has to do with the \$500,000,000. As to the other \$500,000,000, who is to see that each department makes a proportionate cut? There must be someone who has that authority, otherwise it will not be made. They are not going to make a cut unless we make it. There must be an apportionment. Someone must apportion the reduction among the various departments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If they do not have the funds, they will have to make the cut.

Mr. BYRD. No, but who is going to cut the funds?

Mr. DOUGLAS. This makes an automatic reduction in the appropriations in these amounts, to each department.

Mr. BYRD. What reductions? Who is to say what is to come out of the Department of State and all the other departments?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will be kind enough to look at lines 9 and 10 on page 2, he will find:

shall be reduced by \$500,000,000, which reduction shall be made among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government on a pro rata basis.

Mr. BYRD. What is a pro rata basis?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Each department would be reduced in an amount which bears the same ratio to \$500,000,000 as the amount appropriated to such department for such purposes bears to the total amount appropriated for such purposes in this act which are not exempt.

Mr. BYRD. Where in the amendment does that definition appear?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it necessary to define everything in the amendment? I do not see how any other interpretation could be applied.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; but we are not going on the opinion of the Senator from Illinois. His opinion might be incorrect.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The legislative history can furnish a basis for this, as the Senator from Virginia well knows.

Mr. BYRD. What pro rata basis? I never heard of it before.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is a perfectly good term.

Mr. BYRD. It would be necessary to define it, in order to make it workable under this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have defined it although its meaning seems clear. It is workable. I think if we used the Anglo-Saxon word "proportionate" instead of the Latin term, it would be just as good as "pro rata."

I am sorry if there has been any heat in this interchange between the Senator from Virginia and myself.

Mr. BYRD. There is no heat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is a worthy laborer in the vineyard of economy, and I should like to think of myself as laboring alongside of him and trying to get the same end, even if by different means.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say I have enjoyed greatly my associations with the Senator from Illinois in our joint efforts for economy. I admire the efforts he has made. But even regardless of how anxious I am for economy, I want to vote for a law which will be workable. I want to vote for something which, if enacted, is going to work efficiently as

between the departments. I respectfully submit to the Senator that in this case he is doing what the House did in adopting the Taber amendment and the Jensen amendment. Both of those amendments were declared to be impractical from an administrative standpoint. When the Senator tells me that it will be necessary to make an estimate, to find out what a pro rata basis is, when we are asked to write into the law a provision involving a \$1,000,000,000 reduction, I simply cannot follow him on it. I think it ought to be made clear, if the amendment should become law. I am not a lawyer, but it seems to me that what is meant should be written in the law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is in the bill. Were it not for the fact that so able a gentleman as the Senator from Virginia finds difficulty in determining where it is, I should be certain it is in the law. But, since the Senator from Virginia finds some doubt about it, it is possible we shall have to fall back on legislative history, which I hope I have made clear.

Mr. BYRD. One of my colleagues has suggested it is not heat, but probably a lack of light that is bothering the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator knows there is a wise-crack to the effect that when people ask for light rather than heat, they sometimes forget that they themselves are the soot upon the lamp chimney which prevents the diffusion of light. It is very likely that it is my fault, and that I have obscured the real light that is within this amendment.

Now, Mr. President, I do not want to take up too much time, but I do want to say that this is really a very simple proposal, and, on the whole, one which would cut about 11 percent from these items. That can be done by reducing vacation leave, now 26 working days or 5½ weeks, and by reducing sick leave from 15 working days, or 3 weeks, to 20 days and 12 days, respectively.

We would still be providing for governmental employees better conditions than 99⁴⁴/₁₀₀ percent of private employers provide, and we would also squeeze out the 2 percent, let us say, of the least efficient governmental employees. We would then merely fill one-half of the vacancies which occur. This is much, much milder than the Thomas-Taber and the Jensen amendments. The Thomas-Taber amendment provided for a 10-percent cut, and then the Jensen amendment, on top of that, provided for filling only one-tenth of the vacancies. Nine-tenths of the vacated jobs would be allowed to fall vacant. This amendment allows the filling of one-half of vacancies, and diminishes the force by one-half. That is, by one-half the vacancies, during the course of the year. The average Government turn-over is about 26 percent, so that at the end of the year the working force would have shrunk by 13 percent, plus the 2 percent for vacations, or an average for the year of around 7 percent. When this is combined with the 5 percent reduction effected by reducing leave and eliminating the most inefficient personnel we get a total personal reduction of about 12 per-

cent. It is the most painless way of taking the fat out of the Government service, and yet, if in a given department the head of the department wants to make his economies from equipment, materials and supplies rather than from personnel, he can make all the economies in that way. He is given freedom, but he does have to make reductions from specific areas.

I commend the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from New Hampshire and their gallant cohorts for their desire to save money. They have made estimates that their amendments will save about \$800,000,000, and I am ready to accept that estimate. This amendment will save \$1,000,000,000. In other words, if they have \$800,000,000 worth of virtue, this amendment has \$1,000,000,000 worth of virtue. It saves \$200,000,000 more than the eminent gentlemen propose to save. It is done in a more painless fashion, and in a more discriminating fashion. We both use the meat-ax, but whereas they bring it down indiscriminately and order a 10 percent cut across the board, this cut is employed with discrimination and with care. So I hope that my amendment will be adopted. If it should fail, then I shall vote for the Bridges-Byrd amendment as a last resort—as the worst possible way to cut the budget. [Laughter.] But before we turn to the worst way, let us do it in a better way.

**SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS, BY OBJECTS,
FISCAL YEARS 1949, 1950, AND 1951**
(Includes those items exempt by Douglas amendment)

The attached tables, summarizing obligations by objects, show the nature and scope of the services, articles, or other items for which obligations have been or will be incurred for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951.

The classification consists of the categories shown in the numbered stubs of table I. These categories are defined in part V of the Budget-Treasury Regulation No. 1, dated June 1, 1942, as modified by section 45 of Budget Bureau "Instructions for the preparation and submission of the annual budget estimate," dated August 1, 1949. (See appendix 1 attached.) Unnumbered categories: "Unvouchered obligations" includes only those obligations which may lawfully be incurred for confidential purposes, without being subject to vouchering; "Obligations not distributed by object class" is used when the agencies have not classified all of their obligations by objects; "Reserve for future allocation" represents mutual defense assistance funds undistributed to other agencies for obligation.

The dollar amounts of obligations entered in these tables consist of "orders placed, contracts awarded, services received, and all other transactions during a given period which legally reserve an appropriation for expenditure." (See sec. 2 of the Budget-Treasury Regulation No. 1.) These amounts include all obligations from general, special, and postal accounts, but not from trust accounts or corporation checking accounts. The obligations included for the Post Office Department consist of those transactions financed by postal revenues plus the appropriation from the Treasury to cover the postal deficiency. In the case of wholly-owned Government corporations, data are included only for those obligations which are incurred from appropriated funds, and hence exclude all obligations paid by checking, special deposit, or trust accounts. Federal contributions to retirement and disability funds and

the District of Columbia are included in the obligations listed under object "11 Grants, subsidies and contributions." Object "13 Refunds, awards and indemnities" excludes the amounts of obligations representing refunds of excess deposits in the Treasury receipt accounts.

When one agency of the Government requests a service from another agency on a reimbursable basis, the agency originating the request obligates its appropriated funds for "07 Other contractual services" or some other appropriate object at the time it makes advances to working funds prior to the work being done, or makes reimbursements after it is performed. The agency receiving the advance payment or reimbursement uses the same amounts to incur obligations for the various objects required to provide the service involved. This causes a duplication,

which, under the present accounting system, would be difficult to eliminate.

The tables were prepared from obligation schedules printed in the 1951 budget. They include obligations based on (a) actual or recommended appropriations for 1949, 1950, and 1951, and (b) the anticipated supplemental appropriations for 1950. They do not include obligations for 1950 or 1951 based on (a) appropriations required by proposed legislation, and (b) the few anticipated supplemental appropriations which are not included in the obligation schedules.

Obligations against "Funds appropriated to the President" (pp. 51 to 68) are shown either under the respective agencies to which allocations were made, or in consolidated schedules under the respective funds. Unallocated balances are shown as reserve for future allocation.

TABLE I.—Summary of obligations by objects, general and special accounts, for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951

Description	1949, actual	1950, estimated	1951, estimated
01 Personal services:			
Permanent positions.....	\$5,818,471,829	\$5,793,430,629	\$5,795,072,078
Part-time and temporary positions.....	499,948,433	461,783,395	462,013,465
Military.....	3,651,041,098	4,008,750,453	3,917,683,308
Other.....	¹ —41,343,915	187,124,183	181,244,507
Net total, 01.....	² 9,954,466,833	² 10,479,761,775	² 10,385,869,330
02 Travel.....	335,787,043	360,678,180	355,583,413
03 Transportation of things.....	994,066,487	899,780,287	784,154,014
04 Communication services.....	64,112,490	65,292,729	64,041,788
05 Rents and utility services.....	263,764,462	213,668,350	217,107,045
06 Printing and reproduction.....	51,987,726	55,879,854	58,073,105
07 Other contractual services.....	2,109,885,237	1,955,744,377	1,367,141,315
Services performed by other agencies.....	185,517,098	129,894,508	126,908,783
08 Supplies and materials.....	5,692,568,658	4,941,324,999	3,973,724,605
09 Equipment.....	2,917,404,287	3,803,873,007	3,610,081,894
10 Lands and structures.....	1,343,603,233	2,008,126,752	1,359,260,954
11 Grants, subsidies and contributions.....	5,601,993,717	7,451,399,318	3,474,547,221
12 Pensions, annuities and insurance losses.....	5,764,709,619	5,508,337,560	5,310,067,407
13 Refunds, awards and indemnities.....	3,183,030,678	2,489,626,707	2,330,551,457
14 Interest.....	5,447,283,936	5,825,573,768	5,732,221,204
16 Investments and loans.....	2,111,340,475	1,359,953,073	1,190,513,063
Obligations not distributed by object class.....	9,936,682	19,290,387	13,090,500
Unvouchered.....	24,677	592,245	160,000
Reserved for future allocation.....		1,314,010,000	
Total obligations.....	45,886,483,388	48,882,807,876	40,353,097,998

¹ Due to deduct charges for quarters and subsistence.

² Detail does not add to this total because of the inclusion of 1949, \$10,105,655; 1950, \$9,988,680; 1951, \$10,428,407 for Senate; and 1949, \$16,015,540; 1950, \$18,448,215; 1951, \$19,178,710 for House; and 1949, \$228,193; 1950, \$236,220; 1951, \$248,855 for miscellaneous not shown under the separate categories above.

Source: Obligation schedules in pt. II of the 1951 budget document.

TABLE II.—Obligations by organization unit, general and special accounts, fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Legislative branch.....	\$102,572,180	\$113,419,804	\$117,981,372
The judiciary.....	21,361,635	24,146,016	26,033,100
Executive Office of the President.....	8,198,338	8,976,468	9,735,802
Funds appropriated to the President.....	(5,250,045,303)	(5,286,190,300)	(5,286,190,300)
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	5,246,034,042	3,912,180,300	
All other.....	4,011,261	1,374,010,000	
Independent offices.....	(8,820,244,157)	(9,599,373,141)	(8,100,856,878)
Atomic Energy Commission.....	630,567,997	895,210,229	610,809,100
Civil Service Commission.....	244,202,972	324,837,105	353,289,254
General Accounting Office.....	35,565,732	35,726,212	36,946,800
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	50,432,223	63,820,621	63,487,000
Railroad Retirement Board.....	589,112,451	612,334,146	603,433,136
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	257,439,898	157,002,222	159,719,235
Veterans' Administration.....	6,508,575,441	6,702,232,763	5,958,797,205
Other.....	504,347,443	808,209,843	314,375,148
Federal Security Agency.....	456,419,065	1,664,858,910	1,670,841,907
General Services Administration.....	735,559,921	1,037,781,855	816,536,535
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	20,255,731	21,687,015	30,569,875
Department of Agriculture.....	1,345,105,314	1,501,445,686	1,534,627,116
Department of Commerce.....	720,631,376	861,758,550	834,960,126
Department of the Interior.....	565,497,701	727,589,568	739,734,499
Department of Justice.....	129,753,104	137,515,783	149,590,818
Department of Labor.....	200,241,899	181,452,814	220,173,871
Department of Defense.....	(16,108,332,893)	(16,576,140,123)	(15,088,372,517)
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	279,815,173	340,146,000	373,300,000
Department of the Army:			
Military.....	4,795,414,861	4,792,866,614	4,482,385,676
Civil.....	2,122,700,013	1,425,634,476	911,511,501
Department of the Navy.....	5,429,296,924	5,112,584,847	4,790,355,541
Department of the Air Force.....	3,481,105,922	4,904,008,186	4,530,819,799
Department of State.....	302,472,640	386,256,425	282,567,812
Treasury Department.....	8,948,283,402	8,544,205,216	8,468,008,770
Post Office Department.....	2,139,508,729	2,198,010,202	2,250,497,000
District of Columbia.....	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Total obligations.....	45,886,483,388	48,882,807,876	40,353,097,998

TABLE III.—Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951

[In millions]			
Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Legislative branch.....	\$61	\$67	\$69
The judiciary.....	18	19	21
Executive Office of the President.....	7	7	8
Funds appropriated to the President.....	10	13	
Independent offices.....	(863)	(867)	(865)
Atomic Energy Commission.....	21	23	24
Civil Service Commission.....	15	15	15
General Accounting Office.....	34	34	35
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	25	28	31
Railroad Retirement Board.....	4	4	4
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	25	23	20
Veterans' Administration.....	613	618	623
Other.....	126	122	113
Federal Security Agency.....	84	92	98
General Services Administration.....	112	80	77
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	13	17	24
Department of Agriculture.....	209	222	234
Department of Commerce.....	161	219	200
Department of the Interior.....	162	195	215
Department of Justice.....	104	109	115
Department of Labor.....	19	23	27
Department of Defense.....	(6,155)	(6,453)	(6,260)
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	5	8	9
Department of the Army: Military.....	2,281	2,417	2,382
Civil.....	237	206	186
Department of the Navy.....	2,175	2,221	2,090
Department of the Air Force.....	1,457	1,601	1,593
Department of State.....	72	94	92
Treasury Department.....	366	399	425
Post Office Department.....	1,538	1,603	1,656
Total obligations for personal services.....	9,954	10,480	10,386

OBLIGATIONS FOR 02 TRAVEL BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Legislative branch.....	\$1	\$1	\$1
The judiciary.....	1	1	1
Executive Office of the President.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President.....	1	1	
Independent offices.....	(19)	(19)	(19)
Atomic Energy Commission.....	1	2	2
Civil Service Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Railroad Retirement Board.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans' Administration.....	11	10	11
Other.....	6	6	5
Federal Security Agency.....	3	3	4
General Services Administration.....	1	1	2
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	1	1	1
Department of Agriculture.....	11	14	15
Department of Commerce.....	7	10	9
Department of the Interior.....	7	10	11
Department of Justice.....	5	6	7
Department of Labor.....	1	2	3
Department of Defense.....	(217)	(228)	(212)
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	(1)	1	1
Department of the Army: Military.....	96	94	91
Civil.....	14	11	10
Department of the Navy.....	51	59	52
Department of the Air Force.....	56	61	58
Department of State.....	9	10	12
Treasury Department.....	7	11	13
Post Office Department.....	43	45	45
Total obligations for travel.....	336	361	356

Footnote at end of tables.

TABLE III.—Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951—Continued

OBLIGATIONS FOR 03 TRANSPORTATION OF THINGS BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

[In millions]			
Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Legislative branch.....	\$1	\$1	\$1
The judiciary.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President.....	29	13	
Independent offices.....	(15)	(14)	(15)
Atomic Energy Commission.....	4	3	4
Civil Service Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Railroad Retirement Board.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans' Administration.....	5	6	5
Other.....	5	4	5
Federal Security Agency.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Services Administration.....	1	1	(1)
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Agriculture.....	2	2	2
Department of Commerce.....	2	3	3
Department of the Interior.....	9	10	10
Department of Justice.....	1	1	1
Department of Labor.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Defense.....	(484)	(405)	(302)
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army: Military.....	161	170	159
Civil.....	163	79	14
Department of the Navy.....	86	77	57
Department of the Air Force.....	74	78	72
Department of State.....	4	4	5
Treasury Department.....	3	3	3
Post Office Department.....	442	443	442
Total obligations for transportation of things.....	994	900	784

OBLIGATIONS FOR 04 COMMUNICATION SERVICES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Legislative branch.....	\$1	\$1	\$1
The judiciary.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Independent offices.....	(9)	(8)	(8)
Atomic Energy Commission.....	2	2	2
Civil Service Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Railroad Retirement Board.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans' Administration.....	5	4	4
Other.....	1	1	1
Federal Security Agency.....	1	1	1
General Services Administration.....	5	5	4
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Agriculture.....	2	2	2
Department of Commerce.....	8	9	10
Department of the Interior.....	1	1	1
Department of Justice.....	2	2	2
Department of Labor.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Defense.....	(25)	(24)	(22)
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army: Military.....	8	8	8
Civil.....	5	3	2
Department of the Navy.....	4	3	4
Department of the Air Force.....	7	9	8
Department of State.....	4	6	6
Treasury Department.....	3	3	3

Footnote at end of tables.

TABLE III.—Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951—Continued

OBLIGATIONS FOR 04 COMMUNICATION SERVICES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT—continued

[In millions]			
Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Post Office Department.....	\$2	\$2	\$3
Total obligations for communication services.....	64	65	64

OBLIGATIONS FOR 05 RENTS AND UTILITY SERVICES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Legislative branch.....	\$1	(1)	(1)
The judiciary.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Independent offices.....	(31)	(35)	(37)
Atomic Energy Commission.....	8	11	14
Civil Service Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	2	3	3
Railroad Retirement Board.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans' Administration.....	16	16	16
Other.....	4	4	3
Federal Security Agency.....	1	2	2
General Services Administration.....	24	23	22
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	1	1	2
Department of Agriculture.....	4	5	5
Department of Commerce.....	5	6	7
Department of the Interior.....	3	4	5
Department of Justice.....	2	2	2
Department of Labor.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Defense.....	(92)	(91)	(89)
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army: Military.....	35	35	33
Civil.....	11	10	8
Department of the Navy.....	28	26	29
Department of the Air Force.....	18	20	19
Department of State.....	3	3	3
Treasury Department.....	10	11	10
Post Office Department.....	26	29	32
Total obligations for rents and utility services.....	204	214	217

OBLIGATIONS FOR 06 PRINTING AND REPRODUCTION BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Legislative branch.....	\$1	\$2	\$2
The judiciary.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Independent offices.....	(6)	(5)	(5)
Atomic Energy Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Civil Service Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Railroad Retirement Board.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans' Administration.....	3	2	3
Other.....	1	1	(1)
Federal Security Agency.....	1	1	1
General Services Administration.....	1	1	1
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Agriculture.....	3	3	3
Department of Commerce.....	4	6	6
Department of the Interior.....	1	1	1

Footnote at end of tables.

TABLE III.—Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951—Continued

OBLIGATIONS FOR 06 PRINTING AND REPRODUCTION BY ORGANIZATION UNIT—continued

(In millions)

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Department of Justice.....	\$1	\$1	\$1
Department of Labor.....	(1)	1	1
Department of Defense.....	(24)	(22)	(23)
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	(1)	1	1
Department of the Army: Military.....	9	8	10
Civil.....	(1)	1	1
Department of the Navy.....	9	8	7
Department of the Air Force.....	5	4	4
Department of State.....	2	2	3
Treasury Department.....	6	7	7
Post Office Department.....	2	4	4
Total obligations for printing and reproduction.....	52	56	55

OBLIGATIONS FOR 07 OTHER CONTRACTUAL SERVICES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative branch.....	\$6	\$9	\$11
The judiciary.....	2	3	3
Executive Office of the President.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President.....	710	563	
Independent offices.....	(352)	(421)	(420)
Atomic Energy Commission.....	181	262	272
Civil Service Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	2	3	3
Railroad Retirement Board.....	1	1	1
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	22	6	2
Veterans' Administration.....	137	132	124
Other.....	9	17	18
Federal Security Agency.....	4	5	5
General Services Administration.....	44	36	37
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	(1)	2	2
Department of Agriculture.....	26	15	16
Department of Commerce.....	11	10	9
Department of the Interior.....	53	55	63
Department of Justice.....	6	6	6
Department of Labor.....	(1)	(1)	1
Department of Defense.....	(776)	(795)	(762)
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	(1)	1	1
Department of the Army: Military.....	229	267	240
Civil.....	66	66	47
Department of the Navy.....	292	248	252
Department of the Air Force.....	188	213	222
Department of State.....	11	14	12
Treasury Department.....	14	16	14
Post Office Department.....	5	5	5
Total obligations for other contractual services.....	2,020	1,956	1,367

OBLIGATIONS FOR 07 SERVICES PERFORMED BY OTHER AGENCIES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative branch.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
The judiciary.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President.....	\$1	\$1	\$1
Funds appropriated to the President.....	(41)	(40)	(38)
Independent offices.....	40	37	36
Atomic Energy Commission.....	(1)	(1)	
Civil Service Commission.....	(1)	(1)	
General Accounting Office.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Railroad Retirement Board.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
United States Maritime Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans Administration.....	(1)	2	1
Other.....			

Footnote at end of tables.

TABLE III.—Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951—Continued

OBLIGATION FOR 07 SERVICES PERFORMED BY OTHER AGENCIES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT—continued

(In millions)

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Federal Security Agency.....	\$1	\$1	\$1
General Services Administration.....	2	6	13
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Agriculture.....	57	4	5
Department of Commerce.....	2	9	12
Department of the Interior.....	15	4	4
Department of Justice.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Labor.....	(1)	(1)	1
Department of Defense.....	32	33	(19)
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army: Military.....	17	7	5
Civil.....	3	2	2
Department of the Navy.....	6	6	6
Department of the Air Force.....	6	18	6
Department of State.....	1	1	3
Treasury Department.....	30	26	26
Post Office Department.....	4	4	4
Total obligations for services performed by other agencies.....	186	130	127

OBLIGATIONS FOR 08 SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative branch.....	\$27	\$29	\$29
The judiciary.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President.....	111	62	
Independent offices.....	(199)	(184)	(221)
Atomic Energy Commission.....	71	55	77
Civil Service Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	5	5	5
Railroad Retirement Board.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	3	2	4
Veterans' Administration.....	95	92	97
Other.....	24	29	37
Federal Security Agency.....	15	14	13
General Services Administration.....	474	778	505
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Agriculture.....	20	18	19
Department of Commerce.....	17	16	15
Department of the Interior.....	45	58	67
Department of Justice.....	7	7	7
Department of Labor.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Defense.....	(4,687)	(3,688)	(3,014)
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army: Military.....	1,371	1,207	978
Civil.....	1,140	439	
Department of the Navy.....	1,496	1,300	1,209
Department of the Air Force.....	680	742	773
Department of State.....	4	7	10
Treasury Department.....	37	41	45
Post Office Department.....	49	37	28
Total obligations for supplies and materials.....	5,693	4,941	3,974

OBLIGATIONS FOR 09 EQUIPMENT BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative Branch.....	\$2	\$2	\$3
The judiciary.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President.....	1	4	
Independent offices.....	(243)	(160)	(186)
Atomic Energy Commission.....	24	21	21
Civil Service Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	3	4	

Footnote at end of tables.

TABLE III.—Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951—Continued

OBLIGATIONS FOR 09 EQUIPMENT BY ORGANIZATION UNIT—continued

(In millions)

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Independent offices—Con. Railroad Retirement Board.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	\$181	\$82	\$75
Veterans' Administration.....	16	20	28
Other.....	19	33	58
Federal Security Agency.....	5	4	6
General Services Administration.....	1	2	7
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Agriculture.....	13	9	9
Department of Commerce.....	18	36	31
Department of the Interior.....	24	29	34
Department of Justice.....	2	2	3
Department of Labor.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Defense.....	(2,578)	(3,522)	(3,276)
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army: Military.....	503	480	528
Civil.....	26	28	
Department of the Navy.....	1,102	968	975
Department of the Air Force.....	946	2,046	1,755
Department of State.....	6	5	5
Treasury Department.....	11	14	30
Post Office Department.....	13	14	19
Total obligations for equipment.....	2,917	3,803	3,610

OBLIGATIONS FOR 10 LANDS AND STRUCTURES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative branch.....	\$1	(1)	(1)
Executive Office of the President.....			(1)
Funds appropriated to the President.....	3		
Independent offices.....	(328)	(\$638)	(\$253)
Atomic Energy Commission.....	278	478	157
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	12	21	17
Veterans' Administration.....	36	136	75
Other.....	2	3	4
Federal Security Agency.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Services Administration.....	59	67	76
Department of Agriculture.....	3	3	3
Department of Commerce.....	54	41	43
Department of the Interior.....	205	323	292
Department of Justice.....	1	1	1
Department of Defense.....	(658)	(894)	(664)
Department of the Army: Military.....	66	99	36
Civil.....	456	574	577
Department of the Navy.....	92	108	31
Department of the Air Force.....	44	113	20
Department of State.....	28	35	22
Treasury Department.....	3	6	5
Total obligations for lands and structures.....	1,344	2,008	1,359

OBLIGATIONS FOR 11 GRANTS, SUBSIDIES, AND CONTRIBUTIONS BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Legislative branch.....	(1)		
Executive Office of the President.....	(1)	(1)	
Funds appropriated to the President.....	\$3,047	\$3,163	
Independent offices.....	(509)	(1,287)	(\$452)
Atomic Energy Commission.....	2	1	2
Civil Service Commission.....	227	308	336
Railroad Retirement Board.....	9	4	3
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	26	45	58
Veterans' Administration.....	118	517	47
Other.....	127	412	6
Federal Security Agency.....	326	1,507	1,507
General Services Administration.....	8	32	60
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	4		
Department of Agriculture.....	438	627	651
Department of Commerce.....	428	492	493

Footnote at end of tables.

TABLE III.—Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951—Continued

OBLIGATIONS FOR 11 GRANTS, SUBSIDIES, AND CONTRIBUTIONS BY ORGANIZATION UNIT—CON.

[In millions]

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Department of the Interior.....	\$28	\$32	\$30
Department of Justice.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Labor.....	178	154	187
Department of Defense.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army:			
Military.....	(1)	1	1
Civil.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Navy.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Air Force.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of State.....	139	144	85
Treasury Department.....	125	(1)	(1)
District of Columbia.....	12	12	12
Total obligations for grants, subsidies, and contributions.....	5,602	7,451	3,475

OBLIGATIONS FOR 12 PENSIONS, ANNUITIES, AND INSURANCE LOSSES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Independent offices.....	(\$5,453)	(\$5,150)	(\$4,925)
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans' Administration.....	5,453	5,150	4,925
Federal Security Agency.....	1	1	1
Department of Commerce.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Interior.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Defense.....	(298)	(342)	(368)
Office of the Secretary.....	266	322	356
Department of the Army:			
Military.....	8	(1)	1
Civil.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Navy.....	24	19	11
Department of the Air Force.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Treasury Department.....	13	15	16
Total obligations for pensions, annuities and insurance losses.....	5,765	5,508	5,310

OBLIGATIONS FOR 13 REFUNDS, AWARDS, AND INDEMNITIES BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Legislative branch.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President.....	\$4	(167)	(62)
Independent offices.....	(178)	(167)	(62)
Atomic Energy Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Accounting Office.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans' Administration.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Other.....	176	165	60
Federal Security Agency.....	14	33	32
General Services Administration.....	2	7	8
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Agriculture.....	12	2	2
Department of Commerce.....	3	3	(1)
Department of Interior.....	8	1	(1)
Department of Justice.....	(1)	1	5
Department of Labor.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Defense.....	(80)	(77)	(72)
Office of the Secretary.....	6	7	6
Department of the Army:			
Military.....	10	(1)	(1)
Civil.....	(1)	2	(1)
Department of the Navy.....	64	68	66
Department of the Air Force.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of State.....	(1)	20	(1)
Treasury Department.....	2,878	2,172	2,143
Post Office Department.....	7	6	6
Total obligations for refunds, awards, and indemnities.....	3,188	2,490	2,331

OBLIGATIONS FOR 14 INTEREST BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Independent offices: Other.....	\$1	\$1	\$1
Federal Security Agency.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
General Services Administration.....	(1)	(1)	(1)

Footnote at end of tables.

TABLE III.—Obligations for 01 Personal services by organization unit—General and special accounts for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951—Continued

OBLIGATIONS FOR 14 INTEREST BY ORGANIZATION UNIT—CONTINUED

[In millions]

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Department of Agriculture.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Interior.....	\$1	\$1	\$1
Department of Defense.....	(3)	(3)	(3)
Department of the Army:			
Military.....	1	1	1
Civil.....	1	1	2
Department of the Navy.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Air Force.....	1	(1)	(1)
Treasury Department.....	5,442	5,821	5,727
Total obligations for interest.....	5,447	5,826	5,732

OBLIGATIONS FOR 16 INVESTMENTS AND LOANS BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Executive Office of the President.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Funds appropriated to the President.....	\$973	\$150	-----
Independent offices: Railroad Retirement Board.....	575	602	\$594
General Services Administration.....	1	(1)	4
Department of Agriculture.....	544	568	570
Department of the Interior.....	1	4	3
Department of State.....	11	30	14
Treasury Department.....	-----	(1)	-----
Post Office Department.....	6	5	5
Total obligations for investments and loans.....	2,111	1,360	1,190

UNVOUCHERED OBLIGATIONS BY ORGANIZATION UNIT

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Funds appropriated to the President.....	(1)	(1)	-----
Independent offices: Atomic Energy Commission.....	-----	(1)	(1)
Federal Security Agency.....	-----	(1)	(1)
Department of Defense.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of the Army:			
Military.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Treasury Department.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Total unvouchered obligations.....	(1)	\$1	(1)

OBLIGATIONS NOT DISTRIBUTED BY OBJECT CLASS

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Legislative branch.....	\$1	\$1	\$1
Department of Agriculture.....	-----	6	1
Department of the Interior.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Department of Justice.....	-----	(1)	(1)
Department of State.....	8	11	11
Post Office Department.....	(1)	-----	-----
Total obligations not distributed by object class.....	10	19	13

RESERVE FOR FUTURE ALLOCATION

Organization unit	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Mutual defense assistance.....	-----	\$1,314	-----

NOTE.—Due to rounding the detail in table III may not add to totals.

¹ Less than \$500,000.

APPENDIX 1

DEFINITIONS OF OBJECT CLASSES

01. Personal services: Includes all salaries and wages for labor or other services of officers or employees, either civil or military, of the Government. This classification also includes compensation for special services rendered by consultants or others employed on a per diem or fee basis, and cash allowances for quarters, heat, light, and other cash emoluments incident to personal services.

Examples:

Civil-service employees: Salaries and wages and other compensation of all civil-service officers and employees, including that portion which represents employees' retirement

contributions, and other deductions creditable to other appropriations and funds.

Non-civil-service employees: Salaries and wages and other compensation of all non-civil-service officers and employees.

Military and naval personnel: Pay and cash allowances for quarters or subsistence of all military, naval, and quasi-military personnel.

Relief employees: Wages to persons who have been certified as needing relief and who are employed on work projects operated by a Federal agency.

Special and miscellaneous payments for personal services: Commissions, fees, etc., for special and miscellaneous services rendered by consultants or others.

02. Travel: Includes transportation of persons, their subsistence while in an authorized travel status, and other expenses incident to travel which are to be paid by the Government either directly or by reimbursing the traveler.

Examples:

Transportation of persons: Contractual services rendered in connection with carrying persons from place to place, whether by land, air, or water, and the furnishing of accommodations incident to actual travel. This includes commercial transportation charges, charter of passenger cars, trains, vessels, or airplanes, and expenses incident to the operation of the chartered conveyances. It also includes mileage allowances and reimbursement for gasoline and oil used in privately owned vehicles, storage and care of vehicles, and streetcar and taxi fares.

Subsistence: Food and lodging, whether on the basis of a reimbursement for actual expenses or a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence.

Incidental travel expenses: Other expenses necessitated by travel, such as baggage transfer, steamer chairs, and telephone and telegraph expenses, as authorized by travel regulations.

03. Transportation of things: Includes those charges for the transportation of things (including animals) which are paid or to be paid directly by the Government and not by the vendor, whether such transportation be by land, air, or water. It also includes charges for the care of such things while in process of being transported.

Examples:

Freight and express: Charges by common carrier, including freight and express, demurrage, switching, recrating, refrigerating, and other incidental expenses.

Drayage and other local transportation: Cartage, handling, and other charges incident to local transportation.

Mail transportation: Contractual services for the transportation of mail by water, rail, air, motor vehicles, etc.

04. Communication service: Includes the transmission of messages from place to place, such as tolls for land telegraph service, marine cable service, radio and wireless telegraph service, telephone service, postage, and messenger service. It also includes switchboard and service charges and telephone installation costs.

05. Rents and utility services: Includes charges for rents as well as for heat, light, power, water, gas, electricity, and other utility services exclusive of transportation and communication services.

Examples:

Rents: The right of possession and use of land, structures, or equipment owned by another, the possession of which is to be relinquished at a future time. This also includes charges under purchase rental agreements. Under such agreements, until the title to the equipment is acquired, payments should be classified as rentals. Payments subsequent to the acquisition of title should be classified as equipment.

Heat, light, power, water, gas, and electricity: The services indicated when billed separately from "rent."

06. Printing and reproduction: Includes all contractual services for the printing and binding of books, pamphlets, documents, and other publications. Printed forms and letterheads are also included under this group.

07. Other contractual services: Includes all contractual services not otherwise classified.

Examples:

Repairs and alternations: Repairs and alterations to buildings, bridges, viaducts, vessels, equipment, and like items, when done by contract, except those which add materially to the value of such property and therefore may be properly considered as capital improvements.

Storage and maintenance of vehicles: Storage and care of vehicles, except items of this nature incurred in connection with travel and which are, therefore, classified under "02 Travel."

Subsistence and support of persons: Services for providing board, lodging, and care of persons, except travel items, which are included under "02 Travel."

Photographing, typewriting, and stenographic services: Includes contractual stenographic work, typewriting, and duplicating work, such as multigraphing and mimeographing, as well as photographing, developing, and blueprinting.

Advertising and publication of notices.

Fees and other charges: Includes fees and expenses of witnesses and jurors, and fees of abstracting land titles.

08. Supplies and materials: Includes all commodities which are ordinarily consumed or expended within a comparatively short period of time, converted in the process of construction or manufacture, or from a minor part of equipment or fixed property. Also includes commodities purchased for resale.

Examples:

Office supplies (other than printed forms and letterheads).

Chemicals, surgical and medical supplies.

Fuels: All substances, such as coal, wood, petroleum, and oils used in cooking, heating, and generating power, or in making artificial gas.

Clothing and clothing supplies: Articles of clothing, together with materials and sewing supplies used in the manufacture of wearing apparel.

Provisions: Food and beverages for human consumption.

Forage and stable supplies: Food used for livestock and other animals, and stable supplies such as bedding, horseshoes, collar pads, etc.

Cleaning and toilet supplies.

Ammunition and explosives: Bombs, shells, propellant powders, mines, torpedoes, chemical and chemical gases used for combat, powder, fuses, detonators, primers, pyrotechnic supplies, and components thereof.

Materials and parts: Commodities, including building material, entering into the construction, repair, or production of supplies, equipment, machinery, buildings, and other structures.

09. Equipment: Includes machinery, implements, tools, furniture and fixtures, livestock (other than that purchased for slaughter), armaments, vehicles, and other apparatus, which are adapted to continuing use without material impairment of their physical condition, and which it may be expected will have an extended period of service.

Examples: **Transportation equipment:** Vehicles including passenger-carrying automobiles, motor trucks, motorcycles, tractors, aircraft of any character, wagons, carts, vessels, steamships, barges, lighters, and power launches.

Furniture, furnishings, and fixtures: Movable furniture, fittings, and fixtures, such as desks, tables, chairs, typewriters, adding and bookkeeping machines, and household equipment.

Machinery and apparatus: Engines, generators, manufacturing machinery, transformers, shop equipment, stationary pumps, and other production and construction machinery. Instruments and apparatus, such as surgical instruments, X-ray apparatus, signaling and telephone and telegraph equipment, scientific instruments and appliances, measuring and weighing instruments and accessories, photographic equipment, picture-projection equipment, and accessories, and mechanical drafting devices.

Armaments: Tanks, armored cars, tractors, machine guns, rifles, bayonets, anti-aircraft guns, cannons, lights, detectors, fixed and mobile mounts or carriages for cannon, including limbers, caissons, battery and store wagons, reels and carts, fire-control apparatus, submarine mine equipment, ammunition hoists, torpedo tubes, and other special and miscellaneous military equipment.

10. Lands and structures: Includes land and interest in land, buildings, and other structures and permanent improvements and additions when acquired under contracts.

Examples:

Lands and interest in lands.

Buildings and other structures: The acquisition or construction of buildings and structures, and additions and alterations materially adding to the original value when secured under contract.

Nonstructural improvements: Improvements of land, such as landscaping, fences, sewers, wells, reservoirs, when secured under contract.

Fixed equipment: Fixtures and equipment which become permanently attached to or form a part of buildings or structures, such as elevators, plumbing, power-plant boilers, fire-alarm systems, lighting or heating systems, generators, and air-conditioning and refrigerating systems.

11. Grants, subsidies, and contributions: Includes educational and public-welfare grants, Federal contributions to the retirement and disability funds, public-assistance grants, and aid to States, Territories, political subdivisions, corporations, associations, and individuals. Gratuities, contributions to international societies, or payments of quotas of expenses of international societies and proceedings or projects; and contributions of the Government fixed by treaty.

12. Pensions, annuities, and insurance losses: Includes retirement pay on the basis of civil or military service to the Government, pensions on account of service, annuities paid from trust funds to civil service employees and others, monetary allowances on account of military and naval services, losses on life- and marine-insurance policies, and payments made on account of accidents to civil employees of the Government while in the discharge of their official duties.

Examples:

Pensions: Army, Navy, and Marine Corps pensions, civil pensions on account of disability or death due to service.

Retirement salaries: Accruals and compensation for past civil or military services of the Government.

Annuities: Accruals and compensation from retirement and disability funds and from the old age and survivors' insurance trust fund.

Allowances: Allowances to families of deceased soldiers and sailors, vocational rehabilitation allowances for disabled persons discharged from military and naval forces, medical attendance and hospital allowances, other allowances, United States employees' compensation fund payments.

Insurance losses: Losses from the United States life-insurance fund, and on military and naval insurance, etc. Does not include charges under the Government Losses in Shipment Act.

13. Refunds, awards, and indemnities: Includes refunds of the whole or part of amounts previously received by the United States; items for or included in awards by courts of law, boards, or commissions; indemnities made on recommendation of officers of the Government; or indemnities for destruction or injury of persons or property.

Examples:

Refunds: Refunds of fines, penalties, forfeitures, taxes, duties, refunds from retirement and disability funds, and other refunds on account of adjustments, errors in computation, etc.

Awards: Awards arising from abrogation of contracts, awards for the destruction of livestock, crops, etc.; awards to persons for losses incurred in the courses of duty; and other awards such as amounts paid to informers and awards paid to foreign nations not covered by treaty.

Indemnities, losses, and contingencies: Remuneration for loss or injury, such as damage to property, personal injuries, etc. This also includes losses made good on Government shipments, and the difference between the face value of uncurrent coins and the value of coins resulting from their recoinage.

Repayments of deposits: Repayments of amounts not subject to demand or claim by the United States for which it has assumed custody. Such items represent the repayment of those moneys received in trust for private purposes and over which the Government exercises the responsibility of custodian rather than owner.

14. Interest: Includes compensation to creditors of the United States for the use of funds loaned, deposited, overpaid, or otherwise made available to the United States.

16. Investments and loans: Includes the purchase of stocks, bonds, notes, and other choses in action; the original advances for revolving funds—that is, nonstock enterprises, and any increase of the original advances; and loans to foreign governments, States, Territories, and other political subdivisions, or loans to corporations, associations, and individuals.

Examples:

Investments in securities: The purchase of stocks, bonds, debentures, and other securities in which money is invested either temporarily or permanently, including the amounts paid for interest accrued on such investments at the time of purchase, as well as any premium paid on such investments. This classification also includes subscriptions to paid-in surplus of Government-owned corporations.

Advances to revolving funds: The establishment of revolving and other funds, and increase thereof, where such funds are to remain intact, either in the form of cash, receivables, inventory, or other assets, the investment in which is to be returned when the enterprise is liquidated, transferred, or sold.

Loans: Advances to foreign governments, States, Territories, and other political subdivisions, as well as loans to corporations, associations, and individuals.

ANALYSIS OF OBLIGATIONS BY OBJECTS

In order to provide a uniform basis for consideration of the estimates and for consolidation of certain information on a Government-wide basis, the following information will be supplied in the schedule of "Obligations by objects":

Total number of permanent positions.

Average number of all employees.

01. Personal services: Permanent positions, part-time and temporary positions, regular pay in excess of 52-week base, payment above basic rates, total personal services, deduct charges for quarters and subsistence, net personal services.

02. Travel.

03. Transportation of things.

04. Communication services.
05. Rents and utility services.
06. Printing and reproduction.
07. Other contractual services. Services performed by other agencies.
08. Supplies and materials.
09. Equipment.
10. Lands and structures.
11. Grants, subsidies, and contributions.
12. Pensions, annuities, and insurance losses.
13. Refunds, awards, and indemnities.
14. Interest.
16. Investment and loans (net). Unvouchered.

The first two lines will contain information as follows: "Total number of permanent positions—All full-time permanent positions, regardless of the status of the employees (permanent, temporary, etc.), which are occupied or to be occupied at any time during the fiscal year.

"Average number of all employees"—Average paid employment on a full-year basis, stated to the nearest whole number, including the full-time equivalent of terminal leave and of temporary and part-time employment.

The amounts under object class 01 will be broken down as follows:

"Permanent positions"—Net obligations for regular pay for full-time, permanent positions, after deducting savings due to delays in filling vacancies, absences without pay, etc. offset to whatever extent may be necessary by terminal leave payments. Where such positions are paid from more than one appropriation, the applicable portion will be included under each appropriation. Only the actual reimbursement made (if any) for military personnel on detail to civilian agencies will be included. New positions for the budget year are to be estimated at the minimum of the grade.

"Temporary and part-time positions"—Net obligations for regular pay for all positions not included in "permanent positions" above.

"Regular pay in excess of 52-week base"—Compensation at regular rates for the extra day or two, if any, in excess of 52 weeks in the fiscal year.

"Payment above basic rates"—Net obligations for all other types of compensation, including overtime and holiday pay, night-work differential, living and quarters allowance, and additional pay for service abroad.

Where employees are charged for quarters or subsistence, provided in kind, an additional entry "Deduct charges for quarters and subsistence" will be used, followed by an entry called "Net personal services."

Each other object class will be set forth on a single line, except that (a) within class 07, reimbursements and advances to other agencies (for items ordinarily classed as 07) will be set forth separately as an unnumbered item, immediately following the usual entry for the remainder of 07, and (b) a more detailed subclassification may be used optionally to show the distribution of large or unusual obligations under any class.

The distribution of obligations by object class will follow the definitions in the latest Budget-Treasury Regulation No. 1, as revised and amended, issued under Executive Order 8512.

The uniform wording of the object classes will be used exactly as set forth, although an explanatory phrase may be added in parentheses where the whole of the obligations in some class are for a particular or special object. The unnumbered entry "unvouchered" will be used only where obligations may be incurred lawfully for confidential purposes, not subject to detailed vouchering or reporting.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall speak but a word or two in regard to this very simple amendment. I re-

cently said I did not believe in legislating on the floor of the Senate. I referred to the preparation of bills. Here is a committee which, since the 26th day of last January, has worked on this bill faithfully and well, to my knowledge, as faithfully as any committee ever worked. And here is a Senator who says, "We will turn down all this; I have a plan here which provides that almost anyone can make reductions." He first proposes that the Bureau of the Budget make the reductions. He then provides that the heads of the departments shall make the reductions. What would happen, I may ask, if we suppose that neither of them made reductions? I wonder whether the Senator expects that they will turn it over to him to make the reductions.

The Senator from Illinois must not have exerted himself very much in getting information about this bill. The Senator from Virginia has exposed the utter ineptness of this amendment, the utter unfitness of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the able Senator from Tennessee will yield, I ask, in what way?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will have to excuse me. I did not interrupt him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McKELLAR. I accept the apology. I think the Senator should have apologized, after proposing this remarkable amendment. I want to read it to the Senate. It will take me only a minute. I ask Senators to listen carefully to it:

SECTION 1001. Reductions in appropriations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of \$1,000,000,000. Such reductions shall be made in the following manner:

(a) Funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, for lands and structures, and for Federal-aid postwar highways shall be reduced.

"Postwar highways"? We have had quite a number of wars, and I suppose we can be said to be "postwar" as to all of them. We had the Revolutionary War. The Senator's amendment would not specify whether he meant after the Revolutionary War, or whether he meant after World War II. Perhaps he means after the Civil War. On the other hand, possibly the expression is used with reference to the Mexican War. Also, it may have been used, having in mind a half-dozen Indian wars. The Senator does not specify. He merely says "postwar highways."

The Senator calls it fat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall not yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield a little later, but not at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I could clear things up for the Senator by saying that the term "postwar highways" is used in the appropriations bill reported by the Senator from Tennessee. That is why I used it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has shown that if this is a product of his mind, he has one of the most unclear minds in the world. I do not see how he could attempt to explain anything to anyone. I have heard him attempt to explain many things, but this is an amendment which I am sure he cannot explain. It is inexplicable. Listen to this:

Provided, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower—

The Nation's manpower? I wonder what the Senator means.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wonder if he means the mail carrier on a post road.

Mr. McKELLAR. He may. I do not know whether he means a mailcarrier or not. He may mean a stenographer in the office. I do not know what he has in his mind. Yet he wants to clarify something which no one can clarify. I think the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], in the questions which he asked the distinguished Senator from Illinois a while ago, brought out a very clear exposition of the matter. I suggest that the Senator from Illinois get the Senator from Virginia to explain what is in this amendment other than a lot of contradictions.

I have just read that the Bureau of the Budget is to make reductions. I wonder what part of the Bureau of the Budget—a clerk? An office boy? A stenographer? The amendment does not say, as was pointed out by the Senator from Virginia.

After giving the Director of the Budget such power, what happens? Listen to this:

That the reductions provided for in this subsection among the departments shall be made on a department-wide basis—

I wonder what that means. I wish the Senator from Illinois would find out from the Senator from Virginia what that means, when he has time to do so—and the secretaries of the departments are empowered—

The Senator is now turning over the power, already vested in the Bureau of the Budget, to the secretaries of the various departments on a department-wide basis. Suppose a department head cut out a billion and a half dollars and the Bureau of the Budget did not cut out more than half a billion or three-fourths of a billion dollars: Who would decide the matter? One would cut out the fat and the other would cut out the lean, as the Senator from Illinois has said. I do not know what those things mean in that connection. I know when a man is fat or when he is lean, of course, but I do not understand the use of the words "fat" and "lean" in this manner.

Let me go on, Mr. President: the secretaries of the departments are empowered—

They are not authorized or told to do it; they are not directed to do it, as the Senator from Virginia so well explained a while ago. Is there a Senator

present who is so dumb as to believe that simply granting such power would cause a single officeholder, whether he be in the Bureau of the Budget or in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, to reduce expenses by a billion dollars because he is empowered to do it? If so, let him hold up his hand.

I see no hands go up. I congratulate the Senate that no hands went up.

I can see a good deal of advertising by the Senator from Illinois in this amendment. Many persons think that if a man says he is for economy he can show it by offering an amendment of this kind. My heavens. What an effect it would have on the country. The Senator could probably be elected Vice President next time on a platform of that kind. He could say, "Fellow citizens, I did not attempt to cut out only a half-billion dollars; I cut it all out. That shows how economical I am. I just cut it all out."

I read further:

The secretaries of the departments are empowered, by means of transfers and adjustments—

See how easy it is—

by means of transfers and adjustments—

My heavens. Can we make money by transfers and adjustments? I wonder what that means. I yield to the Senator from Illinois to tell me what "adjustments" means.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I take it that this very interesting outpouring of ridicule and satire is not really intended to be taken seriously by the Senator from Illinois. I am very glad indeed if the exercise of this ridicule and satire by the Senator from Tennessee has served to make him happier, and I may say that if I have contributed to giving him more of the joy of life, even though he has exposed me to satire and ridicule, I feel that perhaps that may be one of my unwitting contributions to the Senator, for which I shall be grateful. He has indulged in a fit of temper, and I hope he feels better for it. But since the Senator has yielded to me—

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; I did not yield to the Senator from Illinois to make a foolish speech. I am not at all surprised. What the Senator is now saying is in full accord with the remarkable production which after-ages will heed and because of which they will rejoice. I am very much obliged for his kind feeling toward me because of my recent Charley-horse affliction. I appreciate it very much. Without pursuing the matter much further, I should like to challenge any Senator, with the exception of the Senator from Illinois, who feels there is anything justifiable in the Senator's amendment to say what it is. Certainly it would be a blow at the system used by the Senate if we were to adopt the Senator's amendment.

Mr. President, here we have a committee working day and night on the appropriations bill. My friend from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], my friend from Nebraska, the minority leader [Mr.

WHERRY], who is one of the finest of men, as is the Senator from Arizona, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and all the other members of the committee, have been working almost like slaves on this bill since the 25th day of January, sometimes at night, although mostly in the daytime. Most of them have spent from 8 to 10 hours a day on the committee's work. They prepared a wonderful bill. I think when it is finally enacted into law it will be pleasing not only to the Senate, the House, and the President, but to the country at large, because it is a well prepared bill which fits in with governmental policies and governmental practices. It does not cut one thing off here, another thing there, and it does not destroy. Here at the last moment, Mr. President, comes an amendment offered by a Senator who has not taken part in any hearings, who has not given us any evidence on this bill or on any other bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Listening in the best of faith to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in his laudable attempt at economy—

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure it is laudable.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With particular reference to highways and roads, is it not a fact that the committee recommended to the Senate appropriations for roads only to the limited amount that would be in keeping with our present-day finances?

Mr. McKELLAR. Exactly. We had the proof. Road officials from the various States appeared before our committee. We had all kinds of expert evidence given to us on the question of roads. We made reductions. How did we do it? By resort to imagination? Not at all. We made reductions based on evidence. We based our decisions on evidence which was given before us and very carefully considered. Here at the last minute we have the whole thing being upset.

Mr. CHAVEZ. On the road provisions of the bill we had evidence from the Commissioner of Public Roads and the American Association of State Highway Officials, who are the ones back home who do the actual construction. Does the Senator from Tennessee know of any Senator, aside from the Senator from Illinois, who would like to take one dollar out of the money for the construction of roads in any State?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know of a single one.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. McKELLAR. There may be some Senators, but I do not know of any. I think I have heard several Senators ask that we vote. I want to vote. I hope we can vote on this amendment. I ask for a vote on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thought it best to wait to say what I had to say until the Senator from Tennessee had finished so that he would have a chance to resume his seat and rest. I thought it would be better to not interrupt him frequently while he was in the process of speaking.

Mr. President, essentially what the Senator from Tennessee is saying is that once a committee has made a report it is an act of impudence for any other Member of the Senate to question the recommendation made by the committee. I should like to point out that excellent as the work of this committee was—and I want to say that I know that a lot of work was done and I want to pay tribute to the Senator from Tennessee, who in many ways is a very gallant gentleman—that despite its virtues the committee did bring in an appropriation bill which even prior to the Korean war would have put us approximately \$4,000,000,000 in the red. I submit that it is perfectly proper for any Senator, after such an appropriation bill has been brought in, to try to save money for the taxpayers and the country, and that it is not helpful for one Senator to try to hold up to ridicule a Senator who seeks such economies.

Mr. President, the need of our country for economy is certainly greater in view of the Korean situation, which is going to cost us \$10,000,000,000 and possibly \$15,000,000,000 more, and needs for which were not before the Committee on Appropriations when it held its hearings and made its report.

The other day on the floor of the Senate I produced a copy of the hearings which were held by the Committee on Appropriations which showed that the regular hearings were closed on March 6, I believe, or more than 3 months before the Korean war broke out, that the supplementary hearings were closed in May, or 6 weeks before the Korean war broke out, and that the report and recommendations were made before the Korean war broke out. In the light of changed conditions, in the light of the need for munitions and matériel, I submit that we should economize, and I submit it is not improper—if Senators will bear with me I shall conclude in a moment and we can vote on the amendment—for a Senator to move for economy in general items after all specific efforts at economy have failed.

Mr. President, I have only one specific reply to make to what the Senator from Tennessee has said and what the Senator from Virginia has alluded to. The Senator from Tennessee has poked fun at my use of the term "empowered," when I suggested that the Director of the Budget be empowered to make reductions of construction amounting to \$500,000,000, and that the secretaries of the various departments also be "empowered" to do so. The Senator from Virginia did not make fun of my use of the term, but he did imply that it was not sufficiently strong. In helping to draft the amendment I consulted the amendment introduced by the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from New Hampshire, and other eminent Senators. They used the words, "the head of each

department and agency of the executive branch of the Government is hereby authorized to make adjustments and transfers." In view of the fact that they used the weaker term "authorized" I thought it would be permissible for me to use the term "empowered." If "authorized" is correct for the Senator from Virginia, I do not quite see why he cavils at the use of "empowered." What is proper for the gander should not be improper for the goose.

I may say for the benefit of the Senator from Virginia, who has just returned to the Chamber, that I was saying that my use of the term "empowered" was based on the precedent which the Senator from Virginia had set when he used the term "authorized." So I feel I am in goodly company with the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from New Hampshire, except that I am trying to effect a bigger cut.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an analysis of the so-called Douglas amendment which I have had prepared by the staff.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 1001. This paragraph purports to reduce appropriations in the amount of \$1,000,000,000. But just as in the case of the original Taber-Thomas amendment adopted by the House, there are serious questions not answered by the remainder of the amendment as to how this reduction is to be accomplished and how the total reduction is to be achieved.

Paragraph (a). This paragraph provides for a \$500,000,000 reduction in funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, lands and structures, and Federal aid to postwar highways, and empowers the Director of the Budget to make such reductions among the executive departments and agencies. This paragraph is subject to the same objection as the original Taber-Thomas amendment, chapter 10-A, for the reason that the Director of the Budget, an official of the executive branch, is empowered—not required—to allocate the reductions. In other words, the appropriation act in itself does not make the appropriations but some further action must be taken in the executive branch before it can be determined how much money is actually appropriated under the headings affected.

This Executive action is not merely ministerial, but discretionary, and, under the authority granted, the Director of the Budget could completely wipe out all appropriations for any given agency under these headings if he could determine what such appropriations are, as made in other parts of the act.

However, it must be remembered that budget estimates are not binding in any way unless the Congress specifically states so when an appropriation is actually made. They are merely used for the purpose of justification as to how the agency or department expects to spend the money involved. Therefore, unless some formula is given as to how to determine what is meant in (a), the Bureau of the Budget or anyone else would have to guess. In other words, appropriations in the act are frequently made, not for "supplies and materials" or "lands and structures" but for "salaries and expenses" or for carrying out certain programs. There is no break-down in the bill between

the different objects of expenditure, and frequently the amounts carried in the budget estimates in the aggregate of objects of expenditure have been varied so that no one can tell how much is finally carried in the bill under a given heading of appropriations applicable to a given object of expenditure.

Furthermore, the \$385,000,000 provided for the Federal-aid postwar highway-construction program and a major part of funds indicated in this paragraph are exempted under section 1002 (g) of the Douglas amendment.

1001 (b). This paragraph is subject to the same type of objection as paragraph (a), since it attempts to operate on objects of expenditure rather than on appropriations. Furthermore, the paragraph specifies no one to allocate the reduction between the departments and agencies, merely providing for a "pro rata basis" of allocation. There is no definition as to what, in this connection, the words "pro rata" mean. Obviously, someone has got to make this interpretation. Does it mean prorated between departments on the basis of the total amount appropriated to each department for all purposes elsewhere in the bill? Does it mean prorated in relation to the total amount appropriated for each object or for all objects specified in (b) or theoretically appropriated for, again, no one can possibly tell the amount appropriated for a given object? Incidentally, if this is going to be done on a pro rata basis, it would be a very nice financial proposition to make it come out exactly \$500,000,000.

The second and third provisos would authorize department heads within their departments and the Budget Director in non-departmental agencies to make unlimited transfers and adjustments. It may be significant that the department heads, while making reductions, are required to keep the agencies within their respective departments at their "maximum of efficiency," whereas the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in making the reductions in the nondepartmental and independent agencies, is only required "to provide for maximum of efficiency." In any event, the standard of a maximum of efficiency would be difficult to attain under the reductions provided in the amendment.

The first proviso seems to require reductions in personnel where practicable to be made by eliminating 5 percent of the personnel—not 5 percent of the amount of money estimated for personnel—in the President's budget, and by filling in more than one-half of vacancies. This requirement, while it would be difficult to meet as a firm one, is actually meaningless because of the leeway granted.

The final proviso relates to the annual and sick leave for Government employees. If this subject is to be attached to the bill at all, it should be in the way of a separate amendment since it is a separate legislative problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Virginia, and other Senators, which I send to the desk. I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by these Senators, but I stated at the time it was offered that I would offer an amendment which would exclude the Economic Cooperation

Administration from the effects of the amendment. I will send the amendment forward, and have it lie on the table, and bring it up tomorrow for discussion, if the plan is to take a recess now. I should like to have the amendment stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, lines 24 and 25, it is proposed to strike out the words "paragraph headed 'Mutual Defense Assistance'" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "paragraphs headed 'Economic Cooperation', 'International Children's Welfare Work', 'International Development', and 'Mutual Defense Assistance'; so much of title III of chapter X-B as is contained in the paragraph headed 'Aid to Palestine Refugees'."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Are we to continue in session tonight, or take a recess at this time?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say, in reply to the Senator, that we will recess in a very few minutes.

Mr. President, I hope that we can finish the bill tomorrow, and I am sure the Senator from Tennessee would like to have that done.

Mr. McKELLAR. I certainly would.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Tennessee has been very constant in his attendance on the floor of the Senate for a long time, and he is not in the best of health, so I hope we can get through with the bill tomorrow. We have spent weeks on it, and I should indeed like to accommodate the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator with all my heart, and I hope the minority leader and the other Senators on the other side feel as does the majority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I see no reason why the bill should not be concluded tomorrow, unless some unforeseen amendment comes up about which we do not know at the present time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk. It is a very minor amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois offers an amendment, which will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an amendment which I intend to offer to the appropriation bill, on page 366, together with a statement which I have prepared in support of the amendment.

There being no objection the amendment intended to be proposed by Senator DOUGLAS and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 366, before the period in line 16, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used for construction of the Pine Flat Reservoir or the Isabella Reservoir, California, unless (1) within 6 months following the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Army shall have received reports with respect to the division of costs of such projects among flood control, irrigation, and other water uses from the Bureau of Reclamation and local organizations

and, within 9 months following the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have made a determination as to the allocation of such costs, and (2) repayment contracts, complying with the provisions of the reclamation laws and covering the portion of such costs allocated to irrigation and assigned for repayment by the owners of such lands, shall have been entered into by the Secretary of the Interior with irrigation, reclamation, or water districts or associations embracing at least 75 percent of the lands within the respective projects."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

The amendment which I am introducing in reference to Pine Flat and Isabella Reservoirs in California is designed to meet a situation in which there is grave danger that the repayment requirements, acreage limitations and antispeculation features of basic reclamation laws may be nullified.

The amendment would condition the expenditure of further funds under the appropriations for these two projects upon a new allocation of the costs assignable to irrigation and upon the making of repayment contracts in compliance with Federal reclamation laws by owners of 75 percent of the lands within the projects.

The first section of the amendment is similar to the provisos introduced last year by Senator HAYDEN in reference to the Isabella Reservoir alone. The second part of the amendment follows the lines of earlier recommendations of the President.

Recent developments in the Kings and Kern Rivers Valleys, where these projects are, seem to have demonstrated the clear need of this amendment. In the Senate hearings on the Army Civil Functions Appropriations for 1951 (pp. 745-749) there is a statement on the matter by Mr. M. C. Hermann, quartermaster adjutant of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of California. He reports that there is strong resistance to the signing of contracts in compliance with the law by the water users there and asserts that "we are fearful that unless Congress insists on compliance with reclamation law now, as a precondition of expending appropriations for these two projects, we will end up with the benefits of the projects in the hands of a few, and the United States Government will be whistling for a repayment contract."

He, therefore, urges Congress to follow the recommendation of President Truman in 1946 to make execution of proper repayment contracts a precondition of expenditure of moneys on the projects. He was supported in this appeal by Congressman JOHN F. SHELLEY, of the Fifth District in California.

In view of other contradictory testimony on this question, I addressed a letter to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Hon. Michael W. Straus, who replied fully confirming the principal facts set forth by Mr. Hermann.

For the information of Senators, I am glad to make available my letter and the reply of Commissioner Straus, as follows:

July 3, 1950.

Hon. MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUS: Would you be good enough to send me the information requested below in connection with the Kings and Kern River projects in California, additional appropriations for which will soon be before us in the Senate?

As you know from prior correspondence, I have been greatly interested in the favorable development of the Central Valley project and in the maintenance of the family

farm, 160 acre limitations of the reclamation law.

I note in the Senate hearings on Army civil functions appropriations for 1951, however, an important statement and proposal by Mr. M. C. Hermann, quartermaster adjutant of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of California. He asserts that the resistance to signing contracts with the 160-acre clause is still great, and if continued, may endanger the Federal investment and compliance with reclamation law. He proposes that the Senate approve a 1946 recommendation of the President that execution of proper repayment contracts be made a precondition for expenditure of funds. (Hearings, pp. 745-749.)

Congressman JOHN F. SHELLEY, of the Fifth District in California, supports this view.

On the contrary, there is other testimony to the effect that the projects are primarily flood-control projects, that the determination of \$14,250,000 as the part of the cost allocable to irrigation on the Kings River is too high and that local water users have been willing to repay a fair price, made repeated requests for a contract for 2 years prior to the unacceptable contract proposal by the Bureau in January 1950, and are still willing to negotiate a reasonable contract. (Hearings, pp. 749-758.)

I would now be grateful if you would send me:

1. Your comments on the Hermann proposal, as supported by Congressman SHELLEY.

2. Your report on the progress of negotiations for repayment contracts in line with reclamation-law policies.

3. Your estimate as to whether recent negotiations indicate any probability of such contracts being agreed upon in the near future without an affirmative legal requirement.

4. An analysis of the present reasonableness of the \$14,250,000 figure in the light of rising cost estimates, and a comment upon the appropriateness of an amendment for a new allocation, similar to that introduced by Senator HAYDEN in connection with the 1950 bill. (Hearings, p. 758.)

5. Your judgment as to whether there are other projects in addition to Pine Flat and Isabella, where similar conditions exist and to which the proviso suggested by Mr. Hermann should be made applicable.

6. Any appropriate formula which the President may have prepared since 1946 for such situations, as in the case of the Folsom project.

7. Suggestions of suitable language to insert in the pending appropriation bill, H. R. 7786, to incorporate any one or more of the above protective features.

Your assistance in furnishing this data will be greatly appreciated.

Kindest personal regards,

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1950.
Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Your letter of July 3 requested information regarding the Kings and Kern Rivers projects in California, additional appropriations for which are pending in the Army Civil Functions portion of the appropriation bill now before the Senate. In particular your letter requested information as to the negotiations for repayment contracts for the portion of the costs allocable to irrigation.

The ultimate decision on the matters dealt with in your letter is, of course, for the Congress. The reclamation laws cover such matters in the case of Federal reclamation proj-

ects and section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 indicates a congressional policy that the irrigation phases of water development projects should be handled under such laws, even though the particular project, as in the case of Pine Flat and Isabella Dams, is constructed by an agency other than the Bureau of Reclamation. The implementation of section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 in relation to the Pine Flat, Isabella, and other projects authorized and proposed in the Central Valley area of California has been before the Congress and the Executive for several years.

The following comments are in response to your specific requests for information. For convenience, your inquiries are set forth below, and after each, our comments thereon.

"(1) Your comments on the Hermann proposal, as supported by Congressman SHELLEY."

Mr. Hermann's proposal that any appropriation of funds for prosecution of the construction of Pine Flat Dam on Kings River and Isabella Dam on the Kern River be made subject to the requirement that repayment contracts first be executed by the irrigation beneficiaries would give some assurance to the Congress that its repayment policies for irrigation projects are carried out. Experience has shown, particularly in the case of projects constructed by nonreclamation agencies, that the desire of the project beneficiaries to contract for the repayment of reimbursable costs decreases progressively as construction advances. Once the Federal investment has been made, the availability of irrigation benefits, difficult to withhold, places the water users in a stronger position to insist upon obtaining the benefits upon terms which do not include requirements contained in the Federal reclamation laws.

The entire history of our negotiations with respect to repayment of the reimbursable irrigation costs of Pine Flat Dam leads me to the conclusion that without such action as Mr. Hermann recommends, it will be difficult to obtain repayment contracts within the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws. The Kings River Water Association has made this clear ever since the enactment of the Flood Control Act of 1944. Despite the wording and legislative history of that act, the local group has persisted in its stand that the project is not subject to the Federal reclamation laws and that the Secretary of the Interior is not authorized to execute the repayment contracts on behalf of the United States. It repeatedly has stated the only function with respect to which they will recognize the Secretary of the Interior is as a bargaining agent for the Secretary of the Army. If no condition of the type that Mr. Hermann suggests is attached to the use of funds for Pine Flat Dam construction, there may be no contracts executed before the project is completed. If the project is completed before repayment contracts are executed, it is highly doubtful that contracts will be obtained that will be subject to the Federal reclamation laws, since it will be difficult for any agency to withhold the irrigation benefits. Reclamation could hardly be an effective withholding agency, while not even operating the dam.

It is highly important that the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws be applied in this area as well as the Central Valley project of which Pine Flat Dam should be a part. It would be discriminatory for the Kings River water users to obtain the substantial reclamation benefits free of the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws; for example, while their neighbors in the Central Valley project are required by the Congress to meet the requirements of those provisions. Mr. Hermann's organization is comprised of veterans. Veterans, as well as taxpayers in general, are entitled to insist that these requirements be applied in the Kings River area to the fullest extent

possible. I am not suggesting that there will be vast areas available for settlement by veterans. That can be determined only in the future. I do feel, however, that whatever conditions are contained in the Federal reclamation laws which could conceivably afford settlement opportunities should be preserved as a statutory and contractual matter. This has not been done and it may not be done if the construction of the project is completed before the repayment contracts are executed.

"(2) Your report on the progress of negotiations for repayment contracts in line with reclamation law policies."

Progress of the negotiations for repayment contracts in line with reclamation law policies has been practically nil. The Kings River Water Association consistently has refused to recognize the applicability of the reclamation laws to the principal benefits which will be derived from the Pine Flat project. This attitude is best reflected from quotations from correspondence. In July 1946, the association stated, as a condition precedent to the negotiation and execution of repayment contracts, "That any so-called acreage limitations shall not apply to land now having water rights or [rights to service from parties to this agreement]." [Matter in brackets supplied.] The major portion of the irrigation benefits to be derived from Pine Flat Dam will arise from reregulatory service and it is with respect to this type of service that the association insists the excess-land provisions stipulated by the Congress should not be applicable.

In a letter dated March 2, 1950, to the Fresno office of the Bureau of Reclamation, the theory of the nonapplicability of the excess-land provisions of the law was extended to new water supplies as well as the reregulatory service to be provided by Pine Flat Dam. In that letter it was stated, "Some water now leaving the Kings River area will be regulated in Pine Flat. This is the so-called new water as this term has been used in past discussions. Whether this type of water comes within the terms of reclamation law is primarily a matter of interpretation of the 1944 Flood Control Act, particularly section 8 and the specific authorization of this project. We are advised that this project contains no additional works bringing it within the scope of section 8 of this act."

In addition, the association refuses to acknowledge that the Secretary of the Interior has the authority to execute the necessary repayment contracts. In a letter dated June 27 of this year, Mr. Philip A. Gordon, chairman of the Kings River Water Association, stated, "In conclusion, let us remind you that we propose to negotiate with the Bureau of Reclamation, 'for conservation storage when used' in Pine Flat Reservoir, as Congress directed in the Flood Control Act of 1944. Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and that we recognize no legal authority under which the Bureau of Reclamation can act in these negotiations in any other capacity than as a bargaining agent for the United States. In short, we propose to adhere to our original offer to pay for actual benefits what they are reasonably worth, and we also insist on negotiating within the conditions clearly laid down by Congress in Public Law 534." If the association continues to adhere to this position, it is clear that no contracts can be executed since the Flood Control Act of 1944 clearly requires that the contracts be subject to the Federal reclamation laws and that they be executed by the Secretary of the Interior. Other points, not dealing with the Federal reclamation laws, probably will be resolved by negotiation. The legal requirements, however, are not subject to negotiation and therefore even if all other terms are agreed upon, negotiation inevitably will fail unless the water users will accept the law.

"(3) Your estimate as to whether recent negotiations indicate any probability of such contracts being agreed upon in the near future without an affirmative legal requirement."

For the reasons already stated and some additional reasons which I shall point out, I am of the opinion repayment contracts subject to the Federal reclamation laws could be executed in the near future much more readily with an affirmative additional legal requirement laid down by the Congress.

While I believe that most of the major issues aside from the requirements of the Federal reclamation laws could be resolved, the negotiations we have had with the local groups and the statements issued by them lead me to the conclusion that in order to protect the investment of the Federal Government and in order to insure that the intention of the Congress with respect to the application of the Federal reclamation laws will be accomplished, a legal requirement such as is proposed would assist the execution of contracts in the near future.

The attitude of the local interests with respect to the matter was made clear in the hearings on H. R. 4485, which later became the Flood Control Act of 1944. The Committee on Flood Control, in reporting on the bill, stated, "Local interests are so strongly in opposition to a project built under reclamation law that they have stated that rather than have the project built by the Bureau (H. Rept. No. 1309, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) It appears that the local interests are fond of Federal funds but not the terms of Federal law. Since that time the local interests have reiterated this view."

"(4) An analysis of the present reasonableness of the \$14,250,000 figure in the light of rising cost estimates, and a comment upon the appropriateness of an amendment for a new allocation, similar to that introduced by Senator HAYDEN in connection with the 1950 bill (Hearings, p. 758)."

It is my opinion that \$14,250,000 as a reimbursable allocation to irrigation is not up to date in view of the increased costs of the project. The original amount of \$14,250,000, recommended in 1946, was based upon a then estimated total construction cost of \$36,500,000. The latest cost estimate is closer to \$50,000,000. Even representatives of the Kings River Water Association in testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, at hearings on items for civil functions, Department of the Army, 1951, stated that information in their possession indicated the actual cost would be in the neighborhood of \$45,000,000, which is some \$8,500,000 more than the cost upon which the \$14,250,000 repayment was based. The sum of \$14,250,000 paid over a period of 40 years, together with the estimated annual operation and maintenance costs, would result in an annual per-acre charge of about \$0.44 for the approximately 1,000,000 assessable acres in the Kings River area. If the actual construction costs were to be \$50,000,000 and the irrigation allocation increased accordingly, the annual charge would still be well within the payment ability of an area represented by the local witnesses before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee as one of the most prosperous farming communities in the world. (The water users have by no means agreed to pay \$14,250,000. The only offer made so far is to pay only \$10,000,000.) It should be borne in mind that the reclamation laws look toward repayments based upon actual costs not estimates alone. Consistency with the congressionally approved policies reflected in the reclamation laws would appear to require that Pine Flat be considered in a similar fashion.

With respect to Kern River, the Bureau of Reclamation has conducted no negotiations with the prospective beneficiaries of Isabella Dam. We have had no part in dis-

cussions relating to cost allocation. I believe that a provision on reclamation's participation in those studies, similar to the provisions respecting Pine Flat Dam contained in the War Department Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1947, would be appropriate. There is every reason to believe we will be faced with the same problems with respect to Isabella that are now being encountered in connection with Pine Flat, a matter to which the President called attention in his letter to Senator McKELLAR, dated April 8, 1949, set forth at page 641 of the Senate hearings on the civil functions bill for 1950.

"(5) Your judgment as to whether there are other projects in addition to Pine Flat Dam and Isabella where similar conditions exist and to which the proviso suggested by Mr. Hermann should be made applicable."

Were such a requisite as Mr. Hermann has described made applicable to all projects constructed by other agencies which serve irrigation functions, the Congress would come nearer achieving its reclamation repayment policy. In the case of projects to be constructed by reclamation, there is no question of the applicability of the reclamation laws, however, where the project is constructed by other agencies that question is the one which most delays the execution of repayment contracts. Bureau of Reclamation policy is to insist upon proper assurances of repayment of irrigation allocations in advance of the initiation of construction.

"(6) Any appropriate formula which the President may have prepared since 1946 for such situations, as in the case of the Folsom project."

The President, in a letter dated August 15, 1949, to the Secretary of the Interior, set forth at page 5 of Senate Document 113, Eighty-first Congress, first session, stated with respect to the Central Valley:

"The existing construction authorizations of the Corps of Engineers for the New Melones, Black Butte, and New Hogan multiple-purpose reservoir projects, and the Pine Flat, Isabella, Folsom, Terminus and Success multiple-purpose reservoir projects after completion of construction by the Corps of Engineers, should be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation."

"As additional individual proposed projects not now authorized are found feasible on the basis of detailed projects reports, they will be approved for authorization in accordance with the Folsom formula, i. e., multiple-purpose dams are the responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation and dams and other works exclusively for flood control are the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers."

"I believe that cooperative effort by your Department and the Department of the Army under the functional division of responsibility outlined above will not only facilitate the development and attainment of a sound comprehensive valley plan without duplication of effort and overlapping of jurisdiction, but will provide for unified administration and operation of the completed works which are essential to the best utilization of the benefits from the project as set forth in my message to the Congress on January 12, 1948, House Document No. 496."

These recommendations of the President are before the Congress for action. They go to the crux of the situation. If these recommendations were to be adopted, the basic solution of the problem would be at hand, because the projects in question would be governed by the Federal reclamation laws.

"(7) Suggestions of suitable language to insert in the pending appropriations bill H. R. 7786, to incorporate any one or more of the above protective features."

Pending the enactment of legislation transferring these projects to the Department of the Interior as recommended by the President, the objectives which you and Mr. Hermann have outlined would be met by the in-

clusion of a general requirement along the following lines in the civil functions portion of the appropriation bill:

"All projects authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944, for construction by the Department of the Army, as well as all other projects thereafter authorized for construction by that Department, to the extent that a portion of the cost is or has been allocated to irrigation and assigned for repayment by the project beneficiaries and for which repayment contracts have not been executed, shall be subject to section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, notwithstanding the fact that no additional works for irrigation are necessary, and no funds hereafter appropriated shall be available for expenditure for the construction of any such project unless and until the irrigation beneficiaries shall have executed repayment contracts with the Secretary of the Interior covering at least 50 percent of said reimbursable allocation to irrigation."

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
Commissioner.

It therefore appears that (a) there is determined opposition to the signing of repayment contracts in compliance with reclamation laws, (b) very substantial irrigation benefits can be secured by landowners from the mere construction of the dams and the raising of the underground water level, (c) evasion of reclamation law in these projects will make it very difficult to enforce these carefully developed policies of the Government in other parts of the Central Valley and elsewhere in the country, (d) the \$10,000,000 figure pressed by some water users as a repayment limit in the Kings River Valley (Pine Flat Reservoir) and the \$14,250,000 figure earlier suggested by the Bureau of Reclamation both seem too low in view of the present cost estimates of \$51,121,000 and the 1948 report of the Corps of Engineers that over 60 percent of the benefits of the project will be to irrigation, and (e) the only effective way to enforce reclamation policies here is by requiring compliance prior to completion of construction of the projects.

The President has on a number of occasions revealed his clear understanding of these issues and appealed for such a proviso in connection with any further appropriations for these projects. For the further information of Senators, I also submit a copy of the President's letter of April 8, 1949, to Senator McKELLAR (Civil Functions, 1950 Appropriations, Senate Hearings, pp. 641-642) as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 8, 1949.

Hon. KENNETH McKELLAR,
Chairman, Senate Committee on
Appropriations,

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: When I approved the War Department Civil Functions Appropriations Act of 1947, I issued a statement on May 3, 1946, expressing gratification that the Congress, by the addition of provisos to the item for the Kings River project in California, had afforded an opportunity for assuring that the Federal reclamation policy, including repayment and wide distribution of benefits, would apply to the project. The Kings River project was the first of several similar projects in that area on which actual construction was to have begun by the Corps of Engineers. Construction of that project is now continuing as is construction on the second of these four dams: namely, the Isabella Dam. In addition, funds have been provided in the pending civil-functions appropriation bill to undertake detailed plans and specifications for the remaining two dams in this series: namely, the Terminus and Success Dams.

All of the reservoirs created by these dams will serve multiple purposes and in substantial measure are to serve irrigation needs in

that part of the Central Valley, as well as to provide flood control. The disposition of the irrigation service in all four cases should be by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the reclamation laws.

In addition, because of the physical characteristics of the area, I am sure that we all recognize that, even if these particular reservoirs are built and operated solely for flood control, a substantial portion of the total potential irrigation benefits will result inevitably as incidental to the manner in which these reservoirs must be operated for flood control. Thus, as shown by experience in other cases, the most effective manner of assuring suitable repayment arrangements for the incidental as well as the direct irrigation services would be provided by agreement on those arrangements in advance of construction.

I urge, therefore, that, if the Congress deems it wise to appropriate funds for work on any of these reservoirs, the bill provide for irrigation service to be rendered through the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the reclamation law. In doing so, I hope that the Congress will also find suitable means of safeguarding the Federal investment through assurance of suitable repayment arrangements.

Because of the importance of this matter to the integrity of the great Central Valley project of the Bureau of Reclamation, of which these reservoirs by their very nature must necessarily serve as a part, I hope that it may have your careful consideration.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

ADVANCED TRAINING IN AERONAUTICS OF TECHNICAL PERSONNEL OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4) authorizing the advanced training in aeronautics of technical personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which were, on page 1, line 5, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary of Commerce"; on page 1, line 10, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary of Commerce"; on page 1, line 11, strike out "not to exceed twenty-five"; on page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary of Commerce"; on page 2, line 11, after "aviation," insert "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$50,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection," and on page 2, line 12, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary of Commerce."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AID TO STATES IN FISH RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT PROJECTS—REEN- ROLLMENT OF H. R. 6533

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 249, authorizing the Clerk of the House to make a change in the enrollment of H. R. 6533, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 6533) to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes, is authorized and

directed to strike out paragraph (c) of section 2 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) the formulation and adoption of plans of restocking waters with food, and game fishes according to natural areas or districts to which such plans are applicable, together with the acquisition of such facts as are necessary to the formulation, execution, and testing the efficacy of such plans."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

CONTROLS OVER WAGES, PRICES, AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF GOODS—LET- TER FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the President of the United States has sent a letter to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which I desire to have placed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing you in response to your request for my views on the expressed desire of various Members of the Senate to add to the defense production bill (S. 3936) some kind of authority for direct controls over wages, prices, and the distribution of goods to consumers.

It is urgently necessary that the Congress act on the defense production bill without delay. If this measure is enacted promptly, we can do a great deal to ease the economic adjustments which our defense effort will require. At the same time, we can continue, on an expedited but careful basis, our planning and preparation for other economic controls, if and when needed.

Of course, there is no objection, in these circumstances, to enactment of additional stand-by control powers which the President could invoke when the need arose. Before my message of July 19, I gave careful thought to the desirability of asking at once for stand-by authority to control prices and wages, and to ration at the consumer level. I refrained from making this proposal to the Congress because it seemed more important to obtain quick action on the powers contained in the defense production bill. To have included a request for stand-by controls might, it seems to me, have dangerously delayed enactment of the immediate program, while the Congress considered these broader authorities. My recommendations of July 19 were designed to meet the problems immediately before us.

The Congress, in its judgment, may now want to make price, wage, and rationing controls available, on a stand-by basis, for use if and when needed. But if the Congress were to take this course, the following conditions appear essential.

First. These additional controls should be supplementary to, and not in lieu of, the basic powers already contained in the defense production bill. The production aids and limited controls for which I have asked are essential now.

Second. We cannot afford to bog down or delay in enacting what is needed at once, and supplementary provisions should be added only if they do not prolong consideration or delay action in either House.

Third. Any provisions relating to prices and wages should not set up a rigid formula

or freeze in advance of experience. If these powers are now made available in advance of widespread need, it is simple common sense that they must be written in a form which allows wide discretion and flexibility as to the method and place and timing of application.

Fourth. For the same reason, any grant of price and wage authority should leave open the question of the method of administration. This should remain flexible, because it cannot be separated from the question of the extent to which price and wage controls actually might have to be applied.

If these reasonable conditions can be met, I should have no objection to the granting of authority beyond that requested in my message of July 19. But if, for any reason, these conditions cannot be met, I urge strongly that the Congress move at once to enact the defense production bill without including these additional powers.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

AUGUST 1, 1950.

LOCAL 50, INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION, AND THE WAR IN KOREA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to read a resolution I have received, and make a very brief comment on it. It is a resolution that was passed by Local 50 of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union of Astoria, Oreg., dated July 9, 1950.

As a preface to the reading of the resolution, I wish to point out that for some years there has been a conflict within various maritime unions on the west coast as between the so-called right wing and the left wing. By left wing we mean those who within the maritime union have been following the Communist Party line.

I desire to say, as a Senator from the State of Oregon, that I am very proud of the fact that the members of Local 50 of the ILWU of Astoria, Oreg., on July 9 passed this resolution. It is about as clear evidence as can be offered that there is in a great number of the ILWU locals on the Pacific coast control by the right-wing element. I believe that when men take a stand against communism and make a fight against communism, as these free American workers within the maritime unions have been doing, it is worthy of comment and compliment on the floor of the Senate, and I am pleased to make such comment at this time in this form by reading the resolution.

The communication I have received is as follows:

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was adopted by the officers and membership of Local 50, ILWU, the longshoremen of Astoria, Oreg., on July 9, 1950, in a special meeting:

"Whereas we, the longshoremen of the port of Astoria, banded together in Local 50, are American citizens, proud of our country and loyal to it; and

"Whereas serious international trouble has broken out in Korea, caused by the invasion of southern Korea by the Communist northern Korean Army; and

"Whereas in many places doubts have been cast on our loyalty as American citizens by recent local statements that the longshoremen are Communist dominated: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, the longshoremen of Local 50, ILWU, in no uncertain terms, condemn the act of aggression by the Commu-

nist North Korean Army in breaking the peace and invading South Korea; and be it further

"Resolved, That we go on record without any reservations that we will support our Government and President 100 percent in this great crisis, and we will load any and all cargoes destined for the war area; and be it still further

"Resolved, That we shall not join in, condone, or recognize any Communist demonstrations, picket lines, etc.; and be it finally

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, Senators WAYNE MORSE and GUY CORDON, Congressman WALTER NORBLAD, and the press."

Yours very truly,

HARRY LARSON,

Secretary.

I am very proud of the action taken by local 50 in Astoria, Oreg., and I am satisfied that a majority, and I think a large majority, of the workers in the maritime unions, whose work is so vital to the security of our country, can be counted upon to rally to their patriotic duty, as have the members of local 50 of Astoria, Oreg.

THE KOREAN WAR SITUATION—POSITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION IN HONOLULU

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD several newspaper clippings and editorials from Honolulu regarding the position taken by the I. L. W. U. union there with reference to the Korean war situation.

First is a clipping from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of July 26, 1950, giving the full text of the statement of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union in Hawaii regarding the Korean situation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF THE ILWU STATEMENT ON UNION'S POSITION IN KOREA ACTION

Following is the text of the local ILWU policy statement on UN and United States action in Korea. The statement, on behalf of the four ILWU local groups, was given to the Star-Bulletin this morning. The four groups are the sugar, pineapple, longshoremen's and warehousemen's and miscellaneous.

"Members of the ILWU are loyal Americans as the record conclusively proves. We all support our Government in the Korean police action which was sanctioned by the Security Council of the United Nations. Our locals will cooperate fully with our Government in this action.

"However, we deplore war and we earnestly believe that all international disputes should be settled peacefully through the machinery of the United Nations, without recourse to force of arms, so that the possibility of an atomic world war III might be avoided. This position is the same as that expressed by our union when the Arabs invaded Israel and the Dutch invaded the Indonesian Republic."

USING THE KOREAN SITUATION

"While we support our Government, we must express publicly our real concern about the speed with which certain employer elements in this community, including most newspapers, have seized upon the Korean situation as a smoke screen behind which they are carrying on an increasingly stepped-up campaign to split our union and to wipe out our economic gains.

"These elements are using the Korean situation to divert attention from their plot to speed up their production and to increase profits by getting more work out of less men for less money.

"This selfish program can only result in aggravating Hawaii's chronic unemployment situation."

WE WARN EVERYONE

"We warn everyone not to forget that the reduction in our unemployment rolls which is resulting from a move toward a war economy is but temporary and a return to stabilized economy with peace on the international scene will find unemployment and depression for Hawaii much worse than the recent chaos, should we permit the destruction of our wage and working standards by certain employers acting under their self-tailored cloak of 'patriotism.'"

SEES HORRIBLE EXAMPLE

"Already we have one horrible example of this employer technique.

"A walk-out at Kekaha 10 days ago over the attempt of a sugar company to increase the workload of employees (which was since settled to the satisfaction of the workers) prompted a scurrilous employer newspaper to editorialize that the walk-out was organized by ILWU leadership to aid communism and North Korea.

"A simple, but defeated employer scheme to speed up employees thus becomes a 'red' plot."

WE SERVE NOTICE ON EMPLOYERS

"We serve notice upon any employers who may harbor such plans that we are not going to be intimidated into surrendering our hard-won wages and working conditions because of a phony, profit-inspired clamor that it is necessary for us to do so if we are to prove our loyalty to the Nation.

"We workers of Hawaii have had something more than our share of this 'loyalty' line during the last war when we suffered under the heel of martial law.

"We will not soon forget how we were ordered to 'work to win' and frozen to ill-paid jobs under miserable conditions while tens of thousands of other workers were imported for the relatively well-paid jobs in military employment. We can't and won't tolerate such discrimination in the future."

LOYALTY TO AMERICA

"Loyalty to America is one thing that must be indivisible and universal. It must apply equally to employers and workers.

"Employers must not be permitted to take advantage of their employees in this Korean situation as they did in World War II.

"The future will prove, as has the past, that the loyalty of the ILWU and its members cannot honestly be questioned.

"And, if labor peace is mandatory at this time, we are prepared to meet the employers halfway on the basis of mutual confidence, respect, and fair play.

"If it can't be achieved on that simple, honest basis, then serious consideration must be given to the establishment of machinery such as the war labor boards of World War II for the peaceful adjudication of labor disputes."

Mr. BUTLER. Second, Mr. President, an editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of the same date in which it is pointed out that "to date the ILWU has not backed the Government in its move to bar Communists and other subversives from American ships."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE DOES THE ILWU STAND ON KOREA?

(Since this editorial was written the ILWU has partially clarified its stand. A local statement, given out last night, says in part: "Members of the ILWU are loyal Americans

merly made available in such area or region by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

S. 3012. An act for the relief of Mrs. Osa J. Petty;

S. 3098. An act to amend section 104 of title 28 of the United States Code so as to create a Greenville division in the northern district of Mississippi, with terms of court to be held at Greenville;

S. 3163. An act for the relief of Mrs. Houora Redman;

S. 3253. An act for the relief of Lyon F. Hibberd and the estate of George T. Erb;

S. 3377. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 3585. An act for the relief of Dodge County, Wis.;

S. 3652. An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government;

S. 3653. An act to provide for financing the operations of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 3832. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the Ogden River Water Users' Association, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes;

S. 3833. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the South Cache Water Users' Association, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution authorizing the return to Mexico of the flags, standards, colors, and emblems that were captured by the United States in the Mexican War; and

S. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of Missouri and the State of Kansas establishing a boundary between said States.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 4002. A bill to simplify administration in the Government service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 4003. A bill for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 4004. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Despina Hodos; and

S. 4005. A bill for the relief of Titus Radulesco-Pogoneano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 4006. A bill to exempt certain civilian employees of the Department of Defense from the laws governing the employment, removal, classification, pay, retirement, and leave of Federal officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 4007. A bill for the relief of Kozuko Kudo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7786, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7786, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REDUCTION OF EXCISE TAXES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 8920) to reduce excise taxes and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 3278. An act to amend section 22 (d) (6) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to involuntary liquidation and replacement of inventory;

H. R. 6343. An act relating to customs duties on articles coming into the United States from the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 7891. An act to amend section 2224 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the transportation of narcotic drugs; and

H. R. 8992. An act to eliminate the additional internal-revenue taxes on coconut oil coming from the trust territory of the Pacific islands, and for other purposes.

SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS—LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by the President to the Librarian of Congress on the occasion marking the sesquicentennial of the Library of Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BARREN YEARS—ADDRESS BY COLGATE W. DARDEN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Barren Years," delivered by the Honorable Colgate W. Darden, president of the University of Virginia, at the Twentieth Judicial Conference of the Fourth District, held at Asheville, N. C., on June 23, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE EFFECT OF THE KOREAN SITUATION ON RELATIONS BETWEEN POLITICAL PARTIES—ARTICLE BY GOULD LINCOLN

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "War in Korea Stimulates Party Warfare at Home," written by Gould Lincoln, and published in the Washington Evening Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL SPENDING—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Administration's Duty," published in the Milwaukee Sentinel July 27, 1950, and an editorial from the Chippewa Falls Herald-Telegram, which appear in the Appendix.]

UNION NOW FORESIGHTED—ARTICLE BY CLARENCE K. STREIT

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the second of a series of five articles by Clarence Streit, editor of Freedom and Union, under the headline "Korea's Lesson: The Free Must

Federate Sooner," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE KOREAN WAR—ARTICLE BY DREW PEARSON

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article concerning the Korean war by Drew Pearson, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT DOES CVA MEAN TO YOU?—DISCUSSION BY SENATOR WATKINS AND ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR DAVIDSON

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio discussion entitled "What Does CVA Mean to You?" between himself and C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, on July 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONVENTIONS CONCERNING NIGHT WORK OF WOMEN AND YOUNG PERSONS EMPLOYED IN INDUSTRY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 676)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the obligation of the Government of the United States of America as a member of the International Labor Organization, I transmit herewith, for the enactment of legislation or such other action as the Congress may consider appropriate, authentic texts of a convention (No. 89) concerning night work of women employed in industry (revised 1948), and a convention (No. 90) concerning night work of young persons employed in industry (revised 1948), both of which were adopted by the International Labor Conference at its thirty-first session, held at San Francisco June 17 to July 10, 1948.

I transmit also the report of the Secretary of State with regard to the conventions, together with a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Labor to the Secretary of State regarding those conventions. Attention is invited to the recommendation of the interested departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government, as set forth in the above-mentioned letter, that no Federal legislative action, except with respect to the District of Columbia, be taken.

Under the constitution of the International Labor Organization there is also contemplated appropriate action by a member in respect of territories for which it has responsibility for the conduct of international relations. I am, accordingly, requesting the Secretary of the Interior to transmit the above-mentioned conventions to the Governments of Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands for the enactment of legislation or other action. In addition, I am requesting the Secretary of the Navy to take such action as may be appropriate with respect to American Samoa and the Territory of the Pacific Islands.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 2, 1950.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO HAVE BEEN AWARDED THE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I have had a search made to find the number of Members of Congress who have received the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest military award of our Nation. I find that five Senators have been awarded the Medal of Honor. They are former Senators Ames, Dupont, Quay, Sewell, and Warren. Former Senator Warren was the father-in-law of General Pershing. Twelve Members of the House of Representatives received the Medal of Honor.

I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members of Congress awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, 1862-1950

Name	State	Service in Congress
SENATORS		
Adelbert Ames.....	Mississippi.....	Feb. 23, 1870, to Jan. 10, 1874.
Henry A. Dupont.....	Delaware.....	June 13, 1906, to Mar. 3, 1917.
Matthew S. Quay.....	Pennsylvania.....	Mar. 4, 1887, to Apr. 24, 1900.
William Joyce Sewell.....	New Jersey.....	Jan. 16, 1901, to May 24, 1904.
Francis E. Warren.....	Wyoming.....	Mar. 4, 1881, to Mar. 3, 1887.
		Mar. 4, 1895, to Dec. 27, 1901.
		Mar. 4, 1895, to Nov. 24, 1929.
REPRESENTATIVES		
Henry H. Bingham.....	Pennsylvania.....	Mar. 4, 1879, to Mar. 22, 1912.
John C. Black.....	Illinois.....	Mar. 4, 1893, to Jan. 12, 1895.
Thomas Wilson Bradley.....	New York.....	Mar. 3, 1903, to Mar. 3, 1913.
Amos J. Cummings.....	do.....	Mar. 4, 1887, to May 2, 1902.
Newton N. Curtis.....	do.....	Nov. 3, 1891, to Mar. 3, 1897.
Byron M. Cutcheon.....	Michigan.....	Mar. 4, 1883, to Mar. 3, 1891.
John M. Farquhar.....	New York.....	Mar. 4, 1885, to Mar. 3, 1891.
John H. Moffitt.....	do.....	Mar. 4, 1887, to Mar. 3, 1891.
Charles E. Phelps.....	Maryland.....	Mar. 4, 1865, to Mar. 3, 1869.
Philip S. Post.....	Illinois.....	Mar. 4, 1887, to Jan. 6, 1895.
Daniel E. Sickles.....	New York.....	Mar. 4, 1857, to Mar. 3, 1861.
William E. Simonds.....	Connecticut.....	Mar. 4, 1893, to Mar. 3, 1895.
		Mar. 4, 1889, to Mar. 3, 1891.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, if there are no further routine matters, I should like to have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] offered an amendment and was on his feet seeking recognition when routine matters were taken up, and the Chair feels he should recognize the Senator from New Jersey first.

Mr. FLANDERS. Very well.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to

the amendment I offered yesterday to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and other Senators, and to explain the reason for offering the amendment to that amendment.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment, making a 10 percent cut in the non-military items of the pending appropriation bill, but I feel that we would be making a critical mistake if we included in the amendment the ECA. I have added to the exemption for ECA certain other items in chapter X-B which it seemed to me were small in amount, and which might be affected to a greater or less degree if we did not include them in the exemption.

The purpose of my amendment is to add to the exemptions from the Byrd-Bridges amendment the ECA and these other small items, the total of which is relatively so small that I think the psychology of not cutting them would be valuable. I address my remarks principally to the ECA, because of a very simple fact. The Senate passed an authorization for ECA of \$2,700,000,000, but the appropriations committee reduced this practically 10 percent.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in giving the figures of the authorization the Senator from New Jersey failed to state that the authorization also included any unexpended balance, which amounted to about \$276,000,000 more. So that would have to be added to the figure he gave, if we are to have before us the full amount Congress authorized.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I was going to say, Mr. President, that the inclusion of the unexpended balance would add \$277,000,000 more, making a total of \$2,726,761,437, including the carry-over. That already has been cut by the Appropriations Committee approximately 10 percent. The reason I am asking to have the ECA exempted from the Byrd-Bridges amendment is that unless that is done it would mean a second 10 percent cut, or a total of 20 percent from the figure the Senate authorized.

Mr. THYE and Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have studied the full effect of the 10 percent reduction, and, after having discussed the proposal at some length with the very able Senator from New Jersey, I have come to the conclusion that the Senator from New Jersey is entirely correct in offering his amendment to exempt ECA from the 10 percent reduction which the Byrd-Bridges amendment proposes. Therefore, as one of the cosponsors of the Byrd-Bridges amendment I urge my colleagues to support the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey so that the ECA will be exempt from the 10 percent reduction proposed by the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BYRD, Mr. ROBERTSON, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield first to the senior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Is it not true that the 10 percent reduction made by the committee is less than the carry-over? In other words, there was \$276,000,000 not spent in the past fiscal year. The 10 percent reduction is \$265,000,000. What the committee had in mind was to make a reduction approximately the same as the unexpended balance, the amount which has not been expended, but which, of course, could have been expended. However, it has not been expended.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will say to the senior Senator from Virginia that I have talked this matter over very fully with Mr. Hoffman and members of his staff and I found that they were willing to accept the proposed reduction because they had the two-hundred-and-seventy-odd-million-dollar carry-over, which made it possible for them to operate on the minimum budget. Therefore I was very happy yesterday when the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] bringing the figure up of \$2,450,000,000, plus the carry-over, was adopted, because that provided an appropriation under which Mr. Hoffman and his group felt they could carry on. That reflected a 10-percent cut in the amount authorized by the Senate when the authorization bill was sent to conference, and ultimately as it went to the Appropriations Committee.

I am maintaining that if we permit ECA to be subject to the 10-percent reduction which is called for by the Byrd-Bridges amendment, we shall be asking the ECA to take a 20-percent over-all cut, as against the 10-percent cut which was practically agreed to in fixing the figure the Senator from Arizona had approved yesterday.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I can explain to my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Jersey, that when we reached the ECA item in our committee, by a vote of 17 to 3 we agreed upon the figure of \$2,450,000,000 of new money, plus the carry-over, which was approximately \$276,000,000. As the Senator has said, that was approximately 10 percent below the authorization. Then, after we had finished all the items in the military assistance section of the bill, of which the foreign-aid item was one, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] offered an amendment to cut the nonmilitary provisions of that title 10 percent below the budget estimate. That amendment was carried by a vote of 12 to 11.

So this week the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] offered an amendment, which was adopted, which restores the \$58,000,000, the difference between what the committee had previously agreed to and 10 percent below the budget estimate.

If we now apply the proposed horizontal cut to this fund, it will not be 10 per-

cent below what the Congress authorized, and it will not be 10 percent below the budget, but, as the distinguished Senator from New Jersey has already pointed out, in a base that already is approximately 10 percent below the budget estimate, we shall have cut the fund \$272,600,000 more, because the presently proposed 10-percent reduction not only applies to the new money, but also to the carry-over, so it applies to the total of \$2,726,000,000, if that is the correct figure.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is \$2,726,761,473, including the carry-over.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then the Byrd-Bridges amendment will cut that fund by \$272,000,000 plus. That is the effect of the amendment.

Furthermore, increased prices already have reduced the effectiveness of the program by approximately \$300,000,000; and prices are still rising.

Mr. Hoffman and his assistant, Mr. William Foster, have told me that if we impose this additional cut upon ECA, it will be absolutely impossible for ECA to do an effective job. They say we simply face the question of whether we believe in this program, whether we wish to rehabilitate our allies, whether we wish to carry the work further, or whether we wish to cut the funds to a point where the program will be nullified.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I thank the junior Senator from Virginia for his exposition, because it brings out exactly what I have been maintaining, namely, that in my judgment the leaders of the ECA operation have cooperated with those of us, like myself, on the Foreign Relations Committee who have been studying this matter very closely. They have sharpened their pencils and have tried to make every possible saving. Of course they have reported their carry-over, and they include it in the total.

So, actually, \$2,450,000,000 is the only new money we shall be appropriating, as the matter now stands. With that as a base, if we cut the amount 10 percent further, the result will be, in my judgment, that the effectiveness of ECA will be seriously jeopardized. I wish to stress that point.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I desire to commend the Senator from New Jersey for the position he has taken with respect to the ECA funds. Certainly I shall give him all the support I can as majority leader in respect to adoption of the amendment which he has offered.

As has been said here again and again, the Appropriations Committee went over the ECA program with a fine-toothed comb, and came to a conclusion, by a vote of 17 to 3, as to the proper amount necessary to carry on effectively the ECA program. That was done after all the testimony had been received and after the members of the committee had listened to Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Foster, and others who are vitally interested in this matter from the standpoint of the proper and effective administration of ECA and its funds.

Now to take a meat ax and cut 10 percent from the ECA appropriation would absolutely cripple the ECA operations to the point where there would be chaos and confusion in its administration and the effectiveness of the program would be largely destroyed.

In view of the fact that my friend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is so strongly in favor of the bipartisan foreign policy, and has gone along with the ECA program all the way through, I cannot understand how at this particular time in the history of this country and of the world, in view of present conditions, he could join in an attempt to cripple the ECA by a further 10-percent reduction.

From my examination of the evidence and on the basis of what I know about this matter, I undertake to say that a further 10-percent reduction will cripple the ECA. Certainly this is no time to fool around with cutting the ECA funds. This is a time when we should carry out our international obligations in order to maintain at a high level the morale of those in Europe who are the beneficiaries of this fund. Instead of discouraging them, we should encourage them at this time by standing firm on our international commitments. I wish to make that statement for the benefit of the RECORD, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his support.

When I associated myself with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in sponsoring the amendment calling for a 10-percent cut, I announced that I would bring up this point in behalf of ECA when the matter came up for debate.

The other approach which might be followed would be to request a higher base for the ECA appropriation, and then permit the cut to be made. However, it seems to me that the better procedure is to exempt the ECA appropriation from the cut, in order that we shall not be put in the position of crippling our all-out international and military efforts at this time. I insist that at this time the ECA program must be coupled with our military assistance program. Accordingly, we are jeopardizing our position if we make such a cut in the case of funds appropriated for the benefit of countries which are joined with us in the international and military picture.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to say a word of explanation in connection with this situation.

In the first place, I agree with the Senator from Illinois that certainly we do not wish to cripple the ECA. However, there is a division of opinion as to whether the amendment would cripple it or would not cripple it.

Let me give the picture as I see it and understand it to be. To begin with, I have voted against every amendment—both in connection with the authorization and in connection with the appropriations bill—which I thought would

cripple the work of the ECA; but I have supported amendments which would reduce both the authorization and the appropriation to what I thought were amounts within reason.

As the Senator will recall, there was originally requested \$2,950,000,000 plus the carry-over. On the floor of the Senate that was reduced by an amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, by \$250,000,000, so far as the total authorization was concerned. Another amendment to reduce the authorization by \$500,000,000 was lost on a tie vote, and a third amendment which would have cut it by \$1,000,000,000 was lost by a substantial vote.

The Senator from New Hampshire voted for his own amendment, which reduced it \$250,000,000. He also voted for the amendment which lost on a tie vote, which would have reduced it \$500,000,000. He voted against the \$1,000,000,000 cut.

I shall now refer to the action in the Appropriations Committee. In February 1950, it was estimated that there would be a carry-over of \$149,000,000. In May that was increased, and it was estimated there would be a carry-over of \$276,000,000, approximately \$127,000,000 more than the carry-over estimated in February. I do not know what the actual figure was. It was certainly as much as \$276,000,000, and it may have been more than that. But at any rate, from that source, entirely apart from current appropriations, there was a carry-over substantially more than a quarter of a million dollars. The Budget Bureau then requested, instead of the full amount of the authorization, which was \$2,700,000,000, \$2,657,700,000. The Appropriations Committee reduced that first to \$2,450,000,000, which is the amount to which the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from New Jersey referred.

There was then an amendment adopted, reducing the entire ECA by 10 percent, which would actually cut \$58,000,000 more from ECA, making the total cut by the Appropriations Committee some \$308,000,000. But that was not a net cut, because the carry-over was increased from \$149,000,000 to \$276,000,000. So it was only a net cut of something under half of that. On the Senate floor, I think it was yesterday, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] offered an amendment which restored \$58,000,000, so that we have now boosted this up \$58,000,000.

So that, while I know the Senator from New Jersey is very ably presenting his case, and while I think there is logic in what he says, I believe that, when we study the history of the requests relating to this appropriation, there need be no fear, as expressed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, about crippling the ECA. Certainly I do not want to cripple ECA, and I know many other Senators who do not, who favor this amendment. But in my opinion, if we analyze it, and take into consideration all the factors, including the restoration of yesterday, plus the increase in the carry-over, a 10-percent reduction would not be harmful.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I assume I may yield without losing the floor. I think this is a very helpful discussion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator understands of course that he may yield for a question only. Both the Chair and the Senate have been rather lenient in the observance of the rule, but if any Senator were to make the point of order, the Chair would have to sustain it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from New Jersey has not objected, because he felt that this discussion and the contributions by Members of the Senate who are so familiar with this subject helped to clarify the issue. I am wondering whether I may, without losing the floor, obtain unanimous consent to yield for statements by the various Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator make that as a blanket request?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for such observations, without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator asks unanimous consent that he may yield, without losing the floor, to all Senators who may want to interrogate him or to make statements while he has the floor, whether by question or otherwise. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think such a request ought to be limited as to time. I do not think any Senator ought to have blanket authority to dispense and control the time throughout the day.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Did the Senator from Arkansas object to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Reserving the right to object, I shall not object if the request is made for a reasonable length of time. But if a blanket request is made, which will give one Senator the power and authority to control the time and the debate of the Senate all day, I shall object, if it is made in that form.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator objects, then, to the request in the form in which it is made. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from New Jersey agree with me that the procedure indicated is followed here practically every day without being objected to by anyone? That is a question.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I seem to have observed such procedure when I have been on the Senate floor. I do not

think any of my colleagues would abuse the privilege of discussing this matter or would take undue time. But I am glad to abide by the rule that I may yield for a question only.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that the Appropriations Committee did rather a whale of a job, in respect to the over-all appropriations, in reducing the budget submitted by the President by more than \$1,000,000,000? Am I correct in that?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. LUCAS. How much did the Appropriations Committee cut from the appropriations recommended by the President?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In answer to the question, the Senator from New Jersey will say he is not familiar with those figures.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may reply to the Senator from Illinois, without prejudice to the rights of the Senator from New Jersey to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRIDGES. The first request that came to us—

Mr. LUCAS. We are talking about the over-all figure, not about ECA.

Mr. BRIDGES. The ECA—

Mr. LUCAS. No, no; I am talking about the over-all appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Oh, I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the Appropriations Committee reduced the budget which was submitted by the President by more than \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. The amount of the over-all appropriation, after the House cuts, the Senate cuts, and everything, is more than \$1,000,000,000 under the President's budget.

Mr. LUCAS. That was my understanding. I wanted to make it clear before the Senate and before the country that, through the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, more than \$1,000,000,000 has already been cut from the over-all budget submitted by the President. So far as I am concerned, I am going to stand with the Appropriations Committee on the cuts made by the committee. As majority leader, I have gone along with the committee in that respect, and shall continue to do so.

Many persons have the notion, as a result of the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from New Hampshire, and other Senators, that the 10-percent cut which they now seek is the only reduction which has been made. The country should know that the Appropriations Committee has already trimmed the budget submitted by the President by more than \$1,000,000,000, and that another cut of 10 percent is now sought with respect to ECA funds.

On the question whether ECA funds ought to be cut, I can only place my confidence in the administrators of the funds, and also in what the Appropriations Committee did, by a vote of 17 to 3, after having heard all the evidence. I must stand by the committee, Mr.

President. I think the Senate ought to stand by the committee, and ought not, in these critical times, capriciously and arbitrarily cut the ECA funds—and that is exactly what is being proposed—after the Appropriations Committee has heard all the evidence and, by a vote of 17 to 3, has decided upon the appropriation of a certain amount. That is what I want to stand by.

I do not want to take any chances, Mr. President, in this crucial hour of our history, in cutting the ECA appropriation to a point where, as the Senator from New Jersey said, it might ultimately affect our military assistance program abroad. The whole thing is wrapped up in one ball of wax, so to speak. I would rather take criticism for staying directly with the amount which the Administrator thinks he can get along with, if someone wants to criticize me for that, than to attempt to economize on the ECA fund.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Byrd-Bridges amendment specifically excludes the paragraph headed "Mutual Defense Assistance." I look upon the Economic Cooperation title as having an important bearing on the military operations. That is the reason I am urging that we stand by the figure now contained in the bill, which was the basic figure the ECA Administrator and his colleagues assured us they could take without jeopardizing the economic situation in Europe in connection with the military program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, that we cut the President's budget estimates by \$1,395,000,000, but since that time, since the ECA appropriation had been figured in the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Illinois must realize that there have been, I believe, 20 supplemental requests amounting in the aggregate to \$16,640,000,000. So that while we have cut the estimates \$1,395,000,000, we have received requests for additional appropriations, because of the tremendous emergency in which we find ourselves, amounting to \$16,640,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator. That is the reason why I join with the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Virginia in the amendment providing for a cut of 10 percent in nonmilitary operations. I think we should reduce appropriations for nonmilitary operations, because, as has been pointed out, we shall definitely jeopardize the whole picture if we cut the amount for ECA below the floor which has been set.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator also realize that an additional amount of \$4,000,000,000 is asked for the military-assistance program? In other words, there is already authorized \$1,200,000,000, and there has come in a request for \$4,000,000,000 in addition to that, or a total of \$5,200,000,000 for military assistance, plus the ECA, which I think should be considered in the overall picture.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished Senator from Illinois, in his very forceful way, has stated that he wanted to stand on the report of the Appropriations Committee with reference to the ECA program. I believe the Senator voted to increase the amount by \$58,000,000—

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; but I voted on the theory, as I understood, that the Appropriations Committee had actually made a mistake and it was in error that the \$58,000,000 was not included. It was on that basis that I supported the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not think there was a mistake made. There was a difference of opinion.

Mr. LUCAS. I understood \$58,000,000 was restored by the Hayden amendment and that was the original amount involved when the committee voted 17 to 3.

Mr. BRIDGES. The committee voted subsequently to reduce it a further \$58,000,000 so as to make the reduction an even 10 percent. The Senator stated so forcefully that he was in favor of the Appropriations Committee's report that I wanted to invite his attention—

Mr. LUCAS. I want to be fair about the situation. It had been my understanding that \$58,000,000 was the amount which was absolutely necessary to go along with the ECA appropriation in order that the ECA might do the kind of job in western Europe that was necessary under the powers granted to the Administrator. I listened to the argument made by my friend from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I want to err on the side of giving the administration the necessary money; I do not want to err on the side of giving it too little money. I would rather give it too much money and have it called surplus, or unexpended balance, or whatever Senators may want to call it. If the money can be saved, I am sure the Administrator will save it in the final analysis.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the history of the ECA in the first 2 years of operation has been that the Administrator has saved money and has reported his saving, and we have commended him for having the savings as a carry-over. So there is no question in my mind that, if the money is not needed, a saving will be made. It is necessary to have a leeway for the operation. We have to carry out our military operations. It is a matter of national defense, I will say to the Senator from Illinois, and I think he agrees with me.

Mr. LUCAS. I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator. I would rather take the chance of giving the Administrator the necessary money. I know, as a result of the administration Mr. Hoffman has given the program, it will be an economical one. He is not going to spend any more money than is necessary. I hope that at the end of the year there will be a carry-over of \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000. But I do not think the Senate

can take the chance of providing too small a sum of money.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I feel that the ECA, under Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Foster, has done an excellent job. We cut them a little bit last year, and a great cry went up that they had been cut too large an amount, and so forth. Yet the ECA had a carry-over of \$276,000,000. I have every reason to believe that the figure which we have been discussing could be adopted without crippling the ECA. If I thought it would cripple the administration, I would join with the Senator from Illinois. I want the Administrator to get down to the most reasonable base possible in order to do the job.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, last year there were falling prices which helped the ECA Administration to accumulate a carry-over, but this year there are rising prices, and \$300,000,000 more is necessary in order to take care of the situation.

When I first offered my amendment it was limited to excluding from the 10-percent cut the economic cooperation paragraph in chapter X-B. Since I offered the amendment the fact was called to my attention that there were other paragraphs in this chapter which I added to the amendment for the reasons which I shall state.

On page 449, under the heading "International Children's Welfare Work," it was pointed out to me that the \$12,500,000 reported by the Appropriations Committee was only one-half of what the children's program called for and one-half of the carry-over from that work last year.

Originally we were asked in the hearings, as I remember, for \$25,000,000. That amount was cut to \$15,000,000 in conference, and then the Appropriations Committee cut it to \$12,500,000. Knowing as I do about the great expansion of the work and the wonderful job which has been done by Mr. Pate and his associates, having known him for many years, I am glad to add the children's work to this amendment so that the \$12,500,000 will not be further reduced.

I felt that if there were a question in anyone's mind about the other items, rather than jeopardize ECA I would take them out. However, by special request I have put them in and have given this short explanation of them. On page 449 of the bill there appears the heading "International Development." This is the program for technical assistance, and so forth, which it was felt was desirable for certain backward areas in the light of the present world situation. The Committee on Appropriations originally put the figure at \$10,000,000. Subsequently, at the special request of the President, the figure was increased to a sum approximating \$26,000,000. This figure would cover the operations that are at hand at the present time for helping some of the backward areas. It seems to me to be reasonable, inasmuch

as the figure was put in the bill after consultation between the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and other members of the Appropriations Committee and the President of the United States, that it would be unwise to cut this figure. Therefore I have asked that it be exempted from the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

The third item I have added is in title 3, chapter X-B, under the heading "Aid to Palestine Refugees." I think we are in danger of overlooking the importance of this matter, because along with other appropriations it would receive a 10 percent cut. Mr. President, I have received from friends of mine who have been very intimately acquainted with Middle Eastern affairs for some time, especially Mr. Henry Sloane Coffin, who is head of this Palestine refugee movement, earnest representations that a reduction in this particular appropriation now might have very damaging psychological effects in the Arab world. These Palestine refugees are Arabs who have lost their homes because of the unfortunate warfare in the Palestine area. The United Nations in making an effort to do something for them, and our share of the amount needed for that purpose, on the basis of a study made by the special commissioner whom we sent there for that purpose, is \$27,450,000. That figure has been restored in the bill and it stands at that. If a 10-percent cut were made in the amount provided for in this program it is felt that a serious psychological mistake would be made in our dealings with our Arab friends. Therefore at the request of my friends, who are vitally interested in this work I added the item Aid to Palestine Refugees as an exemption from the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Let me point out that the total of these three items, International Children's Welfare Work, International Development, and Aid to Palestine Refugees, would be \$66,850,000, of which we would save only \$6,000,000 by a 10-percent cut, and probably give a devastating psychological blow to the work being done in these areas. Therefore I have decided to add these items to my amendment as well as the paragraph headed "Economic Cooperation."

I desire to emphasize again that my real concern in this matter is over the item of Economic Cooperation, because if we subject it to a 10-percent cut we would take \$272,000,000 from the operations of the ECA. I am absolutely certain from my contacts with the leaders of the ECA and in going over the figures carefully, that there would be a detrimental affect on the work of the ECA in bringing about production in Europe by the building up plants for military production, and building up transportation systems for military transportation, which although not immediately necessary, are vitally essential to the military. I am convinced that if we reduced the \$272,000,000 we would deal a staggering blow to the whole operation of our military program in Europe.

I should like to say also that I have conferred with many persons about this

matter, including our military advisers, and they feel that the ECA operation is vitally important in going along with and as a part of the military operations. I submit that the amendment which I have offered would take care of these matters by simply exempting from the operation of the Byrd-Bridges amendment these various items I have mentioned.

In closing let me indicate the way the Byrd-Bridges amendment would read in the affected section if my amendment should be accepted. It would read:

Sec. 1003. The reductions provided for in this chapter shall not apply to the following:

(a) Title II of chapter IV; chapter X; so much of title I of chapter X-B as is contained in the paragraphs headed "Economic Cooperation," "International Children's Welfare Work," "International Development," and "Mutual Defense Assistance"; so much of title III of chapter X-B as is contained in the paragraph headed "Aid to Palestine Refugees"; and the amount appropriated to the General Services Administration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946.

I submit the amendment and express the sincere hope that the Senate will adopt the amendment and thus protect these vital interests which are so intimately connected with the war operation.

LET'S TRY GOD

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, no one needs to be told that the people of the United States, while determined and courageous, are yet in a state of uncertainty and dismay. They are ready to go ahead. They are ready to make any sacrifice, but there is no clear or hopeful course of action spread before their eyes, as they view the world scene.

While we meet surprise attack in unexpected places and against unexpected strength, and while we see stretching ahead of us the dismal prospects of more of these unexpected and strong attacks, time and location unknown, our courage and determination, still strong, find little to feed upon for a continuance of that strength. It is time that we examined our foreign policy both to see how it led us where we are and to determine whether by revision, or abandonment and substitution, it can lead us out of the quicksands onto a solid footing.

Mr. President, our foreign policy contains but one element of over-all achievement, and that is the Marshall plan embodied in ECA. That plan has strengthened the economies of western Europe, increased production, raised the standard of living, and brought courage and confidence to the people. Had it not been for the Marshall plan, Germany, Italy, and France would now be in the hands of Communists, and Russian-controlled armies would now be encamped on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean. Here is solid achievement.

This achievement was made in other fields and by other means than that of military preparation or action. But there are scores of other opportunities for strengthening the position of the western world in these nonmilitary undertakings which have been neglected or discarded. From time to time on the

floor of this body I have fruitlessly called attention to these neglected opportunities. They still remain. But as time passes, the measure of their usefulness decreases. We are losing ground daily. Without neglecting these smaller things, more drastic measures must be undertaken.

Aside from the successful ECA, there have been two main elements in our foreign policy. The first of these has been the policy of "getting tough" with Russia. This was first proposed in an article in Foreign Affairs by a Mister X in the issue of July 1947. Mr. X was later identified as Mr. George Kennan, counselor of the Department of State, who became director of the policy planning staff. As the alternative to appeasement, this policy was necessary, for appeasement quite evidently had become the road to disaster. As an effective road to positive achievement, however, the "get tough" policy has failed. When we get tough, Russia gets tougher. Her capacity for getting tough is limitless. Ours is restrained by the desire of our people to live in peace and prosperity; and even more restrained by moral considerations which do not in any way control Russian policy. Getting tough has been fruitless of positive achievement.

Aside from ECA and getting tough, the third element in our foreign policy was that of containing communism. This was first enunciated by our President in connection with the loans to Greece and Turkey. The idea looked simple. It looked good. Its first application in Greece was effective. But what has containment come to mean? The area of our containment stretches from the Bering Sea to Japan, Korea, Formosa, the Philippines, Indochina, Siam, Burma, India, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, Austria, western Germany, through Scandinavia to the North Cape in Norway.

At the present moment the active military defense of the Korean sector is engaging us. The attack was unexpected in time and unexpectedly strong. When we consider it, we begin to realize that this attack may be repeated indefinitely around this enormous line of containment. Russia with her internal position can make trouble here, there, or elsewhere at will. She takes the offensive. We will be rushing frantically to the defensive, perhaps 10,000 miles from where the last attack was made.

There are more serious problems involved in this than the simple problem of having men enough, resources enough, and transportation facilities enough to respond to any fire alarm at any unknown point at any unexpected time. This Korean situation begins to outline a pattern of economic and moral disaster. On the economic side, Russia has not engaged her own forces and only a small part of her own resources. If she can repeat this strategy over and over, she can wear us down while maintaining her own strength. She will weaken her puppet states one after the other as she weakens us, but she herself will remain strong. The prospect is disheartening.

The moral aspects are not less so. As a result of this Korean campaign, we

find ourselves ruining the people we set out to protect. The fighting, the destruction, is in South Korea and only to a limited extent in North Korea. How long can the people of South Korea bless us for coming to their aid? This point must give us serious concern for it is already and has for a long time been in the minds of the peoples of western Europe. Can they afford to have us come to their aid? This, Mr. President, is a very serious question.

Another moral problem will be raised, particularly with later outbreaks of the Russian attack. Indochina is a likely area for a new full-scale invasion, employing Chinese Communist troops. Here we have the misfortune of finding ourselves, in opposing communism, supporting an old and outmoded colonial system. It is indeed almost the only remaining remnant of this system now that the Dutch have released Indonesia as the English have released Burma, India, and Pakistan, and as we earlier released the Philippines. The irony of fate and the perverse genius of Communist statecraft put us in the role of defenders of this last remaining bastion of colonial exploitation. What can we do about this?

Another place where with some confidence we can look for trouble is in Iran. It is not likely that this will be invaded from the north by Soviet armies, for Russia does not have to employ her own armed forces and thus definitely initiate world war III. Why should she initiate a world war when she believes herself able to accomplish her purposes in Iran by fomenting civil war for which she can deny responsibility? To make effective armed intervention in such a civil war, Mr. President, is an exceedingly dubious thing for us to undertake. But unless we meet the situation in some way here, there will be another slice of the earth's territory which will be lost to freedom and come under the totalitarian power of the Politburo. What reactionary social conditions there may be allied with that side of a civil war which we would feel disposed to support, I do not know, for I am not familiar with the internal conditions of Iran. I do know, and anyone familiar with Russian policy does know, that she will appear in the guise of the protector of the underdog. It is going to be extremely difficult, Mr. President, for us to contain communism at this spot under these conditions. Combine this involvement in moral problems with the drain on treasure and lives to which we may be subjected, and from which our opponents are free, and we have a measure of the dangerous situation in which we have been placed.

Mr. President, except for ECA, our foreign policy lies in ruins at our feet. It has failed of its purposes. While being actively and directly applied, we have lost ground; we have gone deeper and deeper into the quicksands and now we must find our way out. There is nothing left to do with this foreign policy except to sweep the pieces up into the dustpan and throw them out onto the dump. What then shall we do?

Mr. President, let us try God.

I make this as a very practical proposal and not at all in the way in which

the pious mouthings of such a sentiment are ordinarily interpreted. It has, for instance, often been said that Christianity has not failed because it has not been tried. There is involved in this some idea of the moral strength of millions of Christians leading Christian lives. There is undoubted moral strength in such a condition. The assumption is sometimes implicit that we need in the world a majority of Christians whose lives should in some sense radiate a world preponderance of Christian influence. That is not at all what I have in mind in my proposal.

It has likewise been suggested that bombarding the throne of grace with 50,000,000, 150,000,000, or even 500,000,000 prayers would solve the world's problems. This assumes that with enough prayers God can be persuaded to work a miracle. With regard to this, Mr. President, may I make two suggestions. The first is that no miracle is necessary, for God in His law has already provided the means. The second suggestion is that these prayers would be better addressed to the opening of the blind eyes and closed minds of the prayers themselves, who have neither understood the law of God nor worked in accordance with it.

The suggestion I am making is based on the fact that there is a moral law in the universe as there is a physical law. That moral law has never been broken. It cannot be broken. We can break ourselves against it, but the law remains firm. It shows itself to us in two aspects. If we see it and follow it, it is full of blessings. If we disobey it, we suffer punishment.

The moral law is unlike statute law, which can be broken. It is unlike statute law in that punishment is not inflicted after indictment, trial, and judgment. The punishment is an indissoluble part of the law itself. The unlawful act carries its own punishment with it.

In these respects the moral law established by God for the ordering of the moral universe more nearly resembles the physical law for the ordering of the physical universe. If we decide to walk on the air and for that purpose step out of the tenth-story window, we are punished by a swift fall to the ground and sudden death therefrom. We are not punished after indictment, trial, and conviction. The punishment is a part of the act. There are no indulgences or judicial pardons. Results are inescapable. The same is the case with the moral law.

What is the moral law? The Old Testament is an unfolding record of the search of a morally conscious people for the laws of the universe. This search finds its finest expression in the 176 verses in the one hundred and nineteenth Psalm, in which the psalmist expresses his delight in the law of the Lord. But that law was also revealed in the harsh terms of the experience of those who transgressed it. Viewed in this aspect of the Old Testament is an inspiring story of the search of an inspired people for the rules under which they

might live in harmony with the purposes of the Creator.

In the New Testament we find the capstone, the pinnacle of the law which was so finely set forth in the Old. Jesus gave His final definition of the law in His life and in His words. He summed it all up in the twenty-second chapter of Matthew, the thirty-fifth to the thirty-ninth verses, which I now proceed to read:

Then one of them, which was a lawyer, asked him a question, tempting him, and saying, "Master, which is the great commandment in the law?"

Jesus said unto him, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." This is the first and great commandment.

I see that my manuscript is faulty at this point, because the next verse was omitted, so I repeat from memory:

And the second is like unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

So we have now arrived at this word "love." In our day it has been given meanings and connotations which sap its strength and hide its power. As a matter of fact, it is the strongest thing in the world. We must put it to the test. How shall we do it?

On the last page of the July 28 issue of United States News and World Report, the editor, Mr. David Lawrence, made a practical suggestion of means for using the supreme power of love. He said, "The President of the United States could reflect the earnest desire of the American people to prevent a world war if he would broadcast through the Voice of America stations to the people of Russia a message in substance as follows." I have taken the liberty, Mr. President, of paraphrasing the substance of this message into basic English, for ease in translating into basic Russian. I now read my version:

I, the President of the United States, send this message from the American people to the people of Russia:

We, the American people, would like to have the Russian people know more about us. We would like to know more about you. This is hard to do, because your rulers do not allow letters to pass freely between us. They jam our messages on the radio and are probably making it hard for you to hear this message. We hope that some of you are hearing some of it.

The American people have no quarrel with the Russian people. You have nothing that we want. We do not want your land. We do not want the riches of your farms, mines, or forests, except in fair trade between free people, in which both buyer and seller gain profit. The American people do not want ever to fight the Russian people.

Many years ago, in 1919, we made a bad mistake. With a small armed force we joined with other nations in interfering with the new government which had been set up in Russia. We must not do this again in any country in which a free people freely choose the kind of government under which they wish to live.

Why, then, are we spending billions of dollars in arming ourselves and the free nations of western Europe? Why are we training hundreds of thousands of soldiers, sailors, and aviators? We are doing this because we have seen your rulers destroying the freedom of free people, compelling them by vio-

lence to give up their right to choose their own rulers, and to submit instead to rulers placed over them by your rulers.

Since 1938 we have seen free Finland invaded by your rulers, conquered, and much of its valuable territory taken away from it. We have seen your rulers destroy the freedom of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and send most of its population into exile. We have seen your rulers first divide Poland with Hitler and then take all of it. We have seen the free peoples of the Balkans enslaved, and then the peoples of Czechoslovakia and Hungary. None of these peoples invaded your country. None of them wanted anything you have.

While your rulers were doing this, the western nations, which you call the capitalistic countries, were doing the opposite. Our country gave freedom to the Philippines. Great Britain gave freedom to Pakistan, India, and Burma. The Netherlands gave freedom to Indonesia. All these peoples are now free to choose their own rulers. If those rulers do not do well, these people are free to dismiss them and choose other rulers. That is democracy. Do you have democracy in Russia?

Our people, with the peoples of other nations among the United Nations, are now fighting with the people of South Korea against the armies of North Korea. Why is this? It was intended that all of Korea should be one free nation. The United Nations asked that free elections be held all over the nation. Your rulers would not permit this. Elections were held in South Korea. South Korea is free.

When South Korea became free our country withdrew its army. It left behind no fighter or bomber planes, no tanks, no heavy artillery. Your rulers armed North Korea with a multitude of tanks, fighter and bomber planes, and heavy artillery. Under the direction of your rulers North Korea attacked South Korea. As so many times before your rulers have once again set out to destroy free governments and enslave free people.

The free nations cannot permit your rulers to do this any more. That is why we are fighting in Korea.

We would like to say to you, the people of Russia, that the citizens of the free nations are better fed, better clothed, and live in better homes than do you in Russia and in other countries which do not enjoy real democracy. The good things of life come in less and less amount to the peoples whom your rulers have conquered.

Your own lot would be far better if your rulers did not compel so much of your work to go for armament, if it did not make so many of your workers go from productive work into the army, and if it did not hold so many millions of your people as political prisoners.

Your country is rich in soil, in mines, and forests. It can give you a good living. But it can do this only if your rulers seek peace and freedom. No one outside of Russia can change your government for you and make it a blessing to you and to other people.

We, the American people, want to help you. We can do so if you will first help yourselves. The time is short. Your rulers are hurrying you and us toward useless senseless war. We pray that this tragedy may be prevented.

We believe it to be the law of God that we can live in peace and prosperity if we love one another. In this message we are trying to tell of our love for you.

This is the message from us, the American people, to you, the Russian people, sent through our President, Harry S. Truman.

Mr. President, this is not to be a single shot message. It must be broadcast

around the globe. It must be incessantly drilled into the ears of such listeners in Russia as can hear it. It must not merely go through the iron curtain by radio. It must go over the curtain by balloons. It must go under the curtain by human messengers—not of subversion but of conversion. Other ways must be found, but the message must be that of love. In so being, it will be a message of truth. The technique of spreading falsehood was developed to the limit by Hitler and Goebbels and now is used by the Politburo. It consists in the insistent reiteration, without pause and for an indefinite period, of the lie it is desired to have take on the form and effectiveness of truth. Is there any reason why the technique cannot be applied to the implanting, germination, and growth of truth? I believe that it can be.

As I said, Mr. President, this is not a one-shot undertaking. It is one to go on day and night, year after year, with some variety of method, with some variety of form, but with its unvarying message of good will for the Russian people and of a desire to work together with them for their own and the world's good, instead of toward world disaster.

Mr. President, the book of Genesis tells how Abraham and Lot settled by the wicked cities of Sodom and Gomorrah. According to the old story, the Lord found it necessary to destroy those two cities of the plain. And He said, "Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do?" So He told Abraham his problem. And Abraham drew near and said, "Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked? Peradventure there be 50 righteous within the city." And the Lord said He would spare the city for 50 righteous. Then Abraham said, "Peradventure there shall lack 5 of the 50 righteous." And God said in that case He would spare the city. And Abraham said, "Peradventure there shall be 40 found there." And God said He would spare the city for 40. Then Abraham bargained Him down to 30, then to 20, and finally to 10, and the Lord said He would not destroy the city for ten's sake. Since there were not 10 righteous men within the city, as the old story tells us, the city was destroyed.

I think we may throw this story into reverse, Mr. President, and put it another way. If there are two righteous men to be found in the Western world, perchance the Lord will save Western civilization and that part of its life and institutions which are based on His law. It is not necessary that there be hundreds of millions of righteous. It is not necessary that the throne of grace be bombarded with hundreds of millions of prayers. It is only necessary that the foreign policies of our country be established and directed in accordance with the laws of God. It is only necessary that our love and good will by any means, conventional or unconventional, known or unknown, be poured upon the people of Russia. He who does so through the power and authority vested in him will be a righteous man. Mr. President, if we find in the President of the United

States and in the Secretary of State of the United States two righteous men in this sense of the word "righteous," the world can be saved. We await the outcome.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, we have voted a great deal of money in order to keep the Marshall plan going for another year. In my capacity as chairman of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation—the so-called "watchdog committee"—I have kept in close touch with Marshall plan operations; and during the weeks since the Communist invasion of southern Korea, I have given particular attention to just what the function of the Economic Cooperation Administration should be under the conditions which confront us today.

It is obvious, Mr. President, that fundamental changes have taken place since Congress made its last evaluation of the Economic Cooperation Administration program in passing the authorization legislation this year. I recognize that the big problem is to fit the ECA program into our all-out defense effort in cooperation with the countries of western Europe. Until a comprehensive defense program has been developed, we should not try to be too specific in assigning responsibilities to the ECA.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, it seems clear that the ECA should immediately make a new approach. The old standards by which it judged whether or not a request for assistance should be granted are no longer valid. From now on, every dollar that is spent should be evaluated with a new set of factors in mind.

The administrators of the Marshall plan should keep constantly before them the following factors:

First. The demands on the United States Treasury are much greater than when the Marshall plan appropriation request was originally submitted to Congress. Today we cannot afford to do certain things that we could afford last spring.

Second. Every pound of steel or of certain other scarce items that is allocated to Europe under the ECA program in the future will be taken away from rearmament or from the American consumer. The American people have a right to know that scarce materials will not be available to Europeans for uses which would not be approved here in the United States.

Third. The fighting in Korea has given a new priority to Asiatic problems in United States foreign policy. I do not see how we can escape doing more for Asia than we have done in the past, and I do not see how we can afford to do more for Asia unless we do less for Europe.

Fourth. The defense objective which has received highest priority in our Marshall plan spending so far has been defense against internal penetration by the Communists. From now on, I believe

that the ECA must give first priority to strengthening western Europe against external aggression.

Fifth. It seems clear that ECA can no longer be as patient as it has been in the past with countries which persist in dragging their feet. Up to now, our approach has been that the United States was helping Europe to help itself. Europe was primarily responsible for the results; and although we were prepared to suggest and facilitate, we have not tried to impose our will on any participating government. However, the situation is different now. Today we face an emergency. The United States and all the countries in Europe are in danger. Not a single American dollar should be spent in Europe unless the responsible United States official believes that the expenditure of that dollar will mitigate that danger. We cannot continue to supply money to nations which are not wholeheartedly carrying forward the program.

Sixth. The goal of making western Europe self-supporting by 1952 will have to be pushed into the background. We are going to distort our own economic structure for military purposes. We expect the European recipients of our aid to do the same.

We must accept the fact that this will create a problem of reconversion in Europe when the crisis is over. We cannot, however, spend money to make Europe "normal" while we are spending money here to make the United States "abnormal."

Seventh. The unification of Europe continues to be desirable and presumably will be accelerated by participation in a mutual defense program. Nevertheless, I do not believe that the ECA can finance projects for rebuilding or relocating industries primarily to advance the integration of Europe, under present circumstances. It is true that greater industrial efficiency in Europe will facilitate our rearmament program, but the problem is immediate and it is urgent. We should limit our expenditures for machinery and equipment for European factories to those cases where a definite contribution can be made to meeting the present emergency.

Let me make it clear, Mr. President, that while I have emphasized the point that the ECA should immediately readjust its sights and modify certain of its procedures, I recognize that many of the operations now being carried on by the ECA are essential to our defense effort and should continue. We must acknowledge the fact that a few of the Marshall plan countries are still in a very weak and uncertain situation. They are not in a position to do very much to defend themselves, let alone aid in the defense of their neighbors or contribute to the arms program of the United States. It is nevertheless in our interest to keep these weak countries from falling under Soviet domination, and we must consequently help to feed them and to provide employment for their people, in order that internal unrest may not undermine their present governments.

I want to point out that in the strongest of the Marshall plan countries we expect the greatest contribution to our mutual defense, and that in order for them to divert a substantial proportion of their manpower and industrial resources to military use, their ability to manufacture for export and to produce essentials for their consumers may be seriously impaired. It will be essential to the rearmament effort that, under these circumstances, we give necessary financial aid.

Let me express the hope that none of the productive resources of western Europe will be allowed to remain idle or devoted to nonessential production while American industry is overburdened and American consumers are unable to obtain articles which they require. My observation of Europe convinces me that there are numerous factories there with precision equipment and highly skilled labor which can manufacture certain types of weapons and other armament for the United States Army, and that there are many things which European industry can supply to American consumers to replace in part the production which is lost here as a result of the conversion of some of our major plants to the turning out of military equipment. I urge that an all-out effort be made in this direction, and I believe that the ECA is better organized and equipped to inaugurate a program of this kind than any other agency.

I think it is clear that we want to keep the ECA in business, but that the ECA now has a different job to do from what it had before. I should like to make this further point: The ECA has not, so far, in supplying food, materials, or machinery to Europe, considered such factors as the will and ability to fight in the receiving country, the contribution the receiving country can make to defense against communism, and the ability of the receiving country to supply products to the United States. It is essential that the ECA should not spend money in the future without taking these new considerations into account. Under present conditions we cannot afford to finance a country merely because its standard of living is low, its factories inefficient, or its budget unbalanced. We should use American dollars to raise a country's living standard if it is necessary to prevent a Communist uprising, or if a country shows promise of being a fighting ally. We can spend American dollars to make factories more efficient and to balance budgets only when such action is essential to the defense effort.

It has not been the function of the ECA to evaluate the fighting ability or the defense role of the various countries of western Europe. I am greatly concerned lest a portion of the appropriation which we have voted be wasted through sheer bureaucratic inertia. ECA has certain standards and procedures now in effect. I am afraid that during the next 2 or 3 months, while our comprehensive program for rearming and defending the free world is taking shape, the ECA will continue to operate in the old way.

I believe that the interests of the American taxpayer would be better protected if the ECA were at once to suspend the making of expenditures in certain categories, pending the development of new rules and their coordination with our military authorities. This is particularly true of machinery and equipment and industrial materials. The ECA as yet has taken no action of this nature, and I note that only last week the ECA authorized Belgium to purchase \$5,000,000 worth of automobiles, procurement to be made any time before December 31 of this year. I am not sure that, when the part Belgium is to play in the defense program and the extent to which the United States auto industry is to be converted to war production are determined, we can regard this money as well spent.

Mr. President, I supported the Appropriations Committee's recommendations. I did it with misgivings, because the situation has changed greatly since the committee made its recommendations, and now, as of today, we intend that the ECA shall not spend the money as contemplated in the program submitted in justification of the appropriation request. I hope that the ECA will interrupt the flow of its expenditures, except in the clearest cases, until the course it should follow in the future is better defined.

In spite of these misgivings it is desirable that the Marshall plan should continue its essential functions.

I can assure you, Mr. President, that as chairman of the watchdog committee I shall give my continued attention to this situation, and that if ECA money is not being utilized for advancing our new program for Europe, I shall call the matter to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment of my good friend and colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey. He and I have both been supporters of the ECA from its inception, in principle and in practice. I cannot, however, in view of the present situation, agree with him when he seeks to omit from the so-called Bridges amendment the amount appropriated for the ECA for the current year.

I voted for the Hayden amendment which restored the 10 percent cut made from the ECA authorization and put the ECA appropriation in the same position as the other appropriations that are affected by the Bridges amendment. In other words the ECA appropriation at the present time is the amount actually voted by the committee without any percentage cut. This puts it in exactly the same position as the other items that are to be cut by 10 percent if the Bridges amendment is adopted.

The Bridges amendment becomes vital to our economy when we think of the additional requests for appropriations submitted by the President since this bill which has been under debate on the floor of the Senate was considered by the Committee on Appropriations. These requests have come largely because of the fighting in Korea.

I know, though I do not for 1 minute consider that I know of them all, of sup-

plemental requests totaling approximately \$16,640,000,000. This total includes \$10,500,000,000 for the Department of Defense, \$4,000,000,000 for military aid to Europe, \$260,000,000 for atomic energy, \$600,000,000 for stockpiling, \$89,000,000 for the Voice of America, \$46,000,000 for the Post Office Department deficit, and \$950,000,000 for additional planes for the Navy.

I was told this morning, that there have been some 20 separate supplemental requests submitted by the President.

Merely reading these huge amounts tells more clearly than any words can possibly do the immediate necessity for large appropriations by the Congress for the security of our country, our citizens, and our loved ones at home.

I have always voted for the authorization of appropriations for ECA because I have been confident that expenditures for ECA helped to give our country greater security and would lead to a more peaceful world. While I still realize the great benefits that have accrued and which I hope will continue to accrue from ECA, I am thinking too of all features of the problem of peace in the world and of our own security. We are faced now with the need for tremendous increases, immediate increases, in our military strength and in the armed resources of the countries friendly with us, and our first endeavor must be in that direction.

Many of the countries that have been receiving aid from the ECA must give greater attention to their defense budgets. It is in line with that that we are increasing the military assistance program from \$1,200,000,000 to \$5,200,000,000. Thus, where the Bridges amendment will cut the ECA appropriation and narrow our assistance to those countries in the amount of approximately two hundred and fifty million dollars, we will contribute to those countries a large part of the total of \$5,200,000 for military aid.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the Bridges amendment and support it as it is now written. The expenditures of our Government must be made on a basis of service to our people. The greatest service that we can render to our people is to protect them, as never before, from both external and internal enemies.

If there must be any sacrifice of services to our people, that sacrifice must be made in those expenditures that do not deal directly with our security. Where there are two expenditures being made for security and our economy cannot meet both demands in full, then priority must clearly be given to defense security. At this moment, in August 1950, there is no question in my mind that priorities must go to the providing of arms for the protection of our own citizens and for those of friendly nations. We must support to the very limit the boys on the fighting front.

The armed strength of our country today and that of the nations friendly to us is what the forces hostile to us and to freedom understand most clearly. I quote from an article in today's Washington Post which in turn quotes from an article that just appeared in the mag-

azine, Bolshevik, an article written by Premier Stalin. It reads:

On the basis of a study of the world situation in our time, when the Soviet Marxist revolution occurs in only one country and capitalism reigns in all other countries, then the country where the revolution triumphed must not weaken but must do its utmost to strengthen its state, its state organs, its intelligence organs, and the army—if this country does not want to be crushed by capitalist encirclement.

Stalin also predicted that all languages will be fused into one language, "when socialism has won its world-wide victory and imperialism and national animosities have disappeared."

For all these reasons I hope the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey will be defeated and that the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire will be adopted without any amendment that will reduce the extent by which it cuts the appropriation bill in the amount of approximately seven hundred and fifty million dollars.

The continuing studies which I have made of the pending appropriations bill bring home to me the fact that we are endeavoring to carry two buckets of water, one being labeled defense and security activities; the other, normal peacetime civilian activities. When both pails are full, they are too heavy for us to carry. Let me repeat that I have always supported the principle of ECA. I shall continue to support ECA, both in principle and in practice; but we have clearly reached a period when first things must come first. The first things today are the appropriations for our own Armed Forces and for the armed forces of the friendly nations throughout the world to whom we wish to give military assistance. The fact that \$16,640,000,000 has been requested of the Congress since the bill was considered by the committee has made me feel that military matters must come first, and that the ECA appropriation can be cut by the amount suggested without hurting its principle or its practice.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have great respect for the business ability of the Senator from Massachusetts, but what disturbs me about the matter is that last year we provided in cash for the Marshall plan \$3,778,000,000. With this proposed cut it would mean an appropriation of \$2,105,000,000, as I figure it—

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator should not forget to add the carry-over.

Mr. HAYDEN. The carry-over, whether we count it one way or the other, is not going to be available, because the carry-over was or last June, and we are now in the month of August. If there ever was any carry-over, it has been used up.

What I am trying to point out is that the testimony of the Administrator was that \$600,000,000 of the appropriation is earmarked for the European payments union. The Administrator testified before the committee, under questioning by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], that if it were not used for that purpose it would not be used at all, but

would remain in the Treasury of the United States. This project is entirely new this year. It is being undertaken for the first time. It is being undertaken with the idea of breaking down trade barriers, reducing quotas, and other impediments to commerce. The \$600,000,000 has been earmarked for that purpose. That leaves for the former purposes of ECA only \$1,505,000,000 which, as I see it, would be a reduction of \$2,273,000,000 of what was spent for this purpose last year. I do not believe that the work can be carried on for that small sum of money.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First let me say that I appreciate very much the opening sentence of the Senator's statement. I hold the Senator's knowledge of financial matters in very high esteem. As I see it, the figures of the Senator from Arizona are incorrect by \$100,000,000. I believe the appropriation is for \$2,450,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. That is the figure we are asked to cut 10 percent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Hayden amendment restored the appropriation the amount at first recommended by the committee, of \$2,450,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we took off 10 percent, or \$245,000,000, there would be left \$2,205,000,000. I believe the Senator said \$2,105,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe the Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we add to that amount the carry-over of \$276,000,000 we have approximately two and one-half billion dollars for ECA. Six hundred million dollars would be used to supply a dollar deficit in the currency union. What appealed to me enormously in this situation was that, outside of military purposes of our own, and the increase in the national budget of \$16,640,000,000—and I am sure the Senator will agree that it will be much more than that before very long—remember the original MAP or military assistance program, which was \$1,200,000,000 and is now going to be \$5,200,000,000. It would at least in part help the economy of the participating countries. It would employ people. It would not employ people profitably, to be sure, but it would employ some people, and it would go to increase production, the building of factories, and so forth, for unfortunate purposes, I agree, but it would employ people. That is the one thing that interests me.

Mr. HAYDEN. The point that I should like to make is that when Europeans are employed in a munitions plant making guns or munitions, while they draw wages and are better satisfied, yet, they are not adding ultimately to the wealth of the country. On the other hand, if they are employed in constructive enterprises such as improving port facilities, or building roads or hydroelectric plants, they are adding to the wealth of the country and to its ability to better defend itself in case of war. Its economic base is that much broader. What I am fearful of is that the squeeze that we would be putting on, when we

consider that last year we expended \$3,778,000,000, and this year we will be expending only \$1,605,000,000 for the same purposes, would have a detrimental effect.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think I have the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. May I ask the Senator to yield so that I may reply to the Senator from Arizona?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to answer the Senator from Arizona; then I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan. I think one answer to the Senator from Arizona is that we are appropriating this year, before conditions changed because of the Korean conflict, about \$13,500,000,000 for military purposes out of appropriations of about \$34,000,000,000 which does not include around six billion service on our debt. That is nearly one-third of the budget. I am not sure of my figures, but I think they are not far off. That is a higher percentage than any participating countries, even England, France, or Belgium have spent for such purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. The reason for that is that we are better able to afford it, because we have a broader economic base in America and a sounder economy. That is why we can afford to or have been able to spend as much as \$13,000,000,000 for military purposes. We have a greater national income. We have better social conditions. Those factors enable us to do it. My conception from the start has always been that what we did in Europe under the Marshall plan was done primarily for our own national defense.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator entirely. That is the only justification. We are working on two things. We are working for our national security by providing appropriations for ECA and we are working for military defense by MAP. When we are working in two ways for our own national security, and we reach the point where we cannot do all of it, we must decide which comes first.

I have reached my decision on this question with great reluctance, but it seems to me that in view of the additional requests for enormous appropriations coming to Congress and in view of the all we must do to further world security and international peace by stimulating with our assistance military defense on the part of the other nations, we must ask them, when we increase their military defense through MAP, that they must let us cut down a little on ECA.

Mr. HAYDEN. If it were only a small reduction that would be one thing, but we would be going from \$3,778,000,000, which we spent during last fiscal year, to \$1,605,000,000 this year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not think the Senator is quite fair in this consideration when he fails to include the \$600,000,000 for the currency stabilization fund.

Mr. HAYDEN. To my mind the \$600,000,000 constitutes the most valuable part of the program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree.

Mr. HAYDEN. But it is not for the things we have been doing heretofore. The things we have been doing heretofore have been to build up the basic economy of those countries, and I do not think would be in the interest of our national security to withdraw from that field.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course a certain amount of it would still be used for the building of roads and power dams.

Mr. HAYDEN. Based on whatever business judgment I have, it does not seem to me that we will be putting sufficient money in this program if we were to reduce the appropriation by the additional amount now proposed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I regret that I must disagree with my friend from Arizona, because I usually do agree with him.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Arizona will recall that when we started the ECA program it was with the understanding it would be completed entirely in 1952. The prophecy was that every year would see a reduction. It is because of that understanding that we have reduced it from \$3,000,000,000, to \$2,000,000,000, approximately, or almost a billion dollars. It is Mr. Hoffman's word that next year it will be reduced further. The Senator could come in at that time and say, "Well, how can it be reduced this year?"

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I am simply arguing about the proportion of the proposed reduction. During the first year we spent \$6,074,000,000. During the second year we spent \$3,378,000,000. This year we propose to provide \$2,450,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. That was the plan.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it is a sound plan. I think a reduction of more than a billion dollars in 1 year is enough from a sound business point of view.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say only one more thing before I yield the floor. I simply say to my good friend from Arizona that with the substance of what he said I am entirely in accord. Putting it on a business basis of a citizen thinking of security, we must decide on a priority basis how our money can best be spent.

Mr. President, I have said what I have said, and taken the position I have assumed, since I went over last night the additional presidential requests, which now aggregate \$16,640,000,000, or about half again as much as we are asked to appropriate in the bill we are discussing. I felt that the money could be better expended in the way I have indicated.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice that the Senator from Massachusetts gives consideration to approximately a quarter of a billion dollars carry-over from last year's funds in estimating the amount

available for expenditure for the ECA this year. However, is it possible so to plan the work that the amount will be completely used up at the end of the fiscal year? If we anticipate a carry-over next year of possibly similar proportions, it does not seem to me that we should then include the carry-over in the amount available for expenditure this year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, \$600,000,000 is included in this appropriation, as the Senator from Arizona so well brought out, which is to be set aside to support the Currency Union. If the Currency Union supports itself and does not run into dollar deficits, or does not need bolstering, that \$600,000,000 will be held in the Treasury, and will be available again next year.

How much of a carry-over there will be it is impossible to estimate. Naturally, if we cut the amount down, there probably will be less of a carry-over, but we will be in a better position to know next year how the ECA is going along, and how peaceful the world may be.

Mr. AIKEN. Could we not normally expect that the reduction in the carry-over would correspond, roughly, with the reduction in the amount of the appropriation made this year?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not think we could—though the Senator from Arizona may not agree with me—because the ECA Administration has planned, naturally, somewhat tentatively, and not accurately as to the amount. They cannot figure accurately just what they are going to do. The ECA is very well managed by Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Foster, and their associates, and they have saved money, represented by the carry-over, and are willing to take the cut in the original authorization, and we are making a cut. When they agreed to take the cut, they had no more anticipation than did the Senator and I of the situation in Korea, and the immense increases in appropriations to be asked of the Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. However, is it not true that under the ECA program, if the Marshall plan countries do make the recovery expected, through the production of armaments, or by any other means, the Administrator could then reduce the amount of spending under the civilian recovery program?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Unquestionably he could; but as I see it, we in the Congress have a responsibility to exercise our best judgment possible on the estimates submitted to us by the President, and when we have to determine the priorities where our money is going, we have to take some responsibility in making a cut.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Senator from Massachusetts any idea of what the effect of an additional reduction might be on the morale of the people of the western European countries, who undoubtedly do not want war and would rather make their living by some means other than war, if it were indicated by the reduction that they themselves were expected to get into war? Has the Senator any estimate as to the effect on the

thinking of the people of western Europe of spending, let us say, this additional quarter of a billion dollars, to help them restore a better living for themselves permanently, contrasted with the effect of spending a quarter of a billion dollars paid to them to produce war materials, which would conceivably, in the long run, bring them into the war itself? I am not saying that we should not take steps against the contingency of war in western Europe; I am merely wondering what the effect of the proposed cut would be upon the morale and the spiritual condition of the people of western Europe.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator is correct in his implication, if that question is answered affirmatively, and it would lower their morale, then we should not consider sending them all the \$4,000,000,000 additional MAP assistance. In other words, must we not, in the interest of our own security, and in the interest of protecting the lives of our own boys, who are now fighting and dying in Korea, emphasize the fact that we expect the participating countries whom we have been assisting to engage more extensively in the production of what is needed?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct about that, but I do not think we should lose sight of the fact, or that they should lose sight of the fact that our primary purpose in going into Europe with the ECA was to restore the people there to a respectable standard of living as quickly as possible.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. And it is the hope of all of us that it may be permanently maintained under peaceful conditions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is the wishful prayer of all of us.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that in the over-all picture the \$250,000,000 which it is proposed to cut from the ECA program might pay good dividends if left in the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is a question of judgment, and the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Massachusetts could answer only at the end of the next fiscal year as to which is right. I should like to agree with the Senator from Vermont, and I should like to agree with the Senator from Arizona, but when I think of all the things we must do, and all the responsibilities, I feel there are other things which come ahead of the items proposed to be cut which will make it possible and wise and practicable to make this 10-percent cut effective.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me with respect to the unexpended-balance question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I recollect the testimony before the committee, it was shown that the unexpended balance was in large measure due to the fact that in estimating the cost of supplies which were to be purchased the estimates were liberal, but actually the costs were not so great as was anticipated, and per-

haps the quantities were not so great. I am sure that with respect to the costs they were estimated liberally, and actually they were not so high, and therefore the ECA did not have to spend as much money in the United States in the purchase of the supplies as had been anticipated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Did not the reduction in the value of the pound have something to do with it as well? I am not sure.

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be. We now face the fact that this year whatever is to be bought in the United States will be bought on an advancing market, and the appropriation has to be higher. The money will not go so far. I believe we have testimony to the effect that if the same quantity were purchased this year as last year the amount spent would be \$300,000,000 more. So we have two factors, one a substantial cut in the amount of money, a quarter of a billion dollars, and then we have another quarter of a billion in increased prices. So that really the ECA Administration is going to be half a million dollars short if it does what it wanted to do a year ago.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Their prices will not go up a quarter of a billion dollars, and I think the Senator should include the additional amounts we are providing under the MAP program, which is a fourfold increase of the amount provided last year and of what we planned to do this year. A substantial percentage of that sum will immediately be expended on the employment of individuals, whether it is good or bad employment, in the countries affected.

I yield the floor.

HOW FORTUNES ARE MADE IN "WAR BABY" STOCKS—ADVERTISEMENT FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, on last Sunday morning there appeared in the press throughout the United States a story which saddened and disturbed all loyal Americans and which, I am sure, brought great grief and sorrow to the loved ones of men who are so heroically fighting in Korea to stem the tide of the Communist advance. I refer to the story of Lt. Gen. Walton H. Walker when he issued a dramatic stand-or-die order to his outnumbered, hard-pressed American soldiers.

We read that General Walker firmly ruled out any thought of surrender or evacuation. The general said, at that time, there could be no hope of a Dunkerque, that mass evacuation by sea would be impossible.

It was hard to conceive, Mr. President, on that beautiful Sunday in this country where millions were seeking their recreation and pleasure as usual, that the youth of this Nation was again spilling their blood in the far-distant reaches of the Pacific.

As I continued to read my newspaper my feeling turned from one of sadness and deep concern to one of anger and chagrin when I read on the financial page a headline of an advertisement which read: "How Fortunes Are Made in 'War Baby' Stocks." That was the headline, Mr. President.

I read on in that advertisement and I could not believe that American business or American financial interests could be indulging in that which I read. But let me read on:

In other wars, favorably situated, companies with large military orders showered amazing profits on well-informed investors. Now, new billions of dollars will be spent on recently invented secret weapons, protective and offensive gadgets, antisubmarine devices, tanks, guns, etc. Again, some investors with courage and a few hundred dollars will buy the right war-boom stocks and become independently wealthy.

I remind you again, Mr. President, that the language which I have just read from this advertisement appeared in the same newspaper as did the report of the order to American soldiers to stand or die.

Let me read on:

Will history repeat itself as little-known bargain-priced "war babies" leap into prominence with perpendicular advances? Fourteen "war baby" stocks picked by famous experts to bring you riches.

They further say:

The experts say this period is just beginning. It is then you need this pooled advice to take full advantage of money-making opportunities.

I shall not read all of the advertisement, Mr. President, for it is all in the same tone. But I shall offer it for inspection in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement may be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 30, 1950]

HOW FORTUNES ARE MADE IN "WAR BABY" STOCKS*

In other wars favorably situated companies with large military orders showered amazing profits on well-informed investors. Now, new billions of dollars will be spent on recently invented secret weapons, protective and offensive gadgets, antisubmarine devices, tanks, guns, etc. Again, some investors with courage and a few hundred dollars will buy the right war-boom stocks and become independently wealthy.

DO GOLD STOCKS NOW OFFER QUICKER WEALTH-MAKING OPPORTUNITIES THAN STEELS, COPPERS, ALUMINUMS, ELECTRONICS, OR AIRCRAFTS?

Which companies can change over to war production fastest and with least expense? Will the 1950 "war baby" stocks be low-priced rails with enormous war-materials traffic? Will history repeat itself as little-known bargain-priced "war babies" leap into prominence with perpendicular advances?

FOURTEEN "WAR BABY" STOCKS PICKED BY FAMOUS EXPERTS TO BRING YOU RICHES

The leading advisory analytical staffs of America combed over thousands of stocks and applied modern standards of appraisal to find today's big "war baby" money makers. The 14 most-favored stocks of these foremost experts (who are usually correct) are tabulated in our exciting report—now ready for you. Get it at once. If you hold listless or weak issues, this report will point out profit-making exchanges into issues ready for tremendous moves. The experts say this period

*Every speculator should have a backlog—a savings account and adequate life insurance. He should buy United States savings bonds regularly.

is just beginning. It is then you need this pooled advice to take full advantage of money-making opportunities. If you know what the leading experts recommend, you have in your possession the opinion of all the major specialists whose life work is investment counsel. How often, after depending on one expert's advice, have you wished you knew what the others were advising?

VALUABLE INFORMATION ONLY \$1

Quick—send \$1 for this fortune-building report on today's new opportunities—14 "war baby" stocks picked by the experts. Free: 4-week trial subscription covers profit-making and profit-saving aids and buy, hold, and sell consensus. Fill out, clip, and mail coupon.

Duval's Consensus, Inc., Department T-126, 41-43 Crescent Street, Long Island City, N. Y.

Rush me profit-packed report on 14 "war baby" stocks with free 4-week-trial subscription for only \$1 (air mail, \$1.25).

Name _____
Address _____

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, what has happened to the moral fiber of the American people? What has happened to the ethics of business when this type of advertisement is presented to the American public, suggesting that one may become independently rich at the expense of the blood and sacrifice of American youth; that great wealth may be accumulated through channels which are causing heartbreak for the wives, mothers, fathers and children of the finest young men on the face of the earth?

I stood on this floor several weeks ago, during the debate on the extension of the Selective Service Act, and I said at that time that if American youth were to be again inducted into the armed service the entire industry and economy of this Nation should be mobilized and that we should see to it that there would not be a new group of millionaires created at the expense of those who now make the sacrifice for the preservation of our liberties and freedoms.

Mr. President, I believe this advertisement speaks far more eloquently than could I in a demand for rigid controls. It indicates for me that there must be a rebirth of patriotism in the hearts and minds of some of our people. I believe the great majority of Americans will consider such activities as reprehensible as I, but those who would place material wealth above their love of country and honor of those who are serving in the armed forces must be regulated and controlled.

We have been asked to appropriate huge sums of the taxpayers' dollars to carry on a great armament and construction program for defense. I, for one, Mr. President, will demand that those funds which are appropriated be used for that purpose and that they shall not be siphoned off into the pockets of a few speculators. These funds must be used, Mr. President, so that there shall be no more orders that American soldiers must stand or die without adequate equipment. They shall not be used for speculative business as usual or gambling in war baby stocks.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to commend the Senator from Kansas for the statement he has just made. I do not know in what newspaper the advertisement the Senator read from appeared. I care not in what newspaper it appeared, but I desire to say that there must be something wrong with the thinking and the patriotism of any newspaper which will carry an advertisement of that kind. I hope the publishers were unaware of the fact that such an advertisement was carried in their newspaper. I also hope that the press will do its part in not carrying advertisements of similar nature while we are in the situation in which we now find ourselves.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I may say for the information of the Senator from Vermont and the other Members of the Senate that the advertisement appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, July 30, 1950.

Mr. AIKEN. I would not condemn a newspaper for the first appearance of an advertisement of that kind. But if newspapers continue to carry advertisements of that kind, then I think they should be condemned.

RUNAWAY PRICES AND OUR MIDDLE- AND LOW-INCOME GROUPS

Mr. STENNIS. I shall address myself quite briefly to the problem which is daily becoming more acute of what should be done with reference to price control.

Mr. President, on the twenty-fifth day of June last, we had a choice to make. We could have heeded the call of the United Nations to go into Korea, or we could have refused to go. We made that choice. We chose to go in. We did go in, and have been fighting there for over 30 days. And let us remember the constant threat of danger from many possible fighting fronts beyond Korea.

Now, we are bound by our choice. We must back it up. We shall back it up. Success on our fighting front will depend on our success on our home front. The home front has certain grave and essential duties. The home front is entitled to protection as it buckles down to meet those duties.

By far, the largest segment of this home front is our middle- and low-income groups. As the military spending increases and prices steadily rise by leaps and bounds, the purchase value of the wages, salaries and savings of the people will steadily fall.

Mr. President, the following facts confront the people on the economic front as we enter this military program:

First, there will be tremendous new spending for military purposes. The \$10,000,000,000 now requested by the President will prove to be a mere starter. Soon, the rate of military spending will doubtless be increased at the rate of \$20,000,000,000 to \$25,000,000,000 per year above our June 1950 levels.

Second, with these huge sums being rapidly poured forth, we will have a runaway of prices that will skyrocket the cost of living for the middle-income and low-income groups on the home front, and they are the ones who really carry the burdens of the war effort. These prices will rise, not once, but over

and over again, week after week, and thus rapidly make serious inroads into the buying power of the public.

Third, new taxes will be imposed and will have to be paid by this middle- and low-income group from their already greatly shrunken buying capacity.

Compensating or offsetting increases in wages or income will be slow in coming, and to many workers, wage earners, white-collar groups, and small farmers, these increases will not come at all, or at least not appreciably. Of course the wage increases will eventually come to certain organized groups, and this item itself will even further increase prices and further add to the burdensome and crushing load carried by the unorganized millions. Thus, these conditions will soon be taking a triple toll from the small farmers, the white-collar group, and those who live on small savings. These are the very ones least able to bear it.

Mr. President, these conditions and circumstances are not remote and uncertain. They are positive, certain and immediate. Three things have become increasingly clear: the first is that the only effective way to avoid run-away prices with consequent ruinous inflation is for Congress effectively to establish price controls and roll back prices of commodities and goods to a date just prior to the Korean invasion; second, the dark clouds of inflation are daily destroying values and will continue to do so as these prices rise. Savings accumulated through years of toil and sacrifice are rapidly losing their buying power, and people dependent thereon will find themselves in need. Other values are being destroyed. It seems clear to me that without price controls during this emergency and during this enormous expenditure of money, we will have a 30-cent dollar within a few short years. Third, the duty of the Congress to act and to act quickly, is clear and demanding. We are burning daylight now.

There is no easy or absolute solution, but something can be done. We are not without experience in this grave problem. We have the benefit of experienced administrators, and—more—we have in the United States Senate Members who gained invaluable experience on this subject during World War II. I feel that our able Committee on Banking and Currency will soon report a worthy bill which will meet the realities and needs of these unusual conditions. I hope the bill as reported will provide ample power for early application of price controls and a roll-back of prices to June 25, 1950, with properly protected rights, of course, for any group to show cause for the allowance of increases in proven and proper cases.

Mr. President, in these brief remarks I emphasize merely the roll-back of prices and price controls because they are the most immediate matters. I believe that the people of the United States stand on the proposition that so far as is humanly and practically possible at this time, all our resources—our capital, wages, commodities, and goods—should be dedicated to the single purpose of carrying out effectively our operations in the war or in whatever we may face in the future. I

stand on the proposition of controlling those matters and dedicating ourselves to the proper purpose and doing what we can to keep this from being a profiteers' war.

I pledge the committee my whole-hearted support for the passage of such a bill, even though I greatly dislike the necessity for the enactment of such legislation.

However, even with all the evils and dangers of such a law—and there are evils and dangers in it—it does not involve the threat which we would face in what could be military disaster, nor does it present the threat involved in ruinous inflation.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senate today has before it two measures, the first being the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, and which calls for a 10-percent cut-back in certain of the nondefense items in the pending appropriations bill. The second measure is a modification of that amendment by which it is proposed that certain other programs, notably ECA, shall be excepted from its operation. At this time I desire to address myself to both of those measures.

Appropriations really mean that the people of the United States, through their tax payments, are providing certain funds to be put into the Treasury of the United States, as a bank, so that the Government may draw upon that account. The question now before the Senate is how much money we are to deposit in that bank, as a charge against the account of the taxpayers, in order that the Government may have funds to be used by it during the coming year.

The principal business now before the Senate, the Bridges-Byrd amendment, calls for a specified reduction in the amount of money which is proposed to be placed in that bank by the people of the United States, in the form of the pending omnibus appropriation bill, with the money so deposited to be spent for the purposes indicated. The proposal is to reduce by 10 percent the funds to be expended on certain items, with all sums for national defense, the Post Office, and other items, including appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, to be excepted from the operation of the amendment. These items are excepted because we do not want to affect emergency functions and others are excepted because we believed they represent firm commitments to our citizens, notably our veterans. As a result the 10-percent reduction would apply only to approximately \$3,000,000,000 of the approximately \$36,000,000,000 intended to be deposited in the Government's checking account by the omnibus appropriation bill.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we have reached the point where we must answer two questions. First, do we wish to reduce the appropriations for some of the less essential Government activities? Second, how are we to do so; how are we

to reduce the amount of money which is to be deposited in the Government's account to be drawn on during the next fiscal year, which began on July 1 of this year?

To my mind, there can be nothing but an affirmative answer to the first question. The military situation we now face, with its economic reverberations, makes such an answer imperative.

Five weeks ago, Mr. President, our country did not know it was about to face combat in Asia. On the morning of June 25, apparently none of our Government agencies, including the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, realized they were about to become engaged in combat, although there were available, if we had but paid sufficient attention to them, intelligence reports indicating that combat was to come at a very early date. However that may be, the events since June 25 have come upon us hard and fast, and with serious military problems there also have come serious economic problems.

As I said on this floor the other day, when I urged a 50 percent reduction in the amount of money to be appropriated for civil works projects, the day of spending-as-usual has passed. Of course, it is quite true that claims are made by someone for every item in the appropriation bill that it is "worth while," or is a "desirable" expenditure in behalf of the people. Nevertheless that is not the test today.

The question no longer is whether a project is worth while or desirable. At this time, when every Government dollar to be spent for nondefense purposes must compete with the dollars to be spent for military or defense purposes, and both are competing with the public's dollars for goods and services, the test is whether the proposed expenditure is essential to the welfare of the people of our country.

Moreover, Mr. President, at the time when this budget was prepared, we were confronted with a deficit of approximately \$5,000,000,000. Since then the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has estimated that the deficit for the present fiscal year would amount to more than \$7,000,000,000. In other words, even before the present emergency it was estimated that for every day of the present fiscal year the Government's deficit would be \$20,000,000, and each day we would be going that much farther into the red through deficit spending.

But even that dismal prospect was laid before us at a time when there was no knowledge of the increased military expenditures which are now required; none of our armed services then knew of the present situation, and they had not planned on engaging in any real military action in Asia.

Since then, in fact since this appropriations bill was brought out upon the floor of the Senate, the military expenditures we are going to be called upon to provide threaten to send deficit spending up to \$20,000,000,000. We are now being asked for \$16,640,000,000 in spending authority to be placed on top of the \$5,000,000,000 deficit originally estimated.

Mr. President, it is sheer folly to permit that sort of deficit financing when we can curb it by reducing expenditures for other governmental functions than those which are actually mandatory for our defense.

If the Federal Government had unlimited funds it would not be difficult to lay down a spending program for nonmilitary projects which would exceed \$180,000,000,000. Mr. President, we are speaking constantly about billions of dollars, and yet there are few of us who know what a billion dollars actually is.

I try at times to visualize it. I have traveled all over the State of Michigan and into every one of its counties and most of its towns. I have tried to visualize the physical wealth of my great State.

Do Senators realize that all the property in the State of Michigan is assessed, approximately, at only \$8,000,000,000? That shows how much a billion dollars is. The people of Michigan have been working for 150 years in order to accumulate wealth, farms, factories, and buildings amounting to \$8,000,000,000. But here we speak calmly of deficit spending of up to \$20,000,000,000 a year, almost three times the entire assessed valuation of the great State of Michigan.

I think at times that, as we have become accustomed to speak of billions of dollars rather than of millions, we have become more careless in the matter of expenditures of the people's money. We simply cannot let ourselves be blinded by the size of the amounts in which we deal here.

I have said there is practically no limit to the amounts of money which Government could spend. A survey of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report suggests the need of \$41,000,000,000 expenditures to improve and expand highways, roads, and streets in the United States.

It has been estimated that from \$77,500,000,000 to \$81,600,000,000 could be profitably spent removing slums, providing decent housing for all citizens.

The American Association of School Administrators proposes a \$12,000,000,000 spending program for school construction.

The Federal Security Administrator suggests that \$9,000,000,000 could be spent profitably on hospital construction.

A Hoover Commission task force estimates an ultimate cost of \$40,000,000,000 for presently contemplated programs of major power, flood-control, and irrigation projects.

And so the list of worth while and desirable projects goes. This Government could spend money on all these programs—if we had the money to spend. The facts of the matter are well known to every Member of the Senate. We do not have the money to spend.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very much interested in the figures given by the distinguished Senator from Michigan with reference to the opportunity and need for internal development within our country. Does the Senator have the fig-

ures for highways, flood control, hospitals, and schools, showing the total amount that is actually needed in order to bring this country up to its present requirements in these particular fields of development?

Mr. FERGUSON. I mentioned a sum in excess of \$180,000,000,000. I should mention also that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has estimated that merely the new programs proposed by the President this year would, if adopted and put into effect, call for ultimate expenditures of about \$25,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This program differs from that. This is a program over a period of years for the development of our resources and for internal improvement. The figures I gave, to which the Senator alludes, related to the legislative program already enacted into law.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The sum of \$180,000,000,000, which I mentioned, and that is undoubtedly a low estimate, refers to internal development and related projects which it has been suggested the Government might undertake over a number of years in the future.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the able Senator that I was particularly interested in the breakdown he was giving because, several months ago, without meticulous calculation as to each particular field and area in which expenditures of this character were needed, I made a general statement that within the next 20 years the Federal Government could well afford to spend, commensurate with its needs, \$100,000,000,000 here at home for internal improvements and developments. In that figure I included construction of highways, improvement of rivers and harbors, flood control and hydroelectric power development projects, the building of hospitals and schools, and other internal improvements of that character.

At that time I was challenged. It was said to me, "You talk economy, but now you are advocating a \$100,000,000,000 spending program." I advocated no such thing. I was simply drawing a line to show that the need exists for further development of this country in order to strengthen our economy, and that we would have to forego these necessities in order to meet the world crisis, particularly to help carry out the ECA program which is now before the Senate, upon which we are challenged to make any cut whatever, notwithstanding the fact that the Appropriations Committee has gone through the bill and made severe cuts in the expenditures for projects here at home. But when we undertake to make a comparable cut in foreign expenditures we are told that to do so would wreck the program. I merely call that to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator and I had in mind exactly the same things when we laid out those figures. I also understood what he had in mind when he totaled the future cost of the legislative program recommended by the President. He was trying to contrast requirements or desirabilities with the capacity to meet them at the present time.

I know how the Senator feels about it, and the Nation is indebted to him for the clarity with which he has presented that picture.

I know how, when mention is made of cutting foreign spending, people are immediately shocked. They seem to believe there is magic in foreign spending, that we can spend abroad, and that we can buy peace. As a matter of fact, peace cannot be purchased; it is not for sale.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to make one further brief observation. We are told that we must spend this money in order to strengthen the recipient countries so they can stand against communism. I am in accord with that idea. But I want to get \$1 in value for every dollar expended. I am very much concerned about that, of course. I am not criticizing the entire program. I have supported it, but I have tried to think in terms of economy, in view of our own condition here at home.

The point I wish to make is this: We can spend this money on ECA countries, but if we do not back up the expenditures with adequate military power both at home and abroad, then, at any time that Russia decides to march to the sea from any direction, from any place where she is now poised, she can do so within 30 days, and all the developments made in those countries will fall into her hands, unless we are ready to go all out in this fight and back it up with all our strength. It is merely a foolish expenditure to pour money into the recipient countries unless we protect it. And we have not been protecting it, until now.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is proved today. We have put many millions of economic aid into Korea. All that is now so much wasted money. We were proved unable to protect any benefits of that economic aid militarily. But we have rallied. We have sent men into the field of battle. We are equipping and transporting more men over 7,000 miles of water to join the battle and defend the cause of freedom in South Korea. Could we have expected anyone else to assume that task? That is the test.

We have to remain strong if we are to help to stem the tide of communism. And let us never forget that our own economic stability is at the heart of this Nation's power to resist and to extend aid to resistance.

It has been suggested by some persons that we should spend on the military the same percentage of our national income which Russia devotes to her armament. If this suggestion were carried out, our military budget would approximate \$55,000,000,000 a year. As a matter of fact, with supplemental defense requests and with foreign arms and economic aid included, our defense budget is creeping well over half that figure, when we started with a small fraction of it.

We do not know what the fiscal year 1951 will demand of us. We know only that it will call for new sacrifices on the part of everyone. This Government can-

not aggravate the needs for such sacrifices by imposing a burden of peacetime "spending as usual" upon our people, who will have to carry the superimposed burden of a military effort.

Obviously, then, Mr. President, this is a time to be cutting back on nondefense spending. Our people have a right to expect from the Congress a cutback in appropriations for items not directly related to the military effort or the minimum requirements of Government operations. The question, then, is, How?

There has been a great deal of talk, Mr. President, about the meat-axe approach to the cutting of the budget. That is so much byplay, although the advocates of "spending as usual" will speak at length about the need for delicate surgery in this operation.

If we were operating on a human anatomy I could understand such talk. But our experience a week ago, when we sought to trim the so-called pork barrel appropriation proves that the anatomy of government has its nerve centers everywhere, and appears even to be most sensitive in its fat.

As a matter of fact, this bill has been subjected to some close surgical probings. The junior Senator from Illinois has spoken about 68 specific reduction amendments that he has offered. I have never counted the number of times that motions to reduce specific items were introduced in the Appropriations Committee and its subcommittees. I dare say that such motions corresponded almost to the number of appropriation items submitted.

Further in the case of all chapters in this bill except that which had already been reduced by the subcommittee, a motion was made in the full committee to return the chapter to subcommittee for item-by-item reductions that would bring the chapter total down by at least 10 percent.

The fact that all these motions were by and large unsuccessful can be attributed to two factors.

In the first place, when the full committee and the subcommittees were at work the same urgency for economy was not upon us. The Korean affair had not then exploded in our faces. For my own part, I found the need for reductions impelling even at that time, but I can understand that other members of the committee may have been less inclined in that direction.

Second, any reduction in an appropriation item is an arbitrary decision by the committee. This is so because the department and agency representatives come before the committee and contend most forcefully that their estimates represent irreducibles. They claim this because it is true that those estimates have been screened first in their own budget offices and then by the Bureau of the Budget. It is too much to expect of them that they would ever say their screening efforts had not been perfect. With the limited facilities at the disposal of the committees it is difficult to go behind those persuasive presentations, and so they are accepted.

The amendment for which I speak today is a workable, clear, and unmistak-

able directive to the executive branch that in certain appropriation items it shall review and reduce its expenditure schedules in accordance with a firm policy adopted by the Congress.

We took pains to specify that this directive applies only to certain appropriation items.

This amendment has been carefully drawn and worked over for fully 3 months by its sponsors, competent staffs, and representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office who gave very freely of their time.

This amendment is free of the "bugs" which were the basis for criticism of the similar amendment adopted by the House. By careful analysis of the expenditure budget it exempts all of those items for which there is a military need and the greatest justification can be made.

It is a sound approach to the problem we have before us, of how appropriation reductions are to be made—now.

In particular, it is well adapted to the omnibus appropriation bill. It will be recalled that the omnibus appropriation idea was adopted because it would permit the Congress to take an over-all look at Government appropriations in a single package, and thereby permit the Congress to take responsible action, if necessary, to bring together the levels of receipts and expenditures.

I believe the omnibus appropriation approach is a success insofar as it now gives us an opportunity to take general action with this reduction amendment—to do what must be done in terms of trimming down appropriations on non-defense items.

It is an opportunity to vote responsibly in the interests of the working men and women of America who must pay the cost of Government, who will be called upon to exert an even greater effort in behalf of their Government in the coming year, and who look to the Congress for sound defense measures by reducing nondefense expenditures.

Mr. President, it has been argued in support of the modification to the Bridges-Byrd amendment that we should consider the morale of those who are to receive funds in foreign lands. The argument is made that if we cut ECA we shall reduce the morale of the people of Europe. Therefore, it is argued, we should exempt ECA and related programs from this percentage cut.

Mr. President, I want to speak today of the morale of the American people. What about their morale? What if we reduce their morale to the point where they cannot defend America as well as helping to defend the other nations of the world? I think someone's voice must be raised for America as well as for the morale of our friends across the water.

As I said when the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] was on his feet, if America had not been strong, if America had not had her Air Force, if America had not been able to ship fighting forces to Korea, who would be defending the free people of the world today? No one, Mr. President.

The time has come when we must raise our voices, even though it be unpopular

to do so, in behalf of the taxpayers of America. We are told, "Do not touch the spending by ECA. That is a sacred thing; that is something that cannot be reduced." I say the dollars of the American taxpayer are sacred, for they are the source of this Nation's strength in an hour of great foreboding.

Mr. President, this appropriation bill, including its provisions for ECA, must be reduced if the American people are to meet the national needs of today. I have supported ECA. I have voted on all occasions for ECA. But ECA is only one of the weapons by which we took it upon ourselves to contain communism. It merits no priority over our own economic stability and our own capacity to defend ourselves and to prosecute an actual war.

I say that all civilian items in this appropriation bill must be reduced, and that includes the civilian items contained in ECA money. There is no other way in which it can be done.

Mr. President, I come from the great State of Michigan, whose industries will be called upon heavily to produce war weapons in this great emergency. The people of Michigan will be taken from their civilian employment and put on war work. We are asked to send to Europe some \$4,000,000,000 in arms aid. Some of the people over there will have to go into war work. When the people of Michigan are not allowed to carry on their civilian occupations, how can the morale of the people of Europe be said to be lowered by the fact that we cannot give them all the money desired to carry on their civilian activities?

To be sure, I hope the European people will come into full alliance with us in this great fight against the ideology of communism. I think they will and I do not think any 10 percent reduction of economic aid will prevent them.

Mr. President, I cannot forget the dramatic scene I witnessed yesterday on television, of the meeting of the United Nations at Lake Success. The Russian delegate, Mr. Malik, who is now the president of the Security Council, appeared on the screen. It was ironic. The arsonist, the man who had set fire in Korea, was sitting in the seat of the fire chief, whose duty is to put out other fires. We saw how he acted. We saw how he tried on an arbitrary ruling to have Communist China seated on the Security Council. We saw our delegate, backed by the other members, upset that ruling.

America has a real battle. The other members of the Security Council who voted with America yesterday at the Security Council, and who gave their reasons for doing what they had done, were right, Mr. President, because they were on the right side.

We are all in this together. Therefore, when we cut our civilian production in America our friends in Europe must expect also to cut their civilian production in Europe. We are to send some \$5,200,000,000 in arms aid over there. Much of it would be spent by European countries for defending themselves, as we are going to defend ourselves.

I was one who supported the arms-aid program, because I believed it was essential for the common defense of America and the common defense of people in Europe who believe in the same ideals in which we believe. At the time the first authorization was before us I offered an amendment which made clear that the purpose of the act was to provide for a common defense. We are now getting around to that common defense.

Mr. President, the President yesterday asked for \$4,000,000,000 in additional aid. He is not asking just for the \$1,300,000,000 of last year, or the \$1,200,000,000 of this year, but he is asking for an extra \$4,000,000,000. Much of that would be spent in Europe. But with all that it is said that we cannot take \$1 off ECA, which is intended for civilian expenditure.

Mr. President, I want to refer at this time to some of the items that would be sent over under ECA. Let us note whether our own people will not have need for them, for military defense, and for basic and essential civilian pursuits here.

It is proposed that ECA will supply in industrial raw materials, \$359,000,000. Iron and steel, raw, \$6,700,000. Iron and steel, crude and semifinished, \$57,100,000. Nonferrous ores and concentrates, \$32,100,000. Aluminum, \$25,100,000. Copper, \$77,000,000. Lead, \$3,600,000. Zinc, \$6,800,000. Other nonferrous metals, \$15,800,000. Lumber, \$39,500,000. Paper and pulp, \$8,200,000. Rawhide and skins, \$25,500,000. Industrial chemicals, \$61,000,000. Capital equipment, \$494,700,000.

Mr. President, regardless of what we appropriate for, much of that material simply cannot be shipped to Europe if we are to produce the necessary weapons of war in this country. If we are to go to rationing, if we are to go on an allotment of materials, such as iron and steel, it will be apparent that these materials cannot be shipped abroad in the amounts specified, and the people of Europe will understand that fact.

Mr. President, ever since the war we have been sharing our money and our substance with others because we believed that we were making common cause. I hope and I believe that those other people will understand the effort we are making here today. I believe they will understand and appreciate, because it must be understood by all people, that if we are to maintain this Republic of ours so that it may be a beacon of light for all the people of the world, it is necessary for us to reduce our nonessential government expenditures.

In that process it must be understood that we are applying our cutbacks as well and in the same proportion, to the economic aid we have been giving gladly to other nations.

I hope that every Senator, in voting on the two proposals now before us, will probe his conscience. I hope that when he casts his vote he will be absolutely certain that he is acting to strengthen this Republic of ours in a

critical hour of its history. He can be so assured if he will throw his weight behind the effort to cut all the nonessentials of government spending. It would be a tragedy if we were to endanger or to lose the institutions of America in this emergency through the fiscal folly of the representatives of the people.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, a magnificent chapter of American heroism and sacrifice is being written in far-off Korea.

It is being written in the blood of America's finest young men.

Facing a force superior in numbers and armament they were ordered to "stand and die."

They were called upon to hold the line—to pay with their lives for the time needed to bring in reinforcements.

The "No retreat—no surrender" order of Lieutenant General Walker was in the best and bravest tradition of American valor.

And along the blazing 200 miles of Korean battlefield the order was obeyed. Our boys fought and died to hold the line.

Mr. President, the appropriation bill now before us for final action must be considered in the light of that grim picture.

We, too, must hold the line. We are moving rapidly toward a supreme test of American strength, patriotism, and sacrifice.

How soon we shall be called upon to meet that test no one can foretell. But no one questions the imperative need for full-scale preparation which may take us up to the limit of our total resources in manpower, wealth, and productive capacity.

The people are aware that the President's request for an additional \$10,000,000,000 for the current military budget is only the beginning.

They know that in this fiscal year alone many more billions of dollars will be called for, not only to build our own military strength, but also to arm the friendly nations of the Atlantic Pact.

The people are prepared to support whatever expenditures may be required to defeat Communist aggression wherever it may threaten human liberty.

But, Mr. President, when we ask the American people to make the sacrifices that are part of the price of war we must make sure that every expenditure by the Government not necessary for national defense is cut to the bare essentials.

I know that such a proposal will be criticized by every pressure group that has sought public funds for local or regional advantage.

I know it will be unpopular in many sections which hoped to benefit from public works to be paid for in whole or in part from the Federal Treasury. I know it will displease the free-spending bureaucrats in many Government departments and agencies. But I contend, Mr. President, that in order to hold the line on the home front we must practice the most drastic economy in every Government function not directly con-

nected with defense. Every cut we make in Government spending is a step for the preservation of our freedom.

I submit, Mr. President, that we should attack this problem courageously. We must stand firm against the demands of the free spenders. I am not unmindful of President Truman's order directing Government departments and agencies to review their spending programs. I commend him for this action, and I am hopeful that it will result in recommendations for substantial savings. But I am not too optimistic that the drastic economies which should be our objective will be achieved in that manner. Decisive action must be taken in this Chamber. Ours is the responsibility. The way to reduce expenditures is to cut appropriations.

I am firmly convinced that if we pass this appropriation bill and leave it up to the bureaucrats to reduce expenditures, it will never be done. My experience has been that bureaucrats, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, never willingly take less. They always want more. The one way to reduce bureaucratic spending is by not giving the bureaus the money to spend. Even then, in many cases, they will not live within the amounts provided. They will come back before the end of the fiscal year and ask for deficiency appropriations. We have seen that happen year after year.

In the face of the situation that confronts us and the sacred responsibilities that are ours, we cannot continue the present free-spending program on the domestic front. If we do, we will spell out in bold letters the final destruction of individual freedom in the United States.

We are through fighting this war and the stars and stripes are carried to victory, we must be in such financial condition that our individual liberties will not have been destroyed.

I ask my colleagues to bear with me while I go over some figures relating to the cost of war. I believe the figures make very clear our duty to cut to the bone every appropriation not directly connected with national defense.

Wars have become more expensive with each generation. The Revolutionary War cost a little less than \$80,000,000; the War of 1812 cost \$180,000,000; the Mexican War cost \$116,500,000; the War Between the States cost \$3,358,000,000; World War I cost \$25,000,000,000; and World War II cost \$356,000,000,000. This does not include interest on the debt incurred, benefits to veterans and their dependents, and other postwar costs.

We are starting the present war with a debt of about \$257,000,000,000. If world war III should continue for 4 years it will cost a minimum of \$600,000,000,000. How do I arrive at this conclusion? I wish to give a few examples of the rising costs. In World War II the maintenance of a soldier cost \$1,900 a year; it now costs \$4,000. A fighter plane which formerly cost \$100,000 now costs \$150,000. In World War I the cost of an aircraft carrier was \$65,000,-

000; now it is twice that amount. In World War II a bazooka cost \$36.25; it now costs more than three times that amount. A tank cost \$60,000 in World War II; now it costs double that amount. A rifle that cost \$40 in World War II now costs \$64. An anti-aircraft gun in World War II cost \$113,000; now it costs two and one-half times as much. War demands much heavy construction, and steel which cost \$50 a ton in World War II now costs \$88 a ton. Critical materials like gasoline and oil cost twice as much now as they did in 1943.

One of the big items of expense to the United States in wartime is the pay received by the men in the armed services. For example, a private, first class, now draws \$95.33 a month while he received only \$54 in World War II. The base pay of an Army captain in World War II was \$230 a month; now it is \$313.50. Every other item essential for waging war will show a corresponding increase in cost. During the 4 years of World War II, even with the high taxes that were imposed, we were able to pay only 45 percent of the combat cost out of taxation.

If the conflict in Korea should develop into full-scale warfare and we should impose taxes that would pay 45 percent of the estimated \$600,000,000,000 cost, we would add approximately \$315,000,000,000 to the present national debt, making a total debt of \$572,000,000,000. If that should occur, the whole economy of the United States would be hog-tied under Government controls and regulations from which it might never free itself. The liberty of the individual which we have enjoyed as Americans for 174 years would be lost. We would continue to live under wartime price and wage controls, rationing, priorities, allocations, and regimentation, restricting every activity of our daily lives.

We will have robbed every boy and girl in America for many generations of the opportunities to which they are rightfully entitled. The burden that we will have placed upon them will be so great that they will never be able to get ahead. Instead, in the words of James F. Byrnes, they will become "economic slaves, pulling an oar in the galley of the state."

Mr. President, I repeat, we must hold the line against nonessential Government spending, without regard for political consequences. We must make substantial cuts even though some desirable services may be curtailed or eliminated. We must have the courage to say "No" to every pressure group which places selfish advantage above the national interest.

As I said before, the people are prepared for willing and patriotic sacrifice. They are ready to assume an increased burden of taxation, even though it may mean a reduced standard of living. Therefore we must do our part by holding nondefense spending to a minimum. As far as possible we must proceed on a pay-as-you-go basis, paying the costs of war preparations out of the increased taxation. By that method we can avoid a substantial part of the deficit financing which would mean dangerous infla-

tion, and would prolong the time when wartime controls would be fastened upon our people.

Mr. President, we have before us an appropriation bill written in peacetime and in contemplation of a continuance of peace. Just before the peace of the world was violated by Communist aggression in Korea we were working on a tax-revision program, including the elimination or reduction of war-imposed excise taxes. When the shooting started that plan was abandoned immediately. It was recognized that instead of tax reductions it would be our job to legislate sharply increased rates of taxation.

Can we, in voting on this bill, close our eyes to the changed conditions forced upon us and the world? Can we justify spending programs which would require the use of money, manpower, and materials vitally needed for defense purposes?

Mr. President, brave men are dying on the front lines in Korea. In time of war there must be battle casualties. Here in this Chamber we must have the courage to face the political fire of those who continue their demands for legislation favoring their own pet projects. The situation confronting us calls for courage to stand and fight for the whole United States.

If we must have political casualties in the battle to build the strength of our Republic and to preserve our freedom, then, I say to my colleagues, we must be ready to make that sacrifice. But there is no doubt in my mind that the patriotism of the American people will support every economy we can effect that will help maintain the financial strength of the United States.

Mr. President, while our boys are displaying such magnificent heroism with bayonets, machine guns, and bazookas, in the tanks, and piloting our fighting planes, we ought to have the courage to do what good, common horse sense directs, without any thought of political consequences.

I shall therefore vote for the Byrd-Bridges amendment, and ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for its adoption.

The one regret I have is that the amendment does not go far enough or cut deep enough.

I am informed that the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] intends to offer an amendment to cut the appropriation deeper, and I shall support that amendment with all my heart and soul because I believe it represents good sound Americanism.

For my part I am convinced that every nondefense item should be reconsidered and that the cuts should go right down to the bone.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has just stated, it will be the purpose of the junior Senator from Nebraska to offer an amendment at the proper time providing for a cut of 15 percent. That, of course, will be after the vote is taken on the so-called Smith amendment which provides that ECA, the point 4 program, and other projects be elim-

inated from the Byrd-Bridges amendment. Until that is done it, of course, is the pending amendment, an amendment of very great importance.

I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for his very forceful speech. The Senator from Pennsylvania is not only an able statesman, but he is a man with a military record second to none. The observations made by him at such a time as this, a time of need, were forceful and sound. They should be heeded by the Senate of the United States. When the time comes for the Senate to act I hope the sound advice given by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be heeded.

A few moments ago the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] mentioned that we should do many of the things proposed in connection with ECA because our country is much more able financially than other countries to do them; that our people are on a higher economic level, that we have greater financial strength than other countries, and therefore we can afford to do what is called for under the ECA program. No one has more charity in his heart for all people than has the Senator from Nebraska. I should like to see other peoples have what those who administer ECA wish them to have. But unless the United States maintains its financial stability, unless we maintain the value of our dollar, the prime medium of exchange, the time may come when we can no longer lead any nation out of its difficulties, because of the troubled financial situation in which we find ourselves. Unless we preserve the stability of our own great country we cannot be of effective help to others. So when it is proposed that we appropriate for this, that, or the other civil purpose in the name of defense, whether the appropriation is made for projects to be undertaken across the water or in the United States, I appeal to my colleagues to comb over the proposals with a fine-toothed comb, to cut from nonmilitary expenditures every dollar that properly can be cut and to apply to military expenditures every dollar that can be taken from nonmilitary expenditures. I say it is common sense and good judgment to do so. The time for such action has now arrived, and we must act.

Dictator Lenin said in 1924 that the Communists would drive the United States of America to spend itself into destruction. Unless we use wisdom, and meet the military needs of the hour by devoting to military purposes every dollar we can save on the home front or across the water from nonmilitary expenditures, we will hasten the day when the United States of America will lose its financial stability and be unable to help other nations, let alone amass the defense needed to protect itself.

In discussing the appropriations bill many general statements have been made. We have heard it said on the floor of the Senate that if expenditures from ECA could be cut by \$1,000,000,000 it would be a tremendous cut. It has been proposed to cut ECA expenditures for this year by several hundred million dollars. The first budget request was for \$2,900,000,000. That estimate came to

the Senate and the House long before we were confronted with the Korean situation. In my humble opinion, we should now approach the question along an entirely different line in view of the situation in Korea.

I shall not now discuss the merits of ECA generally. However, in the face of our military needs, justifications for certain ECA projects should be looked upon in an entirely different light than they were last May. If any items in the ECA program are of a long-range character, and have been included for the purpose of maintaining the morale and economic strength of the ECA countries, we should again examine those items to see whether money for such purposes can now be used by the people of western Europe to help them protect themselves from external force. Such protection—against possible attack from outside their countries—in my opinion, is more important in the face of the present acute situation than long-range programs which are provided for under ECA. I repeat, the acute situation with which we are now faced makes it necessary that we go over the ECA proposals with a fine-toothed comb to see whether any cuts should be made.

Mr. President, I sat in the Appropriations Committee and very patiently interrogated witnesses who came before the committee with respect to the ECA program. If Senators were to be presented with some of the specific items which are included in ECA overseas development projects I believe they could easily understand the viewpoint of the junior Senator from Nebraska. I say with all the force and strength within me, that many items can be cut out of the ECA program, and the money used for the purpose of helping ECA countries defend themselves, at the same time permitting us to spend our dollars in such a manner that we can secure the greatest amount of defense equipment in this critical time. I ask Senators to turn to page 383 of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations on foreign-aid appropriations for 1951. The first item is "Jamaica irrigation project, \$175,000." Mr. President, I ask: Is the money spent for such a purpose going to aid any ECA country to help defend itself today?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask the Senator from Nebraska what justification there is for spending money for such a purpose in a foreign country while we are discussing reduction of 50 percent in appropriations for civil projects in the United States?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I had expected to make. The Senator has anticipated my argument. The Senator from Arkansas, however, has made the point more ably than could the junior Senator from Nebraska. How can we justify an irrigation project in Jamaica while we are discussing cuts of 50 percent in public-works projects in the United States of America? I ask Members of the Senate that question. How can it be done? Mr. President, I come from a State where civil projects such as

those for irrigation mean a great deal. I think an across-the-board cut in expenditures for civil projects should be made. But why, in the face of such a cut, should we exempt ECA projects in out-of-the-way corners of the earth, which have no more to do with defense over there than they have to do with defense over here?

Arguments are made by Senators in favor of cuts being made in nondefense projects in this country, but the same Senators say we cannot touch the ECA items at all. That to me does not make sense, Mr. President.

I have mentioned the Jamaica irrigation project. Then I come to Gold Coast road development project, \$301,200. Cypress agricultural project, \$100,550. Northern Rhodesia road project, \$695,700.

Here we are talking about reducing appropriations for the road program in the United States, including military roads which we need. The other day a point of order was raised against an amendment which would have provided for construction of roads we do need, and the point of order was sustained. Yet we say to foreign nations, "We will give you all the money you need"; and we take that position on the theory that such expenditures will contribute to the national defense.

Mr. President, I appeal to my colleagues to stop and consider. Do they really feel that such projects will contribute to defense and will prevent an external force from attacking western Europe? If Senators answer that question in the affirmative, then I say what is the difference between such a road project in Rhodesia and a road project here in the United States? I ask that question, because I know about this matter; I have been on the Appropriations Committee, and I have spent hour after hour attempting to justify these requested appropriations. I can refer to many similar items.

Here I have a list of 22 projects, including the British Honduras road project, for which an appropriation of \$288,400 is requested. I happened to be in the neighborhood of British Honduras last fall, and I know that American representatives have had to go to British Honduras to talk the officials there into even accepting the money and spending it for that purpose. They do not need it, and it will not add to the defense of the western European countries or to the defense of the United States of America. Yet now we are discussing the question of cutting by 50 percent the appropriations for some of our own projects, which are much more needed from the military standpoint.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I am very happy to hear the able Senator from Nebraska speak about the proposals to reduce the appropriations for some of the very worthwhile projects in the United States which have been recommended and approved. If the Senator from Nebraska will permit me to do so, I should like to explain why I voted against the proposed

50-percent reduction in nonmilitary appropriations.

I voted against the amendment calling for a 50-percent reduction in nonmilitary appropriations, and the citizens of my good State could rightfully question why I would vote against a so-called economy proposal today, when we find ourselves confronted with the necessity of greatly increasing taxes and still of having a tremendously unbalanced budget.

However, in Minnesota we have had a drastic flood condition, not only during the past year, but for 3 years of the last 5. In 18 of the counties of Minnesota there has been a loss of some \$12,000,000, and farmer after farmer has lost the opportunity to grow a crop this year, because of the floods.

In the appropriations bill, and as set forth at page 255 of the report, an item of \$35,000 was recommended for the purpose of making a study leading to the correction of the flood conditions which might recur in Aitkin County, Minn.

There was another reason for the Red Lake and Clearwater projects; that item was in the amount of \$1,350,000.

I met the delegation which came here from the northwest section of Minnesota, and I took the members of that delegation to various of the Senate committees, where they made a very fine presentation in regard to the need for that appropriation. The committees have respected their request, and have recommended that the item be included in the appropriation bill.

Another project involved \$1,300,000 for the Red River of the North. That, likewise, is an appropriation to correct flood conditions which may recur. At the present time we are just recovering from one such condition.

So, Mr. President, after I appeared before those committees with those delegations and presented our requests, and after our requests were given consideration by the committee, by including the items in the appropriations bill, if 2 weeks later I came to the floor of the Senate and voted in favor of an amendment calling for a 50-percent reduction in the appropriation items, how could I explain such a stand to the people of my State who lost their crops and had their buildings damaged anywhere from 50 to 75 percent? Of course, I could not explain such a position.

On the other hand, I have received from some of the good, sound people of my State letters in which they make statements which should cause any of us to blush.

I fully recognize the fact that these good people are confronted with increasing taxes, even though the tax burden already is too great; and of course the deficit which may be incurred this year, because of the excess of expenditures over revenues, is most frightening.

So, Mr. President, I wish to say that I appreciate full well the force of the explanation the Senator from Nebraska is making apropos of items in the appropriation bill which were proposed to be included under the proposed 50 percent reduction; and I realize that some of the Senators who voted against the amendment calling for a 50 percent re-

duction did so because they knew full well that some of those proposed expenditures are badly needed and that the investments, if made, will be good, sound investments and will return dividends manifold.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for yielding to me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his observation. In the case of the specific projects he has mentioned, and in which he is greatly interested, he has expanded on the point I have made.

Mr. President, I voted against the amendment which proposed a 50 percent reduction in civil functions appropriations because I thought such an amendment was the wrong way to handle appropriations in the Senate. I may join in the proposal to make a 10-percent reduction in appropriations, because I believe that if appropriations are to be reduced—and they should be—the reduction should be on the basis of a straight-across-the-board cut.

Last January I was asked, "But will you vote to reduce the expenditures for projects in Nebraska?"

I replied, "Yes; if the Senate will vote to cut all appropriations, both those for domestic projects and those for foreign projects, straight across the board, I will vote to cut all appropriations enough to permit the budget to be balanced, and I mean just what I say."

Of course, Mr. President, since that time the military situation has changed. I will vote to appropriate every dollar that is needed for the national defense.

In further reference to the statement just made by the Senator from Minnesota, let me say that of course the people are alarmed by the proposed increase in taxes, as they have a right to be. After all, what good does it do to increase taxes, if the Congress continues to appropriate money for nonmilitary, non-essential purposes? In that case, the more the Government obtains by means of taxes, the more will be thrown away.

Mr. President, we must work in two ways. We must cut out nonessentials, and must see to it that 100 cents worth of national defense is obtained for every dollar that is spent. Then we should proceed on a pay-as-you-go basis.

I say that we must determine the ability of the people of the United States to pay the bill, not only this year, but in the years to come. I sit on various subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, and I assure the Senate that the demands which will be made for various defense items will require the people of the United States for a number of years to come to tighten their belts, in order to help protect the solvency of the Nation.

So, Mr. President, why should we not cut out proposed appropriations for some of the long-range items which last March or last April might have had a place in the ECA section of the bill, but which, believe me, should be put off in favor of projects for the national defense, which we must undertake in order to back up sufficiently the men who today are giving their lives on the foreign front.

I was reading a list of some of the projects which certainly, to say the least,

should be postponed. After we find where much of the money is proposed to go, or where much of it already has gone, and we protest, we are told that in the name of national defense the appropriations for those projects cannot be cut. However, Mr. President, that simply is not the fact. Nevertheless, we are told that we must provide 100 cents for every dollar requested for such projects, or else the morale of the ECA countries will be impaired. However, the cut proposed in regard to such items is very small, as compared to the amount of funds which will be provided to the people of the western European countries under appropriations still to be made under the ECA program, as all of us must realize when we add the \$4,000,000,000 to be provided under MAP to the previous \$1,200,000,000 for that purpose, and to other supplemental appropriations which I think will be required before this year is over.

If we are to protect the countries of western Europe, we must protect them from an external force, and that I think has the first consideration, rather than the long-range programs which not only require money now but which, as the years come and go, will require more money, as I shall point out in a moment or two. The projects which I have in mind are merely being started. It would be impossible to build these roads this year in order to help in the transportation of strategic materials. These projects are just in the making, and if they can be delayed, it will help us provide the money for national defense, even though someday when conditions permit, they might be undertaken, if we want to continue to help build up the productivity of the countries involved.

We have heard much of the dollar gap. It has been argued that we should send the money over there, so they can have the wherewithal with which to buy. Well, we are going to send them plenty of money, including \$1,200,000,000 plus \$4,000,000,000 under the military-assistance program. That is more than \$5,000,000,000. What about the dollar gap? That will close it. And the more we spend, the more counterpart funds are available the more they will spend over there. That is the way to handle it. They do not need the money represented by this small proposed reduction. It is unnecessary to come here and say that it must be provided for defense, or that it must be provided because of the dollar gap. Not any more—not with MAP assistance, which I think those countries surely will get.

Here are two other items:

Tanganyika mechanical cultivation of rice project.....	\$176,650
Tanganyika cotton and food development project.....	324,610

These are not the mother countries in Europe, these are their colonies. The ones I have mentioned are in Africa. The next item is:

Tanganyika soil-conservation project.....	\$38,920
---	----------

So a soil-conservation project is to be started in Tanganyika. We pared the soil-conservation appropriation in this country down to the bone, if you please,

Mr. President, on the theory that we could not afford it this year. Yet we are going into Africa and starting up a new project of soil conservation. I ask those who feel that this is necessary for defense to show me wherein it is necessary for defense. Why must such a project be established this year? I ask the question.

Other projects are:

Uganda road project (new)-----	\$64, 000
Nigeria road project-----	160, 000
French West Africa road-develop- ment project-----	1, 245, 000
Conakry iron-ore project-----	1, 743, 000
Algeria soil-erosion project-----	525, 000

What has soil erosion in Algeria to do with the defense of the Western Powers today? Can anyone stand on the floor of the Senate and plead that if we fail to make provision for such a project it will undermine the morale of those countries? Why, Mr. President, they have not even started these projects. They can be delayed. They are authorized now, and, believe me, before they are completed, the taxpayers of this country will be called upon to pay millions upon millions of dollars to complete the initial projects which are now being proposed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have not had the privilege of hearing all the discussion by the able Senator from Nebraska, but when the Senator, by his remarks, questions the value of soil erosion, surely the Senator is overlooking the fact that we have had to help feed the world, and that we may have a larger obligation in that respect in the future.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry the Senator did not hear all my remarks, because had he heard them I believe the question would not have been asked. I am not questioning the merits of soil conservation projects in the United States. I am referring to such projects in overseas territories of ECA countries, and I am not here trying to sabotage the basic and essential appropriations. I am not questioning the soil conservation program either at home or abroad. But I am saying that if we cut them, in this country, we should also cut them in overseas territories not related to defense. The argument is now made that we must protect the defense of these countries. I ask again, if we do need to finance soil conservation programs in Tanganyika and Algeria, do Senators think it will vitally affect the defense of the western Europe powers? My judgment is that we shall be called upon to prevent an external force from disrupting western Europe—and we shall be called upon to do so to the tune of about \$5,000,000,000. What the Senate should do is to cut out these nonessential expenditures, to safeguard those dollars which will have to be appropriated for the defense of those countries. That is my plea. I am not questioning soil conservation. I come from a section that needs it, and I voted for soil conservation. But I am

not going to cut soil conservation 50 percent at home and not apply the ax to soil conservation in Africa. That is the way I feel about it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield further to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I imagine, of course, the Senator would wish to know the facts as to what the need was for these soil erosion projects before acting upon them, would he not?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator does not need to give a discourse on the needs. I sat in the committee, and I questioned the witnesses for hours regarding the justifications, and, perchance, as one who has been on the Appropriations Committee for nearly 8 years, I know as much about the needs in Africa as does the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield further to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. PEPPER. The thing I wanted to know was that the Senator from Nebraska knew the facts, and that he was commenting upon them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has not yet yielded to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida. There is no one for whom I have more respect than I have for him.

Mr. PEPPER. I appreciate the Senator's remark.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no other Senator to whom I would rather yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I appreciate the characteristic chivalry of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The feeling is mutual.

Mr. PEPPER. The thing in which I was interested was to observe that the Senator was speaking from a specific knowledge of facts about these specific projects. In hearing his remarks, I thought he was just saying, "Let us cut out all these soil-erosion projects over there; they are not needed."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think I have made my point very clear. I am attempting to cut out these nonmilitary overseas colonial projects. The defense dollars come first with me. They have a priority. I am not discussing the value of soil conservation. But, so far as the facts are concerned, I know I have the facts relative to the justification of these projects. I questioned the witnesses, and I want to say there is an absence of facts, and an absence of a showing of need all through the ECA justification. I ask Senators to read the hearings. I particularly urge them to read the testimony by Mr. Thorp on point 4. I challenge any Senator here to justify the appropriations for the

point 4 program on the basis of Mr. Thorp's testimony. In fact, he himself admitted that he did not make a case. I again urge Senators to read the testimony, showing that we can and should cut out these appropriations.

I could go through the list of projects; I do not want to take the time of the Senate to do so. I did not intend to get into an argument as to the merits of certain of these projects, and I am not arguing about them now.

Mr. President, the United States of America is faced with a new condition since these recommendations were made. In my opinion, the United States of America is at war, and I think we are going to be called upon to appropriate all the money the people of this country can pay, and all the money we can spend, not only now, but in the months to come. For that reason, I think we should scrutinize these appropriations once again. The House is doing it. The House has sent a number of bills back to the committee. I hope the President of the United States, if the Senate lacks the courage to do it, will review every one of these projects and will send to the Congress a rescission bill that will do the very thing I am attempting to do. If the legislative body does not exercise that authority, I hope the President will. And when and if he does, I want him to do it right across the board. If he is going to rescind an appropriation for a project here, let us rescind an appropriation for one in Africa which to my mind has not one iota to do with either the defense of its mother country, or the national defense of this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the table of projects found at page 383 of the hearings, from which I have been reading.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECA overseas development projects approved or under active consideration as of May 1, 1950, out of the special fund

UNITED KINGDOM

	Estimated cost (tentative)
Jamaica irrigation project-----	\$175, 000
Mauritius food development project-----	38, 880
Gold Coast road development project-----	301, 200
Cyprus agricultural project-----	100, 550
Northern Rhodesia road project-----	695, 700
North Borneo road project-----	449, 000
British Honduras road project---	288, 400
Sarawak road project-----	75, 002
Uganda food production project-----	24, 300
Tanganyika mechanical cultivation of rice project-----	176, 660
Tanganyika cotton and food development project-----	324, 610
Tanganyika soil conservation project-----	38, 930
Tanganyika water development project-----	336, 840
Tanganyika road development project-----	546, 000
Uganda cottonseed project-----	12, 000
Uganda road project (new)-----	64, 000
Nigeria road project-----	160, 000
Total-----	3, 807, 072

FRANCE

*Estimated cost
(tentative)*

French West Africa road development project.....	\$1,245,000
Conakry iron ore project.....	1,743,000
Algeria soil erosion project.....	525,000
Morocco rice cultivation project.....	267,000
Cameroons road development project.....	71,300
French Equatorial Africa road project.....	97,632
Total.....	3,948,932

BELGIUM

Belgian Congo soil conservation project.....	1,000,000
Navigation aids of Belgian Congo project.....	650,000—
Belgian Congo road project.....	3,000,000
	1,692,000
Total.....	3,348,000—
	5,698,000

NETHERLANDS

Surinam land reclamation project.....	1,200,000
Surinam land reclamation project.....	800,000
Total.....	2,000,000

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire now to turn to page 411 of the hearings. I come to the subject of power and this international power program. I agree that power is needed in Europe. That has certainly been shown. We also need power here. I repeat, power is needed in Europe, but I want to say that all the power they can get within the next few months is not going to help the cause of defense in the situation which now confronts us, and which may confront us within the next 12 months. I am satisfied materials will be allocated, and that will be a brake. But on page 410 appears one statement which I desire to read:

As anticipated in the initial planning of the European assistance program, the problem of making an adequate supply of electric power has been extremely difficult. In the effort to relieve the situation, ECA, as of June 12, 1950, has approved 32 projects of the national programs which will provide approximately 1,215,000 kilowatts of new generating capacity. These projects will have a total cost of about \$320,000,000 (all currencies), and the dollar assistance will be about \$150,000,000.

That dollar assistance will come from the taxpayers of the United States of America. Grant that they need it; grant that the projects are meritorious; I say that at this time we cannot afford to risk the financial stability of the United States and our ability to provide the necessary money for the defense of this country and our allies, by entering upon a long-range scheme of projects such as these—projects which involve not only tax dollars, but strategic materials as well.

Mr. President, the Senator from Florida raised a question about these projects. Here they are. I am not going to take the time to read them, but they can be found on page 236 of the justifications, revised as of May 4, 1950.

I desire to close by reading some observations by ECA itself, made on July 5. While the United States is talking about huge military appropriations,

while the Banking and Currency Committee is reporting a bill to place controls on commodities practically across the board, including stand-by controls, and while we are talking about increasing taxes, let us see what the ECA says in its release of July 5, 1950:

Industrial commodities represented nearly 70 percent of the dollar value of Marshall plan recovery goods and services approved for purchase by western European countries during May. * * *

The total for the month for 17 countries was \$143,900,000, of which \$100,400,000 was for industrial commodities. The major items were machinery and equipment, nonferrous metals and their products, and crude oil and petroleum products.

I hope the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] will listen to that statement, because he was interested a few days ago in the products going across the water as strategic materials. Seventy percent of those materials that went across the water were industrial commodities, and yet we are going to allocate materials in this country.

I ask unanimous consent to place the entire release in the RECORD. I read only the first two paragraphs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the two paragraphs will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. I might have misunderstood, but I understood the Chair to say that the first two paragraphs of the release were admitted into the RECORD. I understood the Senator from Nebraska to say that he had read only the first two paragraphs, but he desired to insert the entire release in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair apologizes for the error. Without objection, the entire release may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Missouri.

There being no objection, the release, ECA No. 1582, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, July 5.—Industrial commodities represented nearly 70 percent of the dollar value of Marshall plan recovery goods and services approved for purchase by western European countries during May, the Economic Cooperation Administration reported today.

The total for the month for 17 countries was \$143,900,000, of which \$100,400,000 was for industrial commodities. The major items were machinery and equipment, nonferrous metals and their products, and crude oil and petroleum products.

Food and agricultural commodities totaled \$43,800,000, of which \$22,400,000 was for cotton. The May total also included \$600,000 for technical services and a decrease of \$900,000 on ocean freight.

The May figure brought the cumulative Marshall plan total for western Europe to \$9,115,100,000. Purchase approvals announced through July 3 raised the figure to \$9,430,260,000.

About 40 percent of the May total, \$57,800,000, was for France and her territories. The United Kingdom was second with \$24,200,000; the Netherlands, third, \$15,100,000, and Italy, fourth, \$10,700,000.

The other countries who received purchase approvals during May are: Austria, Belgium

and Luxemburg, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Trieste, and Turkey.

The leading May commodity group was machinery and equipment, with a total of \$24,100,000. The bulk of this amount went to France, who received \$12,300,000 primarily for machine tools; construction, mining and conveying equipment; agricultural machinery; and engines and turbines.

Austria received \$3,000,000 for machinery and equipment. Italy received \$3,500,000, mainly for industrial machinery.

The month's total for nonferrous metals and their products was \$24,000,000, of which \$10,500,000 was for the United Kingdom, primarily for copper and aluminum and their products. France received \$3,300,000, mainly for copper and copper products.

Crude oil and petroleum products showed a total during May of \$21,600,000, of which \$9,500,000 was for the United Kingdom and \$4,800,000 was for Sweden.

The May cotton purchase approvals totaled \$22,400,000, with \$20,600,000 going to France. Denmark received \$1,400,000 for raw cotton, excluding linters.

Other May commodity totals included \$3,200,000 for chemicals and related products, including medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations, of which \$4,100,000 went to France and \$1,900,000 to Belgium-Luxemburg, and \$8,000,000 for bread grains, including \$7,000,000 to Greece for wheat.

Following are May and cumulative commodity and country totals (in millions of dollars):

[Amount in millions]

Commodities	May 1950 totals	Cumulative totals (as of May 31)
Grand total.....	\$143.9	\$9,115.1
Commodity total.....	144.2	8,430.5
Food and agricultural commodities.....	43.8	4,074.0
Industrial commodities.....	100.4	4,356.5
Technical services.....	.6	26.0
Ship disbursements.....	—	6.5
Ocean freight.....	— .9	652.2
COMMODITY DETAIL		
Food, feed, and fertilizer.....	19.9	2,681.0
Bread grains.....	8.0	1,338.7
Wheat.....	7.8	1,088.5
Wheat flour.....	.7	239.7
Rye.....	— .5	10.5
Fats and oils.....	6.0	327.0
Peanuts.....	—	55.2
Flaxseed.....	5.8	44.3
Soybeans.....	—	41.5
Copra.....	—	29.5
Oilseeds.....	—	10.9
Lard.....	—	54.1
Soybean oil.....	— 1.1	28.6
Tallow.....	.6	22.5
Linseed oil.....	—	9.2
Whale oil and fish oils.....	—	7.8
Soap, soap stock, and fatty acids.....	—	4.8
Other.....	.7	18.6
Coarse grains.....	5.7	278.2
Corn.....	4.8	200.5
Grain sorghums and buckwheat.....	.8	31.2
Barley.....	.1	25.0
Oats.....	—	21.5
Sugar and related products.....	2.2	259.4
Sugar, etc.....	2.2	239.6
Molasses, inedible.....	—	19.8
Meat.....	— .2	122.1
Beef, veal, pork, lamb, and mutton.....	—	80.4
Horse meat.....	— .2	20.6
Canned meat and poultry.....	—	18.0
Other.....	—	3.2
Dairy products.....	—	114.0
Cheese.....	—	73.5
Milk.....	—	39.2
Other.....	—	1.3

[Amount in millions]

Commodities	May 1950 totals	Cumulative totals (as of May 31)
COMMODITY DETAIL—continued		
Food, feed, and fertilizer—Continued		
Feeds and fodder	-\$1.4	\$51.5
Oilcake and oil cake meal	-1.3	46.6
Other		5.0
Fertilizer	.9	44.5
Nitrogenous	-0.1	27.5
Other	1.0	17.0
Fruits and nuts, excluding peanuts	-1.3	31.9
Rice	.3	27.4
Vegetables and preparations		17.5
Fish and fish products, excluding fish oil and meal	-2	17.0
Coffee		16.4
Eggs	-1	15.8
Miscellaneous grain preparations		6.5
Seeds, other than oilseeds		5.7
Miscellaneous agricultural products		7.3
Fuel	21.6	1,189.7
Petroleum and products	23.3	911.7
Coal and related fuels	-1.7	277.9
Raw materials and semifinished products	72.1	2,723.5
Cotton	22.4	1,010.0
Raw cotton, excluding lint	21.4	996.3
Cotton lint	1.1	12.0
Cotton waste	-1	2.2
Unclassified cotton credits		-6
Nonferrous metals and products	24.0	551.5
Copper	18.2	281.3
Aluminum	7.0	115.7
Zinc	-2.6	68.4
Lead		55.4
Brass and bronze	.1	7.0
Nickel	.1	6.3
Tin		1.9
Other, including precious metals	1.2	15.6
Iron and steel mill materials and products, including ferro-alloys	2.5	247.3
Chemicals and related products	8.2	238.4
Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations	.2	44.9
Industrial chemicals, excluding alcohol	1.5	32.9
Alcohol	.3	16.9
Pesticides	.2	3.5
Other	6.0	140.2
Lumber and lumber manufactures	1.8	124.0
Metallic ores and concentrates	4.4	107.3
Fabricated basic textiles	.5	106.5
Pulp and paper	3.5	99.5
Nonmetallic minerals	3.2	85.0
Hides, skins, and leather	1.1	76.4
Fibers, ex. unmd. cotton and wool	.5	36.4
Naval stores	.6	23.1
Wool, unmanufactured	.2	16.3
Miscellaneous fiber products	-4	1.7
Machinery and vehicles	25.4	1,439.3
Machinery and equipment	24.1	1,126.5
Construction, mining and conveying equipment	3.5	169.0
Metalworking machinery, excluding machine tools	3.4	154.6
Machine tools	3.0	107.3
Electrical apparatus, excluding generators and motors	1.0	71.0
Engines and turbines	1.3	44.6
Generators and motors	.3	42.7
Industrial machinery	6.2	336.0
Agricultural machinery, excluding tractors	2.2	96.4
Tractors, tracklaying, 50 horsepower or over	1.9	39.7
Tractors, other (largely agricultural)	1.4	65.3
Motor vehicles, engines, and parts	1.4	175.9
Aircraft, engines, and parts	-2	84.6
Other transportation equipment	.1	52.3
Miscellaneous and unclassified	5.2	397.0
Tobacco	-1	287.8
Miscellaneous industrial commodities	4.6	89.9
Miscellaneous iron and steel manufactures	.2	18.2
Scientific and professional instruments	.6	16.2
Other	3.9	55.6

[Amount in millions]

Commodities	May 1950 totals	Cumulative totals (as of May 31)
COMMODITY DETAIL—continued		
Miscellaneous and unclassified—Con.		
Unclassified agricultural commodities	\$0.7	\$19.5
Unclassified industrial credits		-2
RECIPIENT COUNTRIES		
United Kingdom	24.2	2,485.7
France	57.8	1,959.8
Italy	10.7	1,013.2
Germany—Federated Republic	3.6	870.0
Netherlands	15.1	835.0
Belgium-Luxembourg	-7	476.3
Austria	5.5	420.5
Greece	8.8	319.6
Denmark	4.1	194.5
Norway	2.0	187.0
Ireland	-1.4	119.6
Sweden	6.0	92.4
Turkey	5.7	88.3
Trieste	.6	25.7
Portugal	1.3	15.5
Iceland	.6	12.1

NOTE.—Totals shown are sums of unrounded figures, hence may vary slightly from totals of rounded amounts. Overseas territories are reported with recipient mother countries.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I read from a release of the ECA, dated June 30, 1950:

Hundreds of miles of roads opening up isolated areas of Africa and the British East Indies will be constructed with the help of Marshall-plan dollars, the Economic Cooperation Administration announced today.

Mr. President, the Senator from Florida wanted the facts, and I have given him the facts. He can read the record.

This release came from the ECA, and I am giving the facts as the ECA released them. I want to read again the first paragraph, and then I shall ask that the entire release be printed in the RECORD:

Hundreds of miles of roads opening up isolated areas of Africa and the British East Indies will be constructed with the help of Marshall-plan dollars, the Economic Cooperation Administration announced today.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, June 29.—Hundreds of miles of roads opening up isolated areas of Africa and the British East Indies will be constructed with the help of Marshall-plan dollars, the Economic Cooperation Administration announced today.

Nearly 1,000,000 ECA dollars will buy United States equipment to be used in road-development projects in seven British territories—the Gold Coast, Northern Rhodesia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, and Nyasaland in Africa, and North Borneo and Sarawak in the British East Indies. The funds, totaling approximately \$975,000, are coming from the special reserve fund set aside by ECA to help the development of overseas territories of Marshall-plan countries, both for their own economic well-being and their contributions to the economic stability of the mother countries.

An additional \$356,000 will be made available from this same reserve fund to buy United States equipment for three other development projects announced by ECA today. They are a rice-cultivation project in French Morocco, in which ECA costs will be \$300,000; a reservoir-construction project in British Somaliland, to which ECA will contribute \$36,000; and an antierosion program on the British island of Cyprus, with ECA costs of about \$20,000.

The road-development projects in the British African territories are companion projects to three announced last week for French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, and the French Cameroons. ECA aid in African road-development projects is designed to help open up isolated areas on the continent as well as improve existing road facilities so that resources can be developed and goods moved to inland and coastal centers. ECA pointed out that this will increase intra-African trade as well as trade between the territories and the mother countries.

ECA dollar costs in the British African road-development projects are estimated at \$314,000 in the Gold Coast; \$267,000, Northern Rhodesia; \$149,000, Nigeria; \$91,000, Sierra Leone; and \$65,000, Nyasaland.

The North Borneo road-development project calls for the reconstruction and improvement of 68 miles of road and the construction of an additional 46 miles. The territory's road system was badly damaged by the Japanese during the war, and the project provides for rehabilitation of old roads as well as construction of new roads. These will open up additional areas for settlement and rice cultivation and also aid the further economic development of a region now producing large quantities of rice, peanuts, sugar, tobacco, and large numbers of draft animals. ECA expenditures in this project are estimated at \$48,000.

The Sarawak road-development project calls for the construction of 225 miles of arterial and 143 miles of secondary roads, with ECA dollars buying equipment at an estimated cost of \$40,000. The purpose of the project is to open up areas capable of producing foodstuffs, chiefly rice, urgently required for local consumption; to help relocate population; and to generally aid expansion of the territory's area of economic development now confined to regions bordering on waterways.

In the French Morocco rice-cultivation project, ECA dollars will buy equipment to help cultivate the Rharb area to make the territory self-sufficient in rice by 1952. When the project is completed, 6,250 acres will be devoted to rice cultivation, compared to 180 acres last year.

The British Somaliland reservoir construction project is designed to prevent the exhaustion of the territory's coastal areas by overgrazing. Small reservoirs are to be built at suitable points along the routes taken by camels and other livestock on their return from inland grazing areas. One of the territory's key economic problems is the severe erosion and deterioration of grazing areas due to overstocking and competition for pasture.

The antierosion program on Cyprus is one phase of a land-reclamation program designed to help increase the island's agricultural production, which has been retarded by erosion as well as antiquated farming methods. The increased output will be used both for domestic consumption and export.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is a list of approximately 25 projects in Africa, the British East Indies, and all over the world. The taxpayers of this country are called upon to pay for those projects when we are confronted with a war. Yet, Mr. President, there is an amendment to take ECA out from this proposed cut. It is being said that we cannot touch ECA funds, that they are for defense. But these are long-range projects that do not have anything in the world to do with defense.

Mr. MALONE and Mr. McCLELLAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator agree that the money for these projects for England, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Africa would result in furthering the colonial system in Africa, holding down wages, and keeping the Negroes in practical bondage, so far as their own government is concerned?

Mr. WHERRY. I think there can be no doubt about that, and I appreciate the Senator's observation. That is another very good point which can be argued in connection with these appropriations. But the point I am making is that, regardless of the merits or demerits—and that question could be argued all afternoon—here is an appropriation for 25 projects in colonial territories, when we are confronted with a budget which, when we take into consideration the military expenditures, the supplemental appropriations and the deficiency appropriations will approach nearly \$50,000,000,000. How far am I off in my figures?

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask him, with reference to the appropriation for ECA for the purpose of strengthening the peacetime industrial structures of the 16 Marshall plan countries, whether in the opinion of the Senate, it is a type of strengthening the industrial production in Europe which puts them into position to fulfill their contracts under the 96 trade treaties they have with Russia and with the satellite nations in accordance with which they are furnishing ballbearings and other commodities to equip them for world war III.

Mr. WHERRY. First, let me place this release in the RECORD, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas. I want to read the first paragraph:

WASHINGTON, May 10.—A project to further mechanize rice farming in French West Africa to provide basic food for a growing population has been approved by the Economic Cooperation Administration, it was announced today here and in Paris.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire release may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, May 10.—A project to further mechanize rice farming in French West Africa to provide basic food for a growing population has been approved by the Economic Cooperation Administration, it was announced today here and in Paris.

The project, to be undertaken by the Office du Niger, a public agency under the jurisdiction of the Government of French West Africa, involves \$1,400,000 in ECA financing. This covers funds for the purchase of agricultural and earth-moving equipment including tractors, graders, ditchers, and scrapers.

ECA funds do not include requirements for spare parts estimated to total \$400,000 by 1952. Of this sum, \$50,000 will be required this fiscal year, \$150,000 in 1950-51, and about \$200,000 in 1951-52. These purchases will be made from local dealers.

With the equipment to be purchased it is expected that 13,000 acres of rice land will be

developed for the 1951 crop and a similar amount of acreage for 1952. The French West Africa Administration plans on developing about 120,000 acres of rice land by mid-1957 at a cost of about eight billion colonial French African francs, equivalent to approximately \$46,000,000 (at the present rate of exchange). Of this amount, about six billion francs would represent direct expenditures for reclaiming new areas and extending main irrigation canals.

Although cotton was to be the chief product of the area when the Office du Niger was formed in 1932, experience showed the area was well suited to rice production. Upon completion of a dam across the Niger River in 1947, assuring an adequate supply of water for irrigation, emphasis swung to rice production. This decision was prompted by the uncertainty over the prospective availability of rice from Indochina and the need for a greater supply of the commodity for the increasing population.

Mr. WHERRY. The next release which I have here is dated May 12, 1950, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

Increased electric power for industrial and home use will be provided under two Marshall plan industrial projects approved for Iceland, the Economic Cooperation Administration announced today in Washington and Reykjavik.

Then it goes on to say:

The expansion of two hydroelectric power projects will also reduce Iceland's requirements for imported fuels, ECA said.

ECA funds totaling \$5,065,000 will be used to finance the purchase of machinery and equipment in the United States and to pay for American engineering services. Total over-all cost of the projects is estimated at the equivalent of more than \$12,000,000.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire release from which I last read be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, May 12.—Increased electric power for industrial and home use will be provided under two Marshall plan industrial projects approved for Iceland, the Economic Cooperation Administration announced today in Washington and Reykjavik.

The expansion of two hydroelectric power projects will also reduce Iceland's requirements for imported fuels, ECA said.

ECA funds totaling \$5,065,000 will be used to finance the purchase of machinery and equipment in the United States and to pay for American engineering services. Total over-all cost of the projects is estimated at the equivalent of more than \$12,000,000.

One project provides for expansion of the Sog River plant of the Reykjavik Municipal Electric Light & Power Co. Development of this plant was first authorized in 1933 and the plant went into operation in 1937 with an installed capacity of 8,300 kilowatts. In 1944 an additional 5,500 kilowatts of capacity was added.

Under the expansion program, a dam will be constructed across the Sog River about 32 miles above Reykjavik and an underground powerhouse to accommodate three 16,000 kilowatt units will be built. However, only two of these units will be installed at this time. A transmission line from the station to Reykjavik and substations, transformers, switchgear, and underground cables will also be provided.

ECA will provide financing of \$3,955,000 for the project for the purchase in the United States of insulators, transmission line

towers, steel aluminum wires, generators, transformers, switchgear, and other miscellaneous equipment as well as engineering plans and services. Total over-all cost is estimated at the equivalent of \$9,060,000.

The second project calls for expansion of facilities on the Laxa River in northeastern Iceland. A reinforced concrete dam, intake works, and powerhouse will be constructed, together with a transmission line to Akureyri, and necessary substation and auxiliary equipment.

United States equipment costing \$1,110,000 will be purchased with ECA financing. The commodities needed include: Wood poles and crossarms, insulators, penstock and surge tank, copperstrand, a generator, transformers and switchgear, a turbine, and construction machinery. Funds will also be used for supplying American engineering services. It is estimated that the total over-all cost will be the equivalent of \$2,931,000.

The Reykjavik project will supply power to meet increased domestic and industrial demand which has resulted from a rise in population. Power from the Laxa River project will be used mainly for domestic consumption in the central part of northern Iceland and to supply various industrial plants including a textile mill, three herring oil and meal factories, and a number of freezing plants.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The 96 trade treaties which have been put into the RECORD by the junior Senator from Nevada are being serviced from the material we are furnishing the 16 nations under ECA to further the two nonaggression pacts separately made by England with Russia and by France with Russia and which are still in good standing, are they not?

Mr. WHERRY. Of course the answer would be "Yes," as to any money or materials furnished by us and so used.

I now yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to compliment the able Senator from Nebraska for giving this splendid exposé of those projects that we are expected to pay for out of these funds. I want to point out that every dollar of this ECA money under present conditions must be borrowed, must be added to our national debt, and must be charged to the American taxpayers and American toilers and producers of the future. Why cannot France, Britain, and other countries, who have an interest in the areas mentioned, use counterpart funds or use their own money to employ people to build roads and build soil-conservation projects? The point I make is that all the free peoples of the world are confronted with an international danger, and we here at home are faced with the demand and urgent need for the identical character of projects that we are asked to appropriate for abroad in ECA. We are sacrificing and we are doing without over here. Why? It is because of the international crisis and because we feel we must conserve and concentrate our strength and power in this hour of danger where they will be most effective in meeting this crisis. Yet we are told that if we do not build some trails in Africa or pile up or dump some dirt somewhere to keep some little topsoil

from washing away in some overseas territory, and charge it to the American people in this time of crisis, the whole economy of the ECA countries is going to crumble. I want to say that if their economy is so weak, all the dollars that America can borrow, scrape together, and spend will not be adequate to save the crumbling economy of those countries.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his observations. Why cannot these countries use counterpart funds? I asked that question many times in the Committee on Appropriations. The answer has always been that we cannot interfere with the sovereignty of another nation. We cannot tell another nation what it must do. We can give them money. However, after they get the money, there are no strings attached. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I ask the Senator what is keeping those countries from issuing their own currency?

Mr. WHERRY. That would suit me.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The primary purpose of our providing dollars is that the countries may use them for the purchase of materials to rehabilitate their plants, and so forth, which materials they must buy from us because they cannot get them elsewhere.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator will agree with me, I think, that the huge amount of money which the United States will give to the European countries for machinery, trucks, and so forth, will supply the dollar gap without having to depend on ECA.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Someone asked for the facts. I shall give a few facts. I did not intend to go into all these facts today, but I think they should be put into the RECORD. I am giving the Senate the releases issued by the ECA. Inasmuch as the question has been brought up I shall give these facts. I have another one.

MAY 18.—Generating equipment which produced electric power for a wartime air base—

If we ever needed air bases, we need them now. We certainly need them in Spain. At long last we finally got an authorization for Spain yesterday.

Generating equipment which produced electric power for a wartime air base will soon supply electricity for a peacetime irrigation and food-development project in Jamaica, British West Indies.

What do Senators think of that? Taking it from an air base and putting it into a peacetime irrigation project.

We will probably raise some more money and build another air base next to the irrigation project. That is the way the Fair Deal operates. The more taxes are levied and the more money we give them, the more they throw away. I ask that the entire release be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, May 18.—Generating equipment which produced electric power for a wartime air base will soon supply electricity for a peacetime irrigation and food development project in Jamaica, British West Indies.

The Economic Cooperation Administration announced today that it has authorized the use of \$175,000 in Marshall-plan funds for the purchase by the Jamaican Government of three generators to supply power for the island's mid-Clarendon irrigation project. The generators have been operating at the United States Air Force base at Vernam Field, Jamaica, which is now being evacuated.

The ECA announcement marks the first use of a special reserve fund set aside by the recovery agency to aid the development of overseas territories of Marshall-plan countries through special projects.

In requesting this ECA aid, the Jamaica Government said that provision of electric power is an essential prerequisite to the implementation of the project and that purchase of the Vernam Field equipment would be the most economical way of obtaining it. The power available from the Vernam Field electric plant is sufficient to pump the water required for the project.

Jamaica's mid-Clarendon area covers approximately 5,000 acres and at present supports a population of about 2,000. Surveys have determined that this low-rainfall area contains inherently fertile soil, capable of heavy production if irrigated. It has also been determined that there are sufficient reserves of underground water to carry out the irrigation project and insure permanent benefit from it.

It is estimated that with proper irrigation, the mid-Clarendon area will produce about 6,500 tons of cane sugar annually, primarily for export, as well as food for the farmers living on the land, and crops such as swamp rice, corn, and pulses for sale on the local market. A dairying industry will also be established in the area. It is planned to devote about 2,000 acres to the production of cane sugar.

The Jamaica Government, which is managing the mid-Clarendon project, plans to lease the power plant to the Jamaica Public Service Co., Ltd., a private company, since the Government has neither the organization nor staff to operate the plant. Construction and installations for the irrigation system will be completed within 18 months.

The total cost of the equipment required for the project is estimated at the equivalent of \$280,000. In addition to the \$175,000 from ECA, the Jamaican and British Governments will provide the equivalent of \$105,000 to purchase auxiliary equipment to operate the power plant.

This is the first irrigation and food development project in the Caribbean area receiving Marshall plan aid, as well as the first ECA use of the special reserve fund. ECA's program to aid the development of dependent overseas territories also provides for purchases of recovery goods for these areas, technical assistance projects, and special projects and surveys in the territories in connection with ECA's procurement of strategic materials for the United States stockpile.

Previous ECA aid in the Caribbean area has provided for purchases of recovery goods and, under the strategic materials program, a project for the development of mining resources and facilities in Jamaica and other British West Indies areas.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have before me a release dated July 27 in which it is said:

To help the Portuguese to develop the rich timber reserves in their West Africa colony of

Angola, the Economic Cooperation Administration has made available the services of an American forestry expert.

I ask the Senators if that is an item that is untouchable? Does that have anything to do with the defense of our country? I ask that the entire release be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, July 27.—To help the Portuguese develop the rich timber reserves in their West African colony of Angola, the Economic Cooperation Administration has made available the services of an American forestry expert.

He is Winslow L. Gooch, who has left for Lisbon, en route to Cabinda, Angola, where he will spend 3 months surveying the area's timber resources and production facilities for the Portuguese Government.

Through the project, the first under ECA's technical assistance program to aid in the development of a Portuguese colony, a new source of lumber may be opened for western Europe.

Cabinda, located on the Atlantic coast near the mouth of the Congo River, is covered with dense tropic forests, many of them virgin. Among the valuable species, for which a ready market exists in Europe, is mahogany.

During his stay, Gooch will make a study to determine the quality, amount, and distribution of the various species and the costs involved. In addition, he will inspect the production set-up, including existing saw mills, transportation, and handling facilities and will recommend to the Colonial Government and the Ministry of Colonies ways for increasing productivity in the timber industry.

Mr. WHERRY. I read from another release:

WASHINGTON, May 20.—The Economic Cooperation Administration announced today the conclusion of an agreement with the French Government whereby \$965,000,000 worth of American equipment will be provided for the modernization and development of nickel production in New Caledonia.

There may be some use for nickel, but we cannot get it out of there now. I ask that the release be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, May 20.—The Economic Cooperation Administration announced today the conclusion of an agreement with the French Government whereby \$965,000 worth of American equipment will be provided for the modernization and development of nickel production in New Caledonia by Societe Le Nickel.

The arrangement calls for delivery by Societe Le Nickel for the United States Government stockpile of nickel in an amount corresponding to the amount of the ECA dollar advances. At the time ECA advances the dollars, the company will deposit the equivalent in francs, and as nickel is delivered, corresponding amounts of francs will be released to the company.

The arrangement takes into account the nickel requirement of the French Union in accordance with the terms of the ECA agreement between the United States and France.

According to ECA officials, the expansion program helped by the Marshall plan should increase the production of New Caledonian nickel from the prewar rate of 6,000 to 7,000 tons a year to 10,000 to 12,000 tons a year.

The modernization of the New Caledonian mining operation is expected to enable the company to sell its product at competitive world prices.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is said that in the interest of national defense we cannot take one dollar from the ECA appropriations. If the President fine combs the bill and he takes from it items affecting projects which need to be developed in America he should do the same thing with the projects such as I have mentioned designed for places in the West Indies, Africa, and other parts of the globe. They should be postponed indefinitely. How can we justify taking dollars from our taxpayers and throwing the Nation into more debt than we are already faced with, for projects like these, when we are confronted with a war? I say conditions have changed, Mr. President, and these projects should be viewed in the light of such changed conditions.

I have before me release No. 1574.

WASHINGTON, June 29.—Belgium today signed agreements with the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Export-Import Bank under which she will receive a loan of \$1,778,000 to finance a major road development project in the Belgian Congo.

We are asked to pay for that. American taxpayers are being asked to pay for it. It must be undertaken immediately. Yet we need every dime we can get, and to obtain the money, we will have to levy taxes in order that we may defend the United States and defend western European countries, to which we have already agreed to send, or will send probably \$5,000,000,000 under the MAP.

I ask that the release be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, June 29.—Belgium today signed agreements with the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Export-Import Bank under which she will receive a loan of \$1,778,000 to help finance a major road development project in the Belgian Congo.

ECA announced that the Marshall plan dollars will pay for United States equipment to be used in initial stages of the Congo road-building program and also for salaries of 12 United States technicians who will train local workers in operation of the equipment. The Congo project is a 10-year program and its total cost is estimated at the equivalent of \$120,000,000.

The loan, which is the first under the Marshall plan for an overseas territory development project, was negotiated through ECA and signed for Belgium by her Ambassador to the United States, Baron Silvercruys. It is a 20-year loan with interest set at 2½ percent. Principal and interest payments are scheduled to begin at the end of 1952, with 50 percent of the principal to be paid in equal semiannual installments during the 1952-60 period, and the remaining 50 percent between 1960 and 1970. The loan agreement provides that Belgium will negotiate at the request of the United States for all or any part of such payments to be made in materials needed for United States stockpiles.

The Congo road project is one phase of the Belgian Government's 10-year plan for the economic and social development of the African territory. Covering more than 904,000 square miles and with a population of

about 12,000,000, the Congo is the world's largest producer of industrial diamonds, one of the world's leading copper-producing areas, and a producer of a variety of other products including minerals, palm oil, cotton, rubber, and ivory.

Much of the area, however, is untapped jungle and its only coastline is a short stretch bordering on the south Atlantic at the mouth of the Congo River. Consequently, the Belgian Government's overall program for Congo development calls for expansion of such basic utilities as roads, railroads, water navigation, power facilities and warehouses, as well as projects in the housing, public welfare and education fields.

The purpose of the program is to create economic conditions conducive to private as well as public investments, leading to development of new industrial, mineral and agricultural enterprises. The Belgian Government foresees this development as providing new employment in diversified Congo industries with an accompanying increase in levels of income, and more extensive and intensive development of indigenous mineral and agricultural resources. Much of the increased output would go into world trade channels.

The road development phase of the overall program calls for a network linking productive areas of the Congo and providing transportation for regions now inadequately served by existing water and rail transport facilities. Five primary routes will be constructed and 11 feeder roads. In addition, existing roads will be improved so that they will be able to carry loads of more than 4 tons, the present maximum, which is considered economically unfeasible.

The Marshall-plan dollars aiding the project will come from two ECA funds. A total of \$1,718,000 to pay for United States road-building equipment is being made available from the special reserve fund set aside by ECA to help the development of overseas territories of Marshall-plan countries.

The balance of \$60,000 is coming from funds set aside by ECA for its technical assistance program, under which United States technical know-how is channeled to Marshall-plan areas. The \$60,000 will pay salaries and certain incidental expenses of the 12 United States technicians who will go to the Congo for 6 months to advise on the setting up of base maintenance shops and the deployment of equipment among road construction sites, as well as instruct local workers in the operation and maintenance of the United States equipment.

The United States equipment will provide 10 road construction units. Each will consist of one heavy and one medium scraper, seven tractors of varying power, one motor grader, one ripper, six dump trucks, a mobile shop, and spare parts.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I read another release:

WASHINGTON, May 25.—Plans of Italy's leading automobile manufacturer to increase production by more than 25 percent during 1950 will be aided by Marshall-plan industrial project, the Economic Cooperation Administration announced today in Washington and Rome.

Of course it would be well to increase the manufacture of automobiles in Italy; but I ask Senators if manufacturing automobiles in Italy is in the interest of national defense of this country? Is it in the interest of our national defense to help automobile manufacturers in Italy increase their output by 25 percent? Yet we are told that we cannot take this item out of ECA. Would it hurt the defense of the United States in the least if we took this item out of the bill? Anyone

with sound judgment knows that it would not. I should like to have the release inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, May 25.—Plans of Italy's leading automobile manufacturer to increase production by more than 25 percent during 1950 will be aided by a Marshall plan industrial project, the Economic Cooperation Administration announced today, in Washington and Rome.

The ECA supplemental project to assist in financing a modernization program for the FIAT Co., was approved along with two other Italian projects. The other projects provide financing for an Italian steel works and a new thermal power station.

FIAT production of automobiles, vans, trucks, and buses in 1950 is expected to reach a total of about 107,000 units. This compares with 71,144 units produced in 1949.

The expected increase in production results from a multimillion dollar modernization program now under way at FIAT. The original project was approved by ECA last July, when \$14,620,000 of Marshall-plan funds were earmarked for the purchase of equipment in the United States.

Under the supplement, the equivalent of approximately \$26,000,000 will be spent by FIAT for modernization of its mechanical sector. Of this total, ECA will supply \$8,432,000 to finance the purchase of machine tools from United States firms and \$200,000 to meet ocean freight charges. Other expenditures will include \$468,000 in non-ECA dollars; the equivalent of \$3,094,000 in sterling and the equivalent of \$13,450,000 in lire for the project.

The steel project provides for \$4,523,000 in ECA financing for the purchase of United States equipment and services for the Milan works of Acciarierie e Ferriere Lombardo, FLACK. An additional \$314,000 is provided for ocean freight. The company will provide the lire equivalent of \$3,000,000 for the project.

New equipment to be purchased under this phase of the project is primarily for the modernization of the plant's wire rod, plate, sheet and seamless tube facilities. Certain of the new equipment will replace outmoded existing facilities.

Previously, ECA approved the use of \$2,200,000 in Marshall-plan funds for the same plant.

The third Italian project provides for boilers for a new 120,000-kilowatt thermal power station at Tavazzano. The plant will be connected to the high-tension transmission system of northern Italy. Five companies participating in the STEI, will own and operate the plant.

A total of \$2,680,000 in ECA financing will be used for the purchase of two boilers, control equipment and American technical services. Freight costs are estimated at \$320,000 for the project, which will cost the equivalent of \$10,877,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish I could read all this material at this time. Someone wanted facts. I am giving the facts. We do not need those items in the ECA program, and they ought to be taken out. Projects for unessential purposes should be taken out of our domestic programs. If the Senators cannot rise to the occasion and have the courage to take these items out of the bill, even if to do so may hurt their own States, I hope the President of the United States will send to the Congress a rescission bill that will take these items out clear across the board as affecting both foreign and domestic spending. I think he should do

that to protect the interests and stability of the United States of America.

Here is another release. It is release No. 1498 dated May 26, 1950:

WASHINGTON, May 25.—An industrial recovery project to provide equipment for oil prospecting—

This is a good one. Oil prospecting. We have 50,000 wildcat operators prospecting in this country every year. This item is also apparently in the interest of national defense. We are providing \$1,300,000 out of ECA funds to pay for oil prospecting in French North Africa for two French oil companies. I ask that the release be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, May 25.—An industrial recovery project to provide equipment for oil prospecting and drilling in French North Africa for two French companies has been approved by the Economic Cooperation Administration, it was announced today in Washington and Paris.

The over-all cost of the project is the equivalent of \$15,000,000 including \$1,300,000 in ECA financing. The companies receiving aid are S. N. Repal, which operates in Algeria, and SCP, which operates in Morocco.

Exploration has disclosed that seven-ninths of Algeria's territory is underlaid by potential oil bearing strata. Morocco is now producing oil in commercial quantities.

Under the project approved, S. N. Repal will receive \$220,000 for maintenance and replacement machinery and \$500,000 for additional drilling equipment.

SCP will receive \$580,000 for maintenance and replacement equipment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it has been said that to take a dime off these appropriations would destroy the morale of people in the participating foreign countries and hurt their national defense. The facts were presented before me as I sat in the meetings of the Committee on Appropriations time and time again, hour after hour after hour, and to say that it is necessary to appropriate \$2,900,000,000 of ECA funds for the defense of those countries is just not stating a fact.

Here is another release, ECA No. 1544, dated June 15:

Three pulp and paper mill projects which are expected to substantially benefit Austria's balance of trade.

Mr. President, I have not anything against that if we desire to help them when the proper time comes, but what do three pulp and paper plants in Austria mean to the defense of the United States, or Austria for that matter. How will that aid the boys in Korea, whom we need to back up with military equipment?

I ask that this release be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, June 15.—Three pulp and paper mill projects which are expected to substantially benefit Austria's balance of trade, strengthen her domestic economy and provide additional employment have been approved by the Economic Cooperation Ad-

ministration, it was announced today in Washington and Vienna.

Total cost of the three projects is the equivalent of \$9,936,000, including \$3,902,000 in ECA financing for purchases to be made in the United States.

The first project is for modernization of two mills owned by Arland Papier- und Zellstoffwerken A. G. One of these factories is a fine paper mill at Andritz, and the other plant is a sulphite pulp mill at Rechberg. Upon completion of the modernization program, it is estimated that paper production at Andritz will be increased from 8,000 metric tons to 17,000 metric tons annually and that pulp production at Rechberg will be increased from 10,000 metric tons to 16,000 metric tons. The present equipment of the two mills is obsolete and inefficient. Modernization will provide increased production with considerable savings in power, fuel and pulpwood per ton of production.

Total cost of this project is estimated at the equivalent of \$2,647,000. Of this amount, \$1,169,000 in ECA dollars will be used for purchases in the United States. The equivalent of \$144,000 in German drawing rights, \$75,000 in Italian drawing rights and local currency of \$1,259,000 will also be used for the project.

A second project involves replacement of two obsolete newsprint paper machines by the purchase and installation of one modern high-speed newsprint machine, together with the necessary auxiliary equipment in the plant of Murztal Pulp and Paper Manufacturing Co., Ltd., at Bruck a. d. Mur, Austria.

The total cost of the project amounts to the equivalent of \$3,714,000, including \$80,000 for ocean freight costs. Of this total, ECA financing for machinery and equipment will amount to \$1,604,000. In addition, drawing rights for the equivalent of \$549,520 were approved for purchases in Germany. Local currency to be expended is equivalent to \$1,430,000.

With the proposed improvements it is estimated that the plant production of newsprint, for which there is an increasing world demand, will be increased from 12,500 tons in 1949 to 30,000 tons in 1952. It is planned to export all of this additional production, thereby increasing Austrian exports by approximately \$1,500,000 per year. Through the erection of a new boiler plant and improved utilization of power, importation of black coal will be eliminated, saving approximately \$250,000 per year.

The third project covers modernization of a completely integrated pulp and paper mill at Niklasdorf for Brigl & Bergmeister A. G. The mill is old and its equipment is inefficient and obsolete. Total cost of the project is estimated at the equivalent of \$3,575,000. Of this amount, \$1,129,000 will be financed by ECA for purchases in the United States. In addition, the project involves an equivalent of \$221,743 in German drawing rights, \$218,085 in Swedish krona and \$81,650 in Swiss francs. The local currency cost is estimated at an equivalent of \$1,925,000.

The proposed modernization is expected to increase the chemical pulp capacity from 26,000 to 30,000 metric tons per year and paper manufacturing capacity from 10,000 metric tons to 18,000 metric tons per year. The contemplated improvements in equipment and methods is expected to bring about this increased production without a significant increase in raw material consumption.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the Senator realize that already the paper industry in America is in a very serious condition?

Imports are coming in which are putting out of business many of our old standing paper mills. Paper is a very important product in the United States in connection with defense.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the situation in the paper and pulp business is rather tight, I know. It is a question whether we want to put the money into such projects in foreign countries now, or when the proper time comes. I am saying that the acute need is for defense dollars. That is what is confronting the Senate this afternoon. These so-called justifications were made before the Korean war situation developed. As I said before, a fine-toothed comb must be used on these appropriations, and every one taken out that is not essential, and is not for the military. That is what should be done by every Senator. I propose to do it. Any other Senator can do as he pleases, of course.

Here is another release, No. 1555:

Nearly \$4,000,000 Marshall plan dollars will be spent in the United States to buy equipment which will help Africa develop her road systems, agriculture, iron-ore deposits, and soil-conservation programs.

This release, No. 1555, was issued on June 23.

This is a soil conservation program! I submit to all Senators present that we have delayed and put off a comprehensive soil conservation program in the United States because we could not afford it. We have put it off and put it off. We have tightened up at every corner. Yet we are asked to launch out and spend \$4,000,000 to start soil conservation in Africa, and help in that section of the world. It is meritorious, I suppose, if we can afford it. But the time has come when we have to choose where we are to spend our dollars.

I ask that this release be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, June 22.—Nearly four million Marshall-plan dollars will be spent in the United States to buy equipment which will help Africa develop her road systems, agriculture, iron-ore deposits, and soil-conservation programs.

The Economic Cooperation Administration today announced the first six African projects under a special reserve fund set aside by the recovery agency to help the development of overseas territories of Marshall-plan countries. The areas involved range from Algeria in French North Africa to French West Africa and to the island of Mauritius in the Indian Ocean off the coast of South Africa.

The projects are:

Three road development projects—in French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, and the French Cameroons, in which ECA dollar assistance amounts to \$1,236,000.

ECA financing of \$1,976,000 worth of equipment to help develop iron-ore deposits in the Conakry Peninsula in French Guinea.

Purchases, financed by ECA, of \$603,750 worth of United States heavy earth-moving equipment vitally needed in Algeria to help halt soil erosion.

A Marshall-plan dollar outlay of \$13,460 to pay for the purchase of agricultural machinery to go into an equipment-loan pool for farmers on the island of Mauritius.

ECA said the projects will aid the development of African resources and, through the road-construction programs, help to move goods to other areas of the continent and to coastal ports for shipment to other world regions.

The road projects will help fill in gaps in meager existing road systems and will aid materially in linking together the transportation network of the French territories. In French West Africa, the goal is construction of 4,300 miles of paved road. ECA will contribute \$1,035,000 to this program. In French Equatorial Africa, the goal is 8,500 miles of paved road, with ECA aid amounting to \$117,000. In the French Cameroons, the program calls for construction of about 200 miles of paved road, with ECA aid under the new project amounting to \$84,000.

Inadequate transportation facilities have isolated large areas of the African Continent. Development of road, rail, and waterway systems, ECA said, is essential to the economic progress of the African territories and a rise in their trade with Europe and the Americas.

The Conakry iron-ore project is a principal phase of French Guinea's over-all economic plans, which also call for development of hydroelectric power resources in mountains northeast of Conakry and development of the port of Conakry. The Conakry deposit, in which Societe Miniere de Conakry holds a 75-year lease, is considered well suited for open-pit operations by mechanized means.

The Algerian soil-conservation program has been developed by the Algerian and French Governments to cut heavy agricultural losses resulting from soil erosion of Algeria's hilly countryside during seasonal torrential rains.

The ECA project for the British island of Mauritius will provide agricultural equipment to be used by local farmers. The machinery will aid in opening up approximately 200 acres of land annually for the lifetime of the equipment, to be planted in rice or maize, potatoes, beans, and onions. The machinery will also help intensify cultivation of 1,200 acres now planted in corn, root crops, and vegetables.

Mr. WHERRY. I have here, Mr. President, an ECA pamphlet. It is quite a pamphlet, and shows what they are doing. On page 2 I find this headline: "ECA names '49 top projects in Europe."

I shall read only the last one, because time is fleeting.

In the Netherlands the Zuyder Zee reclamation project being developed at a cost of \$11,000,000 is an outstanding ECA project.

In Norway there is another one costing \$5,000,000, aided by ECA funds.

The ECA pamphlet is advertising to the world what we are doing for these countries, including an \$11,000,000 reclamation project in The Netherlands. Yet we are denying the very same kind of thing in this country.

Mr. President, I should like to have the particular part of page 2 to which I have referred printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECA NAMES 1949 TOP PROJECTS IN EUROPE

Ten of the outstanding Marshall plan aid projects of 1949 have been picked by ECA-Washington and the European headquarters of ECA in Paris.

The projects range from the completion of the Corinth Canal in Greece to the rehabilitation of Norway's mines 300 miles inside the Arctic Circle.

The reconstruction of the Corinth Canal was started by American contractors under the supervision of the United States Army Corps of Engineers in 1947 and was completed in 1949. American funds totaling approximately \$522,000 and 8,800,000,000 drachmas, part of which was ECA money, were spent to rebuild the canal.

The largest single Marshall plan project for western Europe was the Sollac Steel Works in Lorraine near Metz in France. With \$49,360,000 in ECA funds, the company is expanding its plant facilities and installing the latest American steel milling equipment.

In the Black Sea mining town of Zonguldak in Turkey American and Turkish engineers are modernizing the vital mines under a \$55,000,000 program, of which ECA will contribute more than \$12,000,000. Zonguldak's harbor is also being improved at a cost of more than \$9,000,000 with ECA advancing \$4,000,000.

In the lower Rhone Valley in France a combined electric power and irrigation project will add 2,000,000 kilowatts to the nation's electric potential and an elaborate system of canals is expected to turn southeastern France into fertile farmland. More than \$9,000,000 of counterpart funds is being invested.

The construction of new plant installations of the Steel Co. of Wales in Port Talbot reached an advanced stage in 1949. ECA financing permits the dollar purchase of about \$27,000,000 worth of machinery and equipment from United States companies which is not available in the United Kingdom. The construction program is currently employing 6,000 workers.

In the Netherlands the Zuyder Zee reclamation project being developed at a cost of \$11,000,000 is an outstanding ECA project. In Norway the Syd Varanger mines at Kirkenes, demolished by the retreating Germans, are being restored with ECA dollar aid amounting to \$5,000,000.

In 1949 western Europe saw a great revival of rail transportation. Dollar funds advanced by ECA enabled the Belgium firm of Brugeoise, Nicasie and Delcuve Co. to modernize its machine shops and assembly lines. The firm is now turning out a new freight car every 18 minutes, and is completing a 3,000 freight car order for Bizone Germany.

With \$4,250,000 from ECA the Aquila Oil Refinery in Trieste was able to largely reconstruct its war-damaged plant. Twenty American technicians helped expedite the installation of new American equipment. In its partially rebuilt state the refinery is already working at more than 140 percent of its prewar capacity.

A greatly augmented ECA technical assistance program in 1949 provided the peoples of western Europe with an unprecedented opportunity to study and acquire industrial and scientific know-how from other European countries and from America. The technical knowledge and experience furnished under this program generally through sending technicians from one country to another, is expected to have a lasting effect on the agriculture and industry of the countries participating in the Marshall plan.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire to top this off. I stated that requests for appropriations for such purposes would continue to come to Congress. A new one has just come in today. The President of the United States, in a supplemental estimate, is asking for seventy-nine million more dollars in cash and \$25,000,000 in authorizations. I have here a report which came before our committee, whose chairman, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], has done such wonderful

work in connection with this appropriation bill. On page 16 is this provision:

The funds (not to exceed \$700,000,000) and authority available to the Secretary of State pursuant to the act of March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 31), as amended, to carry out the agreement of December 31, 1943, between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Liberia for the construction of a port, port facilities, and access roads in Monrovia, Liberia, shall remain available until June 30, 1951, for the purpose of constructing and improving roads giving access from the interior of Liberia and adjoining areas to the port of Monrovia.

I now read from the report submitted by the committee:

Extension of the availability of these funds and authority will permit the establishment of a year-round highway to the port of Monrovia. The increased traffic will make it possible to utilize the full potential of the port and increase its success as a financial venture.

I ask, Mr. President, is that necessary for the defense of the United States of America? Is that necessary for the defense of the western European powers?

As I said in the beginning, the appropriation is authorized, and therefore one should not sabotage the appropriation, but with all due respect to those who believe in ECA, the junior Senator from Nebraska has been and is constructively pointing out project after project after project that is nonessential, that has not a thing to do with defense, which should not be started at this time, which should not be an added obligation on the people of the United States until they can afford it. What we need to do is to take every dime we can raise and use it first for defense.

Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I appeal to every Senator on this floor to reduce these appropriations. The committee has spent hours and hours, during the years, studying this question, and many of these projects have not been justified, and if they are eliminated it will not hurt the ECA program. Some of them can be eliminated under a 10-percent cut.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment offered by my distinguished friend from New Jersey, who made a very admirable case for his amendment, will be defeated, not because of any personal feeling I have, because I respect the Senator, who is doing great work on the Committee on Foreign Relations, and he believes in these things, but I have pointed out project after project after project, which could be dispensed with, and I ask him if in his good judgment and his good will, he does not feel that he should withdraw the amendment he offered and permit a cut of 10 percent to be applied to ECA, as we are applying it to projects in the United States, so that projects in Africa, the West Indies, the Congo, and the others to which I have referred may be eliminated. I submit to his good judgment, to his integrity, to his ability. After all, this is a very serious matter. The United States of America is facing a dangerous situation, and if we are to lead the nations of the world out of the darkness into the light, it is absolutely mandatory that we maintain

the financial and economic stability of the land we love.

Mr. President, this is the place where it should be done, and if we fail on the floor of the Senate today, I shall appeal to the President of the United States to send a rescission bill to the Congress which will do what the junior Senator from Nebraska has attempted to do in making the proposed cut in the ECA appropriations, along with the others mentioned.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, simply for the record and for an expression of my own views I wish to follow up along the line of discussion taken by the able Senator from Nebraska. I remind Senators that in the effort of both the House and the Senate to economize with respect to our domestic program at home on projects similar to those which have been referred to by the able Senator from Nebraska—in fact more important projects really to any economy, than some of those to which the Senator has referred—the House has cut from the flood control and rivers and harbors appropriation 24.9 percent under the budget recommendations. Those cuts were made by the House before the present crisis arose. But, in our efforts to economize, in view of conditions that obtained then, the House made cuts in our domestic program of this character of 24.9 percent.

The Senate committee felt that those cuts were too great. Therefore the Senate committee restored a number of those cuts, and the over-all cut under the budget by the Senate committee in this particular field amounted in round figures to \$66,936,000, or 8.40 percent.

Mr. President, what I am emphasizing is that these efforts to economize here at home were being made, and we felt the impelling duty to make them, prior to the war situation that has now developed, which makes the necessity for making cuts far more impelling than at the time the House itself and the committee of the Senate acted.

Mr. President, the Bridges-Byrd amendment, to which I subscribe, if adopted, will, under the Senate bill, result in a further reduction of 10 percent. Thus, funds for this type of projects in America will be reduced a minimum of 18.4 percent under budget estimates.

We are doing our best to cut here at home, and are cutting where it hurts, and pains deeply. Many of our projects, when constructed and completed, and are in operation, will be a protection to human life, just as the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has pointed out with respect to projects in his State. The same is true in my own State, Mr. President. I think we have in Arkansas more miles of navigable rivers than any other State in the Union. Such projects are badly needed there, as well as in many other States. But, Mr. President, in view of the exigencies of our fiscal situation, we are undertaking to make these sacrifices in the name of international security, as well as for our own security; we are paying by way of sacrifices here by way of deferring the construction of many projects of the character I have mentioned.

Mr. President, if this proposed 10 percent is added to the House cut, then we would have a total reduction in amount under the Budget recommendation of 34.9 percent.

When the bill goes to conference, the cut on this character of projects is going to be somewhere between 18.4 and 34.9 percent in America's program of internal development and the strengthening of our economy and the preserving of our resources and developing them for the benefit of mankind. That is the sacrifice we are making here on the home front.

Mr. President, can anyone successfully persuade the intelligent American people that it is imperative that we make the character of expenditures abroad that have been so ably pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska? Can anyone successfully argue that we are compelled to do that as a part of an international defense program?

Mr. President, in my judgment there is no Senator nor anyone else who has the wisdom or the force of persuasion to make a convincing argument to the effect that ECA countries, with respect to projects in the same category we are cutting out in the United States, should not, for their own protection and their own defense be required to cooperate with us and make their contribution, too, make their sacrifice. They would not be making the sacrifice at their own expense. The sacrifice would be made at our expense, at the expense of the American taxpayer. We are very anxious to help them rehabilitate themselves, we are very anxious to help improve their economy and strengthen it, but can we not in good conscience ask them in this crisis to relieve our taxpayers of that much of the burden for the present, at least? Just a 10-percent cut is all we are asking be made in what we appropriate for internal projects in those countries. We have already taken off our own internal program from 8.4 percent to 24.9 percent.

As we impose upon ourselves a further cut of 10 percent, is it unreasonable, is it improper to ask the ECA countries to go along with the same kind of sacrifices?

Mr. President, we must spread this thing around. We have got to take our cuts. We have all got to deny ourselves some of the things we need and that we want, both personally and in Government.

To support the program, even with the proposed reductions and the economies we are compelled to make, and in order to carry out the military program which must be carried out effectively, the American people are called on to do two other things. They will be required to take from their earnings money with which to pay higher taxes as a contribution to the common defense and the common welfare. Beyond that, they are asked to go still further in debt, a national debt, which will be a charge upon generations unborn.

Assuming there is a legal obligation and committal on our part, yet when the very lives of the people in the ECA countries are in danger, when their very

existence is threatened as well as our own, as we make sacrifices here at home should they not be willing to make sacrifices also? In my judgment every supporter of ECA should be willing to say "We are all going to travel the same road at this time." That, Mr. President, is all we are asking the ECA countries to do.

It may be said that all the proposed civil expenditures are in the interest of national defense. However, the projects which were read off to us by the very able Senator from Nebraska furnish a thoroughly convincing argument, which will remain unchallenged on this floor. The spending of money for such purposes will not contribute to the defense of the countries involved. The program is a fine one in time of peace. The purpose is to build up the economy of the various countries. I probably would support such a program in time of peace. I certainly would support the same character of program here at home. But in this crisis, when we have got to place first things first and give priority of attention and effort to those things which are most vital and essential, we are compelled to dispense with many things and defer many projects that are desirable, in order to be able to provide for those things which are of compelling necessity.

Mr. President, I could make the same comparison in reference to Federal-aid highways.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to make a brief statement, but I shall put it in the form of a question: Is the Senator aware of the fact that this matter was explored fully by Mr. Hoffman, of the ECA, and that he has said that he is always glad to take his share of any cut which must be made, provided he is not required to take his cut twice?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in reply, let me say that we have taken cuts twice for domestic projects. If the Senator from New Jersey means what he says, he should withdraw his amendment right now, and should follow Mr. Hoffman's advice, for we are taking the cuts twice and where it hurts, so far as our projects in the United States are concerned.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am talking against the proposed 20-percent cut.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But our domestic projects and programs are taking a 20-percent cut. For instance, in the case of highways we have already cut the appropriations for that purpose 9.6 percent, under the budget recommendations, and here is another 10-percent cut to be made, which will comprise a total of approximately 20 percent.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, my State takes its share of that cut.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. But the Senator from Arkansas does not realize that the only justification at all for exempting the ECA from the proposed reductions to be made is because the ECA

is a part of the military operations. That is the only purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from New Jersey certainly does not maintain that projects of the character of those which have been enumerated here by the able and distinguished Senator from Nebraska constitutes a part of any military defense operations; does he?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Oh, not for a minute.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course not. Then why not cut out the appropriations for them?

The only way we can cut them out is by means of this proposed blanket cut of 10 percent. If we insist upon having the blanket cut made, then the ECA will cut out those projects, or some of them. That is the only way to get them taken out.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. But, Mr. President, I have endeavored to determine about these matters, and I have been assured that the whole program is adapted to the military operation. I would be amazed if any of those projects are included this year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, we can say just as much—and, in fact more—in favor of every flood-control project and every highway project in the United States that is included in this bill. They are for the defense of the United States, and for the defense of other countries too, because if our power to defend ourselves breaks down, there will be no power on earth which will be able to save the other countries.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is the Senator from Arkansas aware of the fact, as has just been stated by the senior Senator from New Jersey, that the entire basis on which the Appropriations Committee recommended this appropriation and the entire basis on which the appropriation was justified have been changed and tossed out the window, and another one substituted?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course the situation has changed. That is one of the reasons why we have before us now the 10-percent-reduction amendment. We are undertaking to cut drastically in the appropriations for projects here at home; and we undertook that before the new development occurred. We were undertaking that because of our fiscal situation and the fact we are operating our Government at a deficit, and because we wanted to keep our economy stable and sound.

So we were deferring many desirable projects until we could afford them.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CORDON. Did the Senator from Arkansas understand the statement made by the Senator from New Jersey to be that he had been advised by Mr. Hoffman that the entire basis on which these funds would be expended had been changed by the ECA since ECA presented its justification to the Appropriations Committee? That is news to me, I say frankly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think the Senate has that information.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, may I correct that statement?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I simply say that I do not have that information.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I have understood that the ECA has studied this matter, so that unnecessary expenditures which do not contribute to the all-out military effort will be eliminated and that the ECA is trying to focus on plants which can be put into production for military needs, and also on transportation projects and on power plants in connection with the military necessities; and also the ECA is reconsidering the entire policy with regard to the counterpart funds which must be used for military purposes abroad, and we are getting the benefit of that.

I appreciate what the Senator from Arkansas said, but I felt that he had not been fully advised in regard to the application of this entire matter to the military picture. If that picture has been ignored by the ECA, and if ECA is going ahead with a peacetime program, I would be as much opposed to that as the Senator from Arkansas is, and I would not support such a position.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then let me say to the Senator that the ECA certainly should acquaint us with the revised plans. All we have before us today are the justifications the ECA submitted to the Appropriations Committee. If all that is changed now, certainly until the ECA discloses its change in plans, and as long as we can act only on what is before us, then let us treat ECA with the same economy provisions and practices which we are going to apply here at home.

Mr. President, I have just this further brief statement to make with reference to highways: There are a number of road projects coming under the ECA program. The Senate Appropriations Committee has reduced by 9.6 percent all proposed expenditures for highways. Mr. President, we are going to add to that a further 10-percent reduction, if this amendment is adopted; and that will mean a total reduction of approximately 20 percent in our highway program.

Mr. President, cannot we dispense with the building of some roads in Africa, while the necessity is upon us to concentrate on Europe and Asia where our boys are dying? Had not we better dispense with the construction of roads in Africa for the present? That is the way the situation impresses me.

In regard to both the road programs here at home and flood control and rivers and harbors projects here at home, let me say that notwithstanding that the further 10-percent reduction will be applied, and notwithstanding that the law may be enacted in that form, the President of the United States will still have the power—and it is my anticipation that he will use it—to freeze or impound the funds appropriated for any project, if the crisis grows more acute, and if the President feels that such an expenditure would not be justified in the war effort. Therefore, we can expect the ap-

propriations for these projects and these programs to take a further cut, in addition to the 10-percent reduction; and I say frankly that whenever that situation arises and the President exercises that power, instead of complaining, I shall applaud and approve.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With reference to the power the President now has to control the expenditure of funds in the case of any department if an emergency occurs, is it not a fact that in considering the new road bill, which was drawn up even before the situation in Korea became so serious as it is now—

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from New Mexico refers to the highway authorization bill, does he not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. Did not the committee, at the instance of one of its members, insist upon writing into that bill a provision which will strengthen the power of the President in this respect?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; and very definitely so in the case of highway funds, because the committee voted to give the President the power to divert all those funds to military purposes and military construction.

Mr. President, I can well foresee that if the present conflict abroad becomes drawn out, as it may well become, although I hope not—but I cannot view the present situation with sufficient optimism to lead me to believe that the conflict there will end soon—in view of the present appropriations and in view of the power we have vested in the President to further withhold the expenditures for construction of projects needed in this country, I say we will not be true in the highest sense to the American people or to ourselves or to the countries abroad which we wish to help if we do not make the same reduction in the appropriations for their nonessential projects which we are financing that we are making in our own domestic program. We should make the reductions straight across the board; and the ECA should make its sacrifices in connection with its program, just as is done in the case of the highway program in the United States and all the other internal development programs in our country.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CORDON. Frankly, I am troubled by the statement which was made by the Senator from New Jersey. I hope some light will be thrown upon this question, with respect to exactly where we are in the entire ECA program, if the fact is as indicated by the Senator from New Jersey.

Does the Senator from Arkansas agree that the only source of counterpart funds which accrue as a result of the ECA operations, is when the dollars appropriated for ECA are used by private industry in a recipient country and the private industry pays the equivalent of those to its government, and that government then receives from private industry the equivalent of dollars in its own currency?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct, as I understand. I am not referring to normal conditions, since ECA has been in operation, but in my opinion, if they do not want to use those funds for the national defense in the present situation, they are funds of the character that ought to go into the building of roads down in Africa or somewhere else, in order that we may not be required to put up dollars for them. But if we are going to rehabilitate them, certainly they can do that character of work. But let us provide the tools and the machinery to rehabilitate their industries. That is what I thought was the purpose of the ECA program, together with the other purpose, of course, of providing them with food, as to which they have a deficiency, because it is necessary to sustain them until they can be rehabilitated economically.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield further to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. CORDON. If there is a new concept in the recipient countries with reference to the need for changing the use of the American dollar, or its equivalent in counterpart funds, and that new concept includes a greater use for national defense purposes, is it not a fact that if the dollar itself be used for national defense purposes it will be used by the recipient government, in which case there will be no counterpart funds equivalent to it; and if it be used by private industry, then its equivalent in counterpart funds will be available anyway to the Government, and the Government will have the use of the same amount of money in its own currency, that it would have otherwise in dollars?

Mr. McCLELLAN. In its own currency, for these purposes. That is what I have been trying to point out. I feel that those funds should be used for that purpose, Mr. President. We keep speaking of defense of the European countries, and we are appropriating, I think about \$5,000,000,000, or we are asked to appropriate it, for military assistance. Many of the things that we are talking about here as being necessary for their defense will be provided in this additional appropriation for military assistance.

I sincerely hope that in fairness to the American people, in all common sense and justice and equity, and in deference to the situation as it applies to the countries we are trying to help and to ourselves, that this cut of 10 percent will be made across the board.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, the Senator from Virginia, and other Senators, of whom I am happy to be one, and in opposition to the amendment to that amendment, offered by the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey. I may say in the beginning that I think it would be appropriate at this time to review the history of the effort of the Congress this year to make appropriations to meet the ex-

penses of our National Government. Both the committee in the other branch of Congress and the committee in the Senate have, I think, worked with tremendous devotion. I have never seen, in the brief time I have been in the Senate, anything approaching the hard work which those committees have done on the subject of appropriations this year. Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to make it very clear in the beginning that the things I shall say are not to be regarded as criticism leveled against our own committee, or, for that matter, against the House committee. I think both have worked hard and diligently. But, Mr. President, when one looks at this bill he will have to recall that the House of Representatives passed the bill in the early part of May. It came to the floor of the Senate on May 11 of this year. All the efforts of the House committee on this bill were expended prior to that time. All of them were against a background of a belief on the part of the President of the United States and of the heads of our Defense Department, of our armed services, and of many, many others of our very finest citizens, as announced to the public and to us repeatedly and from time to time, that we were nearer to a secure peace than we had been for a long time, and that the situation was a good one, in which we could confidently plan for the development of our Nation and for the enlargement of our peacetime activities.

Mr. President, on May 11 that bill came to the floor of the Senate and was referred to our able Appropriations Committee, which had already been working diligently on the subject, but which continued its labors until early July, when it reported to the Senate the bill in the form that it came from the Senate committee, with the Senate committee amendments.

It goes without saying that every one of us knows that the labors of the Senate committee were complete before the stunning notice and knowledge came upon the Members of the Senate and upon the world in general that we were faced with what may be the beginning of a long war, with what is certainly a difficult and expensive war, fought on a spot where we were not prepared to fight, a spot most remote from our Nation, and under highly difficult circumstances.

It is quite apparent that the comment made by the Senator from Oregon in his colloquy with the Senator from Arkansas is completely sound, namely, that the background against which this bill was reported by our own diligent and able and devoted committee has been changed completely to a background of war and military apprehension and generally worsened world conditions. It seems to me that that background, changed as it is, must apply to the thinking and action of the Members of the Senate as they pass upon this bill. If the Members of the Senate do not regard that as the background upon which this bill now must be acted upon by the Senate, we will have to be blind to world conditions, we will have to be deaf to the requests of our people, we will have to be completely oblivious to the fact

that our own people all over this Nation are apprehensive, and that they do not expect this bill as originally drawn, on a basis of "business as usual," "government as usual," and "expenditures as usual," to be enacted in that form, but instead expect the Senate of the United States, which is the only body of the Congress which has the opportunity to view this bill under these changed conditions, to reflect those changed conditions in the action which we take upon this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was wondering whether the Senator imagines, as certain other Senators seem to have done, that the Appropriations Committee has not reduced this appropriation. The Senate committee has already reduce this appropriation nearly \$1,000,000,000 below what it was last year. It has already reduced the appropriations \$332,915,000 under the estimate. The committee has made very large reductions already. We have cut out on a percentage basis quite as much with reference to these items as we have with reference to other items of the bill. The committee has not been derelict in its duty.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the Senator's question. I refuse to yield further.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have not mentioned—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida declines to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. HOLLAND. In reply to the question of the distinguished Senator, I want to say that I am not at all without knowledge of the fact that reductions under the budget figures have been made. Before the Senator returned to the floor I had expressed my appreciation of the committee so ably headed by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for its long and devoted service, but I had invited attention to the fact that the background of war which prevails now did not prevail while the able and devoted services of the Members of the Senate who are members of the Appropriations Committee were being performed.

Mr. President, I want to read into the RECORD two short paragraphs appearing on page 6 of the report of the Appropriations Committee to the Senate, because they show that the work was done and that reductions were made, but they also show, inescapably, Mr. President, that the same kind of approach was followed by our own able committee of the Senate as was followed by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. I read:

Of the \$28,701,781,108 of budget estimates considered by the House, a total of \$27,346,713,664 was approved by the House, or a reduction of \$1,354,967,504 from the budget estimates.

Of the \$33,900,208,648 of budget estimates considered by the Senate, a total of \$32,504,-

972,672 was approved by the committee, a reduction of \$1,395,235,976.

In other words, Mr. President, it must be remembered that supplemental estimates came to the Senate committee in the amount of nearly \$5,000,000,000 after the House committee had worked on the bill, and it will appear from the quoted figures that the total reductions made by the House committee and by the Senate committee from the estimates upon which they were working were quite similar, and that there was no real difference in the approach, and there was no reason why there should be a difference, because there was no war threat at that time. I think it shows that equal devotion, equal ability, and equal understanding of the situation which then prevailed, and which does not now prevail, existed both in the Senate committee and in the House committee.

Mr. President, to make my point perfectly clear I want to read again simply two figures. One is that the House committee cut off from the budget estimates which went before it \$1,354,000,000, and that the Senate committee cut off from the larger amount of estimates which came before it \$1,395,000,000. In other words, Mr. President, no one is in the slightest degree to blame for the present situation. The philosophy which prevailed when both of these excellent and devoted committees were performing their able services was exactly the same when the service was being performed in the House as when the service was being rendered in the Senate, and the two committees came to very nearly the same answer and to very nearly the same kind of treatment of the claims by agencies of the Government for appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, in which we are now operating.

Mr. President, there is no blame to be attached to the action of either committee. To the contrary, they were serving ably, they were serving splendidly, and they both showed a grasp of the situation.

But, Mr. President, war is now here, and that fact is going to change and must change the thinking of every Senator, just as it has already changed the thinking of every businessman, of every farmer, of every young man who is facing possible induction into the service. Every person in our entire Nation necessarily has to readjust his thinking as to his own situation as well as to the situation of his State and Nation in the light of the changed conditions. Mr. President, if we did not recognize that changed situation, if we did not adopt a different approach, if we did not bring out a different answer, we would simply make it appear that we thought the problems of this Nation which is now at war and now in the critical condition which we recognize, were identical with the problems of this Nation as they were thought to be by these two able committees—and they had every right to think them so to be in the spring and the summer—when they were passing upon the peacetime estimates which had been submitted to them.

Mr. President, so much for that point. The next point I want to make is this; and I ask Senators to follow it carefully because the performance of the Senate is going to be measured not only by our demonstrated understanding of the changed situation, but it is going to be measured to some degree by a comparison of the attitude which we are reflecting after war has come with the attitude reflected on the floor of the House when the House passed this particular measure. The House wrote into the bill before it permitted its passage, two amendments. I shall not labor the question as to what is involved in those amendments. One was the Taber amendment, appearing as chapter X-A of the Senate bill; the other was the Jensen amendment which is now sought to be replaced by the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and other Senators of whom I am one.

Mr. President, no matter how wise or unwise those amendments were—and personally, my thinking is different from the approach used under both of those amendments—the fact remains that the House of Representatives, before the existence of war, in performing its function against the background of peace, for peace then seemed to be here for a good long time, insisted upon putting two general economy amendments upon the bill which would have effected a saving of somewhere between a billion dollars and \$1,200,000,000, if the figures reported by the staff are correct, as I believe them to be.

Mr. President, it is now proposed here, after weeks of debate and after war has come, that we go along with the striking of both those efforts at economy and pass to the conference a bill without any general approach toward economy whatever. In the House there were two amendments with an attempt to indicate economies effected by the lopping off of approximately \$1,200,000 in the general list of expenditures, and in the Senate both of those amendments are to be stricken and nothing offered to take their place. In spite of the fact that we are at war, there is nothing offered which looks to reduced expenditures except the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, the Senator from Virginia, and other Senators.

Mr. President, this bill will go to conference. I think the Senate owes it to itself, in the first instance, to show that it realizes the fact that we are at war, that conditions have changed, that the able committee could not possibly base its decisions upon the present conditions, and that we, in justice to ourselves and to the country, ought to make it clear that, in our judgment, the changed conditions require and necessitate a reduction of the expenditures of our Nation in these civilian activities of our Government which have nothing to do directly with our defense. If we do not take that action, we shall be unfair to ourselves and to our country.

There is another thing which I want to mention. If we do not take that action, I think we shall be unfair to our

committee and to the conferees who have to go into conference on the bill.

Mr. President, I remind Senators that the House bill will come to conference with two House economy amendments on it. We should pass a bill with this particular amendment or some other general economy amendment, and not pass a wide-open peacetime appropriation bill, knowing that war has changed our situation and problems, without any instructions whatever or any indications whatever to our conferees as to where economies should be effected. It is from that point of view that I think it is highly necessary not only for the protection of the country and the protection of Senators themselves, but in particular for the holding up of the hands and giving information to our conferees as to what is the attitude of the Senate as a whole that this amendment be passed because, carefully drawn as it is, I think it makes very careful distinction between exempt fields of appropriation, on the one hand, which are not affected by the amendment and wherein appropriations are not reduced, such as the appropriations for defense, atomic energy, law enforcement, and tax collection, and the other group of activities, as to which this amendment makes it clear that this Senate thinks, not as against the background of when the bill was being drawn but as against the background now existing, that substantial reduction is in order, and that these particular activities can be and should be reduced. I think the conferees would go to conference with a much better understanding of what the Senate wants and with a much better chance of bringing back a good sound bill under which these agencies could properly function, if we passed this particular amendment for the guidance of our conferees.

To summarize what I have said, I think we owe it to ourselves and the country to make it clear that we realize that this Nation at war should not go on with the business-as-usual, big-Government-as-usual, and expenditures-as-usual basis, which might have prevailed very properly if the situation were otherwise and if we were going toward a more lasting peace.

If we pass this amendment we would not only be fair to ourselves and our country, but particularly we would be pointing out to our conferees, who as Members of the Senate will want to know, what the opinion of the Senate itself is upon the question as to which appropriations can be properly cut to meet the emergency. By the passage of this amendment we would indicate to them that we think there are items that should be left as they are. They are the items in the exempt classifications. However, we would also point out that we do think there are other items and other activities that do not have to continue on a 100-percent basis in time of war as they would be continued in time of peace. With the passage of this amendment, Mr. President, the conferees would go into conference with the definite expression from the Senate that we have divided out from the essential wartime ac-

tivities of our Nation those which do not have such direct relation to our national defense. We would have the first class of items, those that are essential. They should stay as they were originally put in. We know that some of them will require much more in the near future. As to the other items, however, we feel that they should take cuts, and we do not believe any harm would be done by such cuts.

I know that during World War II some 16 or 17 Members of the Senate served as Governors of their States. They had to reduce their budgets, and usually more than the 10 percent which would be accomplished under the terms of this amendment. They found it not impossible to do. They found it quite easy to do. They found their people not only expected it and approved it, but were highly satisfied with the reduction in size of the civil agencies and functions of government.

Mr. President, I think such a situation prevails now. I confess I am disappointed that heads of agencies which are not essential to the successful defense of our Nation have not come in and offered to take reductions and to point out the places where such reductions could be accomplished. I think that is what they ought to be doing. I regret they are not doing it. Since they are not doing it, I think it is the clear duty resting upon the Members of the Senate, and ultimately upon the whole Congress and the President, to see that appropriations for these nonessential agencies be reduced in conformity with the fact that we are operating under wartime conditions.

I want to say that I much prefer this amendment to either or both of the amendments offered in the House. If the Senators will follow the remarks which I am about to make, perhaps they will see some compelling fact in what I am about to mention, namely, it seems to me that the reductions proposed by the House, which will be in conference no matter what form of bill we send to conference, are absolutely wrong in the light of the changed conditions which now prevail. For instance, if Senators will read one of the amendments, they will find that it actually proposes a reduction of defense personnel—not a large reduction, but nevertheless a 2-percent reduction in defense personnel. Many of the activities which we now know to be so necessitous are not exempted by the House amendments. For instance, the personnel for the collection of revenue, personnel for the handling of our immigration problems, and numerous other agencies, which we certainly want to have functioning on a basis of real effectiveness during wartime, and many other such activities that I could mention, are not exempted in the House amendments, as they are under the terms of the proposed Senate amendment which is now pending. This amendment has been very carefully drawn and I think it carefully discriminates and differentiates between activities which are essential to the war effort, and which are exempted from this 10-percent cut, and activities which are not

essential to the war effort and are subjected to the 10-percent cut.

Mr. President, I am glad to see the junior Senator from Illinois on the floor of the Senate, because I want to say that while I have not been able to support him in all the efforts he has made, I have a very wholesome respect for the way in which the Senator from Illinois has devoted himself to the effort to bring down the total of the appropriation bill to something like what we can pay or should pay for the civilian activities of government under our present confused and difficult situation. Certainly I want him to understand that while I have been able to vote with him on some things and not vote with him on others, nevertheless I greatly respect his approach to this problem. I honor him for his approach, even though at times he must have felt like a man armed with a toothpick or a teaspoon trying to chop up an iceberg. That is all it has amounted to. Going at an appropriation bill item by item the Senator from Florida would respectfully say to his good friend the Senator from Illinois is quite properly to be likened to an attack on an iceberg, in the hope of demolishing it, with a toothpick or teaspoon.

We have come down now to where we can by general effort, which is an effort based on the desire to discriminate between essential and nonessential items, approach the problem in a way in which I hope a majority of the Senate are willing to enact savings which will amount to around \$800,000,000.

Mr. President, there were other particulars in which I was not wholly in accord with the approach made by the Senator from Illinois, but I think it would be useless to discuss them now. I do want to mention just one of those particulars, however, namely, the one that has to do with internal improvements, particularly for flood control and waterpower development.

If we are in the middle of a hot war which will continue as such, those things which cannot be quickly completed will of course be cut off by Executive decision; and if we are not in the middle of a hot war, but will shortly find ourselves back again in the progress of a continuing cold war for an indefinite period of time in the future, I say respectfully to the Senator from Illinois that I think it is of very great importance to have available appropriations in these particular fields. I especially name flood control and waterpower development because if we press them to completion, we strengthen the sinews of war in this Nation, and every additional project we complete we find ourselves better able to cope with the problems which will possibly confront us in the future in the event of a long war.

Mr. President, on that point I may say that it is not necessary to complete every internal improvement to get value from it. I happen to know of one which is in my own State, and which will have to be differentiated from some of the others in my State. I think every additional mile of levee finished and constructed on that project serves a two-

fold purpose, of saving lives or property in the event of a disastrous flood, and also saving additional precious acres for the production of an immense amount of food which will be of incomparable value to our Nation in time of great or global war.

It seems to me, therefore, that in his thinking on that point the Senator from Illinois may have been mistaken. I realize that he was perfectly sincere in his approach. Perhaps he was right and the Senator from Florida wrong, but at least it seems to the Senator from Florida that the action sought to be taken by the Senator from Illinois in the matter was not sound in that, in the first place, if hot war comes, the action is not necessary, and is meaningless, because the cut-backs will come anyway; and if hot war does not come, I think we should press ahead with all vigor to conclude construction of these very great developments, which mean so much to the strength and power, the food-producing power, of our Nation.

Mr. President, I am not going to dwell longer on this particular point. It seems to me that the Senate must adopt this amendment or leave itself on the Record as having determined that there is no war going on, and that if there is a war going on, it does not change our situation at all, and that the painstaking and devoted efforts of the committee of last summer, rendered against a back drop of peace and promised peace, are still applicable to the present situation, changed as it is, and disagreeably changed.

Mr. President, I come now briefly to a discussion of the amendment offered by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], for whom I have the deepest respect. I doubt if the Senator from New Jersey has any keener desire than I to carry on to its logical, successful conclusion the ECA effort, which I think has already rendered great service to ourselves as well as to our allies, a great service in the cause of freedom and free men everywhere. I submit that I am as anxious to carry that on to successful completion as is the Senator from New Jersey, but I am strongly of the feeling that the amount of the appropriation can, against the background of what has happened to us in the last several weeks, be cut down and reduced without in any way jeopardizing the successful completion of that great effort.

I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the remarks made a little while ago by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on that particular point. I believe it was sound, and I should like to carry a little further two points which the Senator from Massachusetts made so ably, namely, that we were going to be called upon very soon to do two things which do affect very greatly the interior economic stability of our friends in western Europe, and that we must have that fact in mind as we pass upon the provisions of the bill relating to ECA, which affect them now.

One point has to do with the raising of the amount for our strategic stockpiling of materials. We have already raised it somewhat in this year's bill, as related to last year's bill. We have

raised it to \$730,000,000, and if the Senators care to look through the record of what was done last year and the year before, they will find that much, indeed, the great majority, of the stock-piled materials which were required for our Nation to make a bulwark of safety and security in the event we are thrown into global war, was purchased from and came from our friends in ECA. In some instances they produced within their own areas in Europe some of these vital materials, and in other instances, in many instances, in fact, empires like the British Empire, the French Empire, and the Dutch Empire, produced in their colonies, possessions, and dependencies lying outside of their own territorial limits, these materials which are regarded as of such strategic importance to us.

I call attention, therefore, in the first instance, to the fact that the pending bill raises materially, raises substantially, the appropriation for stockpiling, and that that very fact will throw more business into the hands of our friends in western Europe, in the regular channels of trade. That is the finest thing that could happen, because that is regular trade, where real dollars move from us in the purchase of materials produced by them and help to restore the sound balance which we are so eagerly hoping eventually to restore.

I go to the next point mentioned by the Senator from Massachusetts when he called attention to the fact that the supplemental estimate that reached us a few days ago calls for \$600,000,000 additional money for stockpiling to be made available immediately.

Mr. President, no matter how much this appropriation is combed with a fine-tooth comb—and we may reduce the appropriations—it is inconceivable to me that the Congress of the United States will not listen to the advice of the executive department of the Government and of the leaders of the Armed Forces and those who are responsible for our industrial mobilization when they tell us that our stockpiles are not large enough, that we need more money to acquire more of such strategic materials, particularly in certain very vital cases, and that we should step up greatly the tempo of our acquisition of these strategic materials.

Every Senator knows that we are certainly going to appropriate whatever can be justified, and it is not going to be very far from what is asked for as necessary to build, as rapidly as we can, our strategic stockpiles. We are going to make the appropriations, and I call again to the attention of the present occupant of the chair, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who himself has been so interested in this subject matter, together with all other Senators who are present, the fact that of necessity most of the added amount, just as most of the \$730,000,000 already in the bill, is going to have to be spent in ECA countries, because they are the only ones who produce, either by themselves or through their dependencies, the materials which are strategically of such vital and of such overwhelming necessity to us.

Mr. President, I have looked at the proposed budget, and I am just as sure

as that I am standing here that there is more business for our friends in western Europe, the ECA nations, involved in the \$600,000,000 added stockpiling appropriation, and in the expenditures to accomplish it, than there is in the reduction of the \$245,000,000 which is proposed under the amendment we are considering at this time.

But, Mr. President, that is not the whole of the picture. There is yet another part of the picture which shows greater and even greater acceleration of the business of Europe. I do not feel justified in referring to it in too great detail, though if Senators wish to do so they will find in committee the papers, they will find the justification of the supplemental estimates which have reached our committee. I understand that the committee has not considered it. It is not classified information, but I prefer not to discuss it in detail so long as the committee has not itself yet had the opportunity to consider it, because I do have the greatest of confidence in the patriotism, the ability, and the industry of the able chairman and the members of his committee. I know that they will give due effect to those supplemental requests and the others which are being made now by the President just as quickly as he can prepare them. But I do feel justified, since the Senator from Massachusetts has already put the matter in the RECORD, in calling attention to the fact that one of the supplemental estimates calls for \$4,000,000,000 of military aid over and above what is in the present bill, and that the President asks for its quick consideration and for its prompt appropriation, in order that the timing of our stepping up of the ability of western Europe to stand with us sturdily, if there should come serious difficulty shall be accelerated so that they will be sooner prepared than if we merely continued the present program.

Mr. President, this \$4,000,000,000 is broken down, and Senators can see the justification, if they wish. It is available in the Appropriations Committee. I shall not quote the figures. But they can see for themselves how that justification is broken down into amounts to be expended here, and then into amounts to be expended overseas in the ECA countries themselves, to build up their facilities in the one case or give them more materials to enable them to work at full blast with many of their facilities which are not now operating at full blast, so that their economy must be greatly affected for the better by the expenditure of these increased amounts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Florida, apropos of his discussion of the \$4,000,000,000 supplemental arms implementation program, if he does not think it would be advisable for the State Department and the National Defense Establishment to give more attention to the Pacific flank. I have at this moment more particularly in mind bringing both Australia and New Zealand into the picture. So far as I can learn from reading the press dispatches

dealing with the statement from the White House the other day, there is no provision in the request for funds which is being submitted to us which would cover Australia and New Zealand. In the event of trouble of a major sort breaking out in the Pacific, and in view of Prime Minister Menzies' speech here yesterday, it seems to me that we should not underestimate the importance of the Pacific flank in the arms implementation bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the question and the remarks of the Senator from California. I thoroughly agree with him that just as we are helping friends in one direction to make themselves strong and able to help themselves and us, so we must help friends in the other direction to do exactly the same thing. I comment only for myself, but I believe my comments will find approval in the heart of every Senator who was present and heard Prime Minister Menzies yesterday. I comment, however, only for myself when I say that I have not heard in a long time such sturdy, self-reliant, pioneering words coming from good never-yielding stock as I heard from the Prime Minister of Australia yesterday. I say if we cannot back up the Australians and New Zealanders and stand with and help them to arm themselves and help to make themselves the effective force for liberty and the effective force for freedom they want to be, we are very unwise and blind to the fact that we have no such natural friends on top side of green earth, except the Canadians on our northern boundary. I fully agree with the sentiments expressed by the Senator from California.

Mr. President, I spoke of the reduction a while ago as \$245,000,000. That would be the reduction accomplished by taking 10 percent of the amount mentioned in the bill, which has now been restored under the amendment adopted yesterday, from an amount somewhere under \$2,400,000,000 to \$2,450,000,000; 10 percent of that, of course, would be \$245,000,000.

There is in addition a small amount that is carried over, variously mentioned in the debate today all the way from some \$230,000,000 to two-hundred-and-seventy-odd million dollars all across the board. There seems to be some question as to exactly how much there is in the carry-over. But 10 percent of that amount would be cut off by the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and other Senators.

Mr. President, that amount, that whole 10 percent—or about \$270,000,000—will be so far offset and so completely offset by the added amounts for stockpiling which will be purchased through ECA countries, and the added amounts for arms aid which will be expended through those countries, that there will be no comparison between the lesser amount which we proposed to cut off here, the 10 percent, and the much larger amount which will be poured into their domestic economy through the two other channels which I have just mentioned.

So in conclusion, Mr. President, it seems to me that to make a distinction

between ECA and vital, very vital agencies, domestic agencies of Government to which we are applying cuts in the amount of 10 percent, would be unwise. Are not these people our partners? Are they not our allies? Or are they simply beneficiaries? I think they are our partners and allies, and I think they are as proud to be considered as our allies as we are proud to be considered theirs. I think they will feel that we have done the right thing in applying to this particular expenditure, now become so much less necessary than that part of the helping of Europe which has to do with arms aid, that they will be so sure that this effort must be subordinated to that, that they will approve heartily the consideration of this effort as of no higher standing than that of our own domestic agencies to which we apply a 10-percent cut.

Mr. President, I very strongly hope that the Senate of the United States, looking now at the backdrop of war which has fallen back of the stage, changing the scenery since this bill was developed by a devoted and excellent and patriotic committee, and realizing the meaning of the changed scene, will make a reduction in ECA, particularly when it knows that it can do so without hurting one bit. To the contrary, Mr. President and Senators, the amounts which I have spoken of as being added to the stream of American money which is going into European industry in connection with the stockpiling and arms-aid efforts, are so much greater than the cut we propose to ECA, that when the time comes for us to consider those amounts, I think we are going to see that it is going to be necessary for us to take steps to reduce further the ECA appropriation. I would not be in favor of doing so at this stage, but I do think, with all the information we now have, we have definite assurance that we are not hurting this important objective by the application of the same degree of cut-back to them that we are applying to our own important domestic agencies.

BUILDING AND OPERATION BY THE DU PONT CO. OF PLANTS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF HYDROGEN BOMB EXPLOSIVES

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I have just been advised of an announcement by the Atomic Energy Commission to the effect that the du Pont Co. of Wilmington, Del., will build and operate plants for the production of hydrogen bomb explosives. The fact that it is necessary to produce any atomic weapons is regrettable, but in the light of existing international conditions no other course of action appears possible. It is a source of great satisfaction to me personally, and I know to all the people of Delaware, that the Government has asked the du Pont Co. to play a major part in this program.

As I am sure you know, Mr. President, du Pont has already had wide experience in the field of atomic energy. The company built and for a time operated the huge atomic plant at Hanford, Wash., during and until shortly after World War II.

I am advised that the du Pont Co. officials in their proposed contract with the Government have stipulated that all patents growing out of this work are to go to the Government and that the company will receive a fee of \$1.

I am completely confident that this important assignment by the Government could have been placed in no more capable hands than those of du Pont Co. As the Senate may recall, only a short time ago I made here on the floor an address in which I expressed the belief that in the present emergency, the du Pont Co.'s facilities and its personnel stand ready at any time for a call by the Government. Those comments, Mr. President, were made in connection with an incident, which I described, concerning the inability of the du Pont Co. to supply business establishments of this country with an adequate supply of cellophane, a product extensively used in the packaging of foods and other goods. The du Pont Co. has been unable to meet its demands because a pending suit by the Department of Justice against du Pont made it undesirable for this concern to proceed with the construction of additional plants.

I said then, Mr. President, that in my opinion this is no time for our Government to restrict the activities of American business, either large or small; and I added that a company is not good or bad because of its size. The du Pont Co. has made its greatest contributions to America's economic life in the field of chemistry. In doing so, it has provided employment for thousands and thousands of our citizens, and most of its products are in constant and increasing demand because of their high quality. The fact that this company has been so successful in this field indicates to me that its efforts to assist our Government in atomic projects will be equally successful. This has already been proven by the company's accomplishments during the past war, and I know it will attain comparable results in its newest endeavors in the atomic field.

Mr. President, American business is probably the most expressive form of our free economic system, and I hope it will ever remain so. Without it, I fear that our standard of living, and in fact our whole way of life could not successfully continue.

I join with all other peace-loving peoples in the hope that the mere feasibility of an H-bomb will successfully deter any further aggression on the part of unscrupulous Governments. I commend the leadership of this Government in association with American business and industry in leading the way toward the successful attainment of essential weapons to defend the democratic way of life, and thereby to hasten the day when world peace will be a reality.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING— STATEMENT BY SENATOR MALONE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a release issued today from my office on the subject of the universal military training bill, Senate bill 66, now before the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. President, I joined in introducing this bill on January 5, 1949, and if it had been passed at that time we would have trained troops in Korea now instead of sending untrained boys up against the superior training of the North Koreans.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 2, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE (Republican, of Nevada) today called on the Senate Armed Services Committee to report out the Malone bill for universal military training, S. 66, introduced in the Senate on January 5, 1949. The Nevada Senator said that the American Legion and the military leaders of the Nation are now calling for "just such legislation as is provided for in the Malone bill which was referred to committee a year and a half ago."

It is being suggested by congressional leaders in the Capital that the Malone bill, which when passed will be cited as the National Security Training Act, will now at last be considered, that hearings on the bill will be started before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Senator MALONE said that he agreed with Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson and the other military leaders who recently have expressed the opinion that, had a universal military training program been adopted, when the Malone bill was introduced, we would not have suffered such severe setbacks in Korea. Our boys must have the proper fundamental training and the most modern equipment so as to have an even break in any conflict," the Senator said.

Senator MALONE expressed the belief that the Korean situation might never have arisen in the first place if the State Department had not blundered in advocating loss of China, Manchuria, and Korea. In this connection, Senator MALONE said: "For 3 years I have been pressing the executive branch to name the nations in Europe, Asia, the South Seas, and Africa, whose integrity is important to our ultimate safety, and to build a national defense organization, spearheaded by an Air Corps and a submarine fleet, strong enough to defend those areas, so that the entire world would be on notice not only as to our position, but as to our ability to fight if necessary to maintain that position. The executive branch paid no attention to these demands, and even now have no fixed foreign policy. The people of foreign nations and our own people are entitled to know just what we intend to do and what areas we must protect for our own ultimate safety.

"It has been demonstrated that we must keep our Nation strong industrially and militarily. An important part of the overall program to keep us strong is the permanent establishment of military training as provided for in the Malone bill."

AID GIVEN BY OUR COMBINATION DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY TO THE ADVANCEMENT OF COMMUNISM— STATEMENT BY SENATOR MALONE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement released from my office on July 26, relative to the effect of our combination domestic and foreign policy on the advancement of communism.

The attack on American industry which has been carried on within the present administration, through its free-trade policies, curtailing or preventing the domestic production of the articles so necessary to our national defense,

constitutes a dire threat to our entire economic structure.

Our State Department at the same time was advocating the loss to Russia of Manchuria, China, and Korea—and at the same time gave Berlin to the Russians without means of ingress or egress.

The combination of wrecking our economic structure and giving away strategic foreign areas has more than doubled the hazards in the defense of our country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 26, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE (Republican, Nevada) charged today that we have been "sold out" by our State Department. The Nevada Senator said that the foreign policy of our Government "which got us into this war was part of a deliberately designed plot to advance communism."

Continuing, Senator MALONE said: "The handing over of Asia to the Soviets, the arming of Russia through Marshall-plan countries, the encroachment of socialistic ideas in our legislation here, and the wrecking of American industry were some of the steps in the treacherous plot.

"Undoubtedly, Stalin thought he had the nod from Acheson to go ahead in Asia. Everything points to that. But Acheson's position on Korea was suddenly reversed, and it may be presumed that he is now apologizing to the Hisses and his other Communist friends. Our position in Asia and elsewhere is just what could be expected with the personnel of our State Department what it is.

"On the home front, the Red plot has been carried on within the administration by a constant attack on American industry. This attack has come through (a) Government regulations so designed as to eliminate venture capital, which made this country great; (b) taxes so designed as to eliminate initiative; (c) a foreign free-trade policy so designed as to curtail domestic production; and (d) reckless spending on the part of the Government so designed as to threaten our whole economic structure.

"Until this country squarely faces its errors in foreign and domestic policy, which is all one policy, until it abandons the spend-and-elect theories of welfare stateism, and until its citizens are discouraged from running to Washington for hand-outs we will continue to tremble before the threats of a people backward in production and culture. Until that time, the prestige of America will continue to sink as it sank in the face of the Korean affair.

"How far are we now from the mood for reclaiming our national self-respect? Unless there is a complete reversal in Washington's mood, this armed outbreak will be the occasion for more reckless spending, further demands for power, and more of all the same trappings that have accompanied this country to its present plight.

"There will no doubt be bigger requests for all sorts of things that can in some way be tied to the label 'national defense.' We will not question many of these expenditures. Peace that was so costly won has been thrown away by blunders and stupidities. And with it gone, we must, however sadly, prepare to defend ourselves against the possibility of new onslaughts.

"We do not anticipate that the present administration will curtail its spending on nondefense items. It has shown no love for a balanced budget or a strong currency. Now is the time Congress needs a little backbone to stand up against Government waste and against unlimited powers for the administration—all in the name of saving us.

"We need to remind ourselves that our first and foremost task is to keep ourselves strong. Only with a strong American industry can we win. The anti-Communist forces of the world that are able and willing to fight are outnumbered. The defense of the free world must be achieved by quality which is able to overcome quantity. We are not big enough to overwhelm our opponents by the massing of military power. Since we cannot hope to be bigger, our fate depends on whether we can be better.

"Where is the greatest danger—at home or abroad? We have been repeatedly warned that we are in danger from within. Since 1932 there has been a constant war against America, within our gates.

"The State Department's foreign free trade policy, through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended, which has been erroneously called 'Reciprocal,' has removed the floor from under wages and investments and has stopped the flow of venture capital in a large section of the industrial field. American mines have been closed, and at a time when an adequate stockpile of strategic metals and a going-concern mining industry is vitally needed. The so-called escape clause proved to be no escape; a deaf ear has been turned to the American industries which have appealed for relief from the State Department's actions. The so-called peril-point provision is just as much of a snare and delusion; in case of a test, it would mean nothing, because it provides only that when the peril point is reached the President write a letter to Congress. Nothing more.

"Let us clean up the home front, give assurance to American people that American industries and things American will be protected. Let us once and for all put a stop to the foreign policy which weakens our positions abroad and destroys our industries at home. Let us fight for ideals and for an administration that will uphold them when this war is at an end. The boys on the front have little to fight for unless they can know clearly that they are defending the American way of life."

TIMID REPUBLICANS—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Timid Republicans," which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of July 27.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIMID REPUBLICANS

The Democrats in Congress are almost a total loss to the country. They know that the administration invited what is happening to our Army and our prestige in Korea. In the circumstances, the only thing the Democrats can do is to wrap the flag around them and cry that in such a time of crisis the Executive must be supported in every proposal he now offers.

The Democrats, to save their own hides, have to pretend that the President is a leader whose recommendations for domestic legislation on taxes and economic controls can safely be trusted. The Republicans are under no such necessity. There is nothing to prevent them from examining the administration's proposals and pointing to the flaws in them. Nevertheless, with the honorable exceptions of Mr. TAFT, Mr. MALONE, and a few others, the Republicans are taking the whole business lying down. The country expected better of them and is bitterly disappointed.

First, as to taxes: They are surely going up, but even before they are raised the Government's expenditures for nonmilitary pur-

poses should be shaved to the bone. If the Republicans were worth their salt, they would be crying for the reduction of farm subsidies, for the dismissal of thousands of departmental press agents, and all other superfluous help in Government offices, for the withdrawal of all funds for reclamation and river and harbors pork until the war is won, for denying free service in veterans' hospitals to anyone whose disabilities are not service connected, and for a great many other economies of the sort which, in the aggregate, could save the war-burdened Treasury \$10,000,000,000 a year.

With that accomplished, the need for new taxes would be considerably less.

Second, as to economic controls: The Republicans know that a voluntary system of giving priority to military contracts can be improvised in a couple of days and will work more quickly and more effectively than any compulsory system that can be devised. A voluntary system of allocating raw materials and factory facilities to war needs is all that is required, at least for the present, and anything more than that will only delay a start until an elaborate bureaucratic machine is assembled and set in motion. A voluntary system of allocations will save months and millions.

The measures which the President is proposing are wholly disproportionate to the scale of the war. All that Mr. Truman's controls will accomplish is to tie the Nation in knots, hamper production, and promote the Socialist revolution to which he long has been committed. The war gives him an excuse for demanding the dictatorial power that he craves but is wholly unfit to wield. Why haven't the Republicans had the sense and courage to say so?

PROVIDING FOR THE WARTIME BUDGET BY MAKING SAVINGS IN OUR PEACETIME DOMESTIC EXPENDITURES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a release from my office under date of August 2, showing how \$8,000,000,000 can be saved for the wartime budget, through making reductions in our peacetime domestic expenditures.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 2, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE (Republican, Nevada) said today that there is no need at present to raise the taxes on the overburdened American taxpayers. In a statement issued by his office in the Capitol, the Nevada Senator said it is unfair to call on the American people to support Europe and pay for new domestic peacetime projects while they are carrying the cost of the war.

"We will provide whatever is necessary to win this war," Senator MALONE said, continuing: "The administration has called on the people to tighten their belts. The administration should tighten its own belt along with them—call a recess in its worldwide boondoggling, its peacetime projects, and, in fact, all domestic spending which is not absolutely necessary."

The Senator has suggested the following savings which he says would make available the funds now requested by the President for the expanded military program without raising the tax rates at the present time:

- (a) Suspend ECA, a peacetime endeavor, save \$3,000,000,000.
 - (b) Suspend domestic peacetime public works, save \$500,000,000.
 - (c) Suspend 20 percent of civil government spending, save \$3,500,000,000.
 - (d) Suspend extra foreign military assistance, save \$1,000,000,000.
- Total savings, \$8,000,000,000.

The Senator made the following comments about the four items:

(a) ECA assistance was to be dependent upon continuity of cooperation among countries participating in the program. Furthermore, ECA assistance to European industry—the carrying on our backs of 16 foreign countries—was to be a peacetime endeavor. We must pay for a new war now.

(b) Worthy as are our peacetime public works, our taxpayers cannot be expected to pay for these while having to bear the heavy cost of war.

(c) Let us look at our budget for the current fiscal year:

"National defense.....	\$13,545,000,000
Veterans' services and benefits.....	6,080,000,000
Interest on public debt.....	5,325,000,000
Remaining.....	17,189,000,000
Total.....	42,139,000,000

"I have suggested that we save 20 percent on the last item, the seventeen-billion item. This would be a reasonable cutting back of the Government's domestic expenditures, and would not take 1 penny from national defense, the stockpiling of atomic energy, veterans' aid, or interest on the public debt.

"(d) The money appropriated for military assistance to foreign countries can now be better spent in our expanded military program, which doubtless will be on a global basis. Our military programs should be unified."

Senator MALONE concluded: "There is no valid reason for gouging the people to build up peacetime economy in Europe and finance domestic peacetime projects here while we are on a wartime basis. Economy is a much sounder method of meeting the increased military costs than burdening the American people with more taxes."

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S APPROVAL OF LEGISLATION FOR STAND-BY PRICE, RATIONING, AND WAGE CONTROLS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, yesterday I issued to the press a statement commenting on President Truman's approval of legislation for stand-by price, rationing, and wage controls. I ask unanimous consent to insert that statement in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON STAND-BY PRICE, RATIONING, AND WAGE CONTROLS

I am pleased that the President has approved the idea of stand-by price, rationing, and wage controls. I feel that such controls may soon be necessary, if they are not necessary already. I agree that the powers proposed to be granted should be authorized in such a manner as to make their application flexible in the situation as it develops. But the country must know and must be assured that inflation is not to be allowed to run rampant. The health of the national economy must be preserved. Whatever powers are necessary to guarantee this must be granted and must be enforced whenever and in whatever manner necessary.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, one of the provisions of the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey

[Mr. SMITH] to the Bridges-Byrd amendment reads as follows: "so much of title III of chapter X-B as is contained in the paragraph headed 'Aid to Palestine Refugees'."

Mr. President, the purpose of the Smith amendment is to exempt from a further 10-percent cut, such as is proposed by the Bridges-Byrd amendment, the subjects covered in the ECA legislation, namely, the mutual defense assistance program, the Economic Cooperation program, the international children's welfare work, international development, the mutual defense assistance program, and aid to Palestine refugees.

The Senator from New Jersey is to be commended, in my opinion, for offering this amendment and asking the Senate not to impose a second 10-percent cut on the appropriations for these purposes, all of which were embodied in the ECA authorization bill passed by the Congress, and all of which are directly related—as is the amendment I shall discuss—to the peace and progress of the world.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that a few days ago we had a direct vote in regard to making provision for ECA, and that the Senate sustained the ECA on these very items? Now to reconsider them and take another cut at them is not in accordance with our method of procedure?

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for his inquiry and observation, and I wish to commend him for already having acquiesced, without opposition, in the making of the cut of 10 percent in the ECA funds, as recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

In other words, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, supported by the members of his committee, already has recognized the need for all possible and practical economy, and has accepted a 10-percent cut in ECA appropriations, as recommended in the wisdom of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

However, I think it is the position of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—and it is certainly mine—that a second 10-percent cut should not be imposed on the appropriations for those items, which are as vitally related to the peace and security of the world as is the defense effort itself.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator from Florida is not mistaken so far as the appropriation for aid to Palestine refugees is concerned. The full amount of the budget estimate was allowed; no 10 percent cut was made in it.

Mr. PEPPER. I understood that the Appropriations Committee had recommended a 10 percent cut, and that a 10 percent cut was made, on the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; the full amount of the budget estimate was restored.

Mr. HAYDEN. It was restored, on my motion.

Mr. FERGUSON. Likewise, the appropriation for the international point 4 program is up to the amount of the budget estimate, namely, \$26,900,000. So no cut has been made in it.

Mr. PEPPER. So the Palestine refugee fund is now back to the amount of the budget estimate; is it?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; it is back to the full amount of the budget estimate, namely, \$27,450,000. So is the appropriation for the point 4 program.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thought the same principle should be applied. I would acquiesce in the application of the principle similarly to the appropriations for all these subjects. I shall not ask for special treatment in favor of the Palestine refugee fund, although I feel that the Foreign Relations Committee was correct in speaking of the significance of that program.

I wish to read what the committee said in January in support of the resolution allowing approximately \$27,500,000 for that purpose. As I understand, there is \$27,500,000 in the bill for this purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. The exact amount is \$27,450,000, which is the budget estimate.

Mr. PEPPER. That is very good. So there would be only one 10-percent cut for the Palestine refugee fund, even if the Bridges amendment should prevail.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, while, as I said, it is very questionable whether there should be any cut in these funds, I am not disposed to ask that they be treated in any more favorable way than the ECA appropriation was treated. But I do want to call attention to what was said in the report of the Foreign Relations Committee:

REASONS FOR COMMITTEE ACTION

Quite apart from humanitarian considerations, the committee believes that it is in the interests of American foreign policy to continue our contribution to the Palestine refugee program. The presence of 750,000 refugees in the Near East constitutes a serious strain on the economies of the Arab states and consequently creates real dangers to the peace and security of that area. Moreover, it is apparent that so long as the refugee problem remains unsolved, one of the major sources of friction between Israel and the Arab states will be prolonged. On the other hand, a satisfactory solution of this problem would ease existing tensions and contribute greatly toward an over-all political settlement in Palestine and the Near East.

No one can doubt that peace and security in the Near East have a direct and important bearing upon the security and prosperity of the western world. Taken together the six countries of Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Iraq comprise an area of great strategic importance in world affairs. They serve as a vital cross road of world-wide sea and air communications, they are a major source of petroleum supply, and they are the center of the Moslem religion whose followers number nearly 300,000,000 people.

Traditionally our relations with the peoples of the Near East have been friendly. The committee strongly believes that the reservoir of good will which we have built up in that area is well worth preserving. This resolution will help accomplish that purpose, for our leadership in a humanitarian enter-

prise such as this is not likely to be forgotten by the peoples of the Near East.

I am pleased to learn that the committee has restored that 10 percent cut, and I shall not ask treatment more favorable than is accorded to these other subjects. Let me ask, has anything been done about the International Children's Fund?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is in the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand that, but is the appropriation the amount the Bureau of the Budget requested for that fund?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. My recollection—we did not allow the Budget request, but we allowed more than the House did.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senate committee allowed a 10 percent cut of the budget request; is that correct? Does the Senator from Michigan recall what was done?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Budget estimate was \$15,000,000, and the committee allowed \$12,500,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Twelve million five hundred thousand is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it proposed that that be cut again, unless the Smith amendment is adopted?

Mr. FERGUSON. That item would come under the cut.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, no doubt the Senator from New Jersey was not aware that this restoration had been made. I suggest that if there has already been a 10 percent cut in the children's fund, the Senate should weigh wisely the subject of whether an additional cut should be imposed. Surely, if we are trying to provide some means for the salvation of homeless and helpless children, we should not impose an additional cut above the 10 percent cut that has already been made by the committee. So I certainly hope that that part of the Smith amendment will prevail.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am so anxious to see whether an arrangement can be made whereby we may conclude consideration of the entire bill tomorrow, that I should like to suggest that the leadership discuss the question of a limitation of debate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate at 1 o'clock tomorrow proceed to vote on all amendments to the bill and on the bill itself, and that each Senator be allotted 5 minutes on each amendment, if he desires to take it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Reserving the right to object—and I shall object—every day I have been here, the same question has been asked. But there are two important amendments pending to this bill. There have been many amendments which have been discussed by Senators, in some cases for hours. There is a very important amendment on the subject of cancer and heart research. I know 38 Senators are sponsors of that amendment, many of whom, probably, will want to discuss certain portions of it. The other is a very important amendment affecting our entire war effort, namely, the amendment regarding ship repair of vital merchant marine ships necessary for any naval movement.

That is pending. I think it would be a little bit unfair if we were allowed only 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. How long does the Senator think it would take to discuss the amendments?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I could finish what I have to say in 20 minutes or half an hour. But there are several other Senators who I know want to speak on the health amendment. It is the last important amendment pending. I have waited here patiently through the whole week, with the acquiescence of the distinguished chairman of the committee. If we could make some arrangement whereby we could devote about 2 hours to those amendments and to the other amendments which have already been discussed, that might suffice. There has been no discussion whatever of the amendments to which I refer.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me make this suggestion to the Senator: I am quite sure that so far as the heart and cancer amendments are concerned practically every Senator has made up his mind, and there is no occasion for much argument. If the limitation were 10 minutes, and the Senator had not completed his remarks in that time, and another Senator took the floor, he could yield to him some time. This, as I understand, is a proposal that no Senator shall speak more than once, nor more than 10 minutes. It could be modified to not more than 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Why cannot these two amendments, which have not been discussed at all, be excepted from the unanimous consent agreement?

Mr. HAYDEN. What would be a proper limitation as to the amendments to which the Senator from Washington refers?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suggest that we limit discussion of those two amendments to half an hour. We would probably get through in half an hour.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Washington mean a half hour on each amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I mean on the two amendments.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator mean half an hour on each side?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I mean for each side. There would probably be 10-minute talks at most.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why not begin at 1 o'clock on those two amendments, devote a half hour to each amendment, and then vote at 2 o'clock, beginning approximately at the hour suggested by the distinguished majority leader? I believe that would be the best way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that would be agreeable with me, but I know there are many Senators who would like to speak.

Mr. HAYDEN. Each of them would have 10 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We would limit it between 1 and 2 o'clock.

Mr. LUCAS. Assuming we start upon the debate on the amendments in which the Senator is interested at 12 o'clock, would 2 hours be sufficient time on those amendments?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think 2 hours would be a sufficient time. But in order to be sure, why not make it 2:30, because usually when the Senate convenes a half hour is taken up by Senators wanting to make insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me remind the Senator that this is the fourth week the bill has been before the Senate. I know he has been waiting all that time, but the bill must be passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was not my amendments that took up the time. I am willing to limit the time on my amendments to a very short time compared to the time which has been consumed on other amendments. There has been no discussion whatever of these amendments. This is the fourth week, I appreciate that, but the discussions have continued for hours on other amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, even with no discussion, I think the two amendments of which the Senator speaks have the best chance of any amendments at all of being agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the Senator from Washington had better accept the 2-hour limitation, in view of what the distinguished chairman of the committee has said.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator had better accept it, and if he needs any additional time, if I have any time, I will yield it to him.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not speaking for myself. I am speaking for many other Senators. I know the Senator from Montana wants to make some remarks on the dental-care provision. The Senator from West Virginia wants to place in the RECORD certain important facts regarding cancer research. I can get through in 15 or 20 minutes, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wondered whether, in order to try to arrive at some arrangement, it would be possible for some of the Senators who I know are vitally interested in the subject of cancer and heart research, and so forth, to put some of their statements in the RECORD tonight, so there would be an opportunity to review them when the RECORD is read tomorrow, and thereby save some of the time required, so that we could fix a time for voting with a reasonable limitation on debate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will agree that that may be done. It is all right with me. But, as has been said, there has been debate over a period of 4 weeks, during which time I have not said a word. I have two important amendments. An effort is now made to cut me down to 10 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Where has the Senator been during all these 4 weeks?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have been here all the time.

Mr. LUCAS. He has surely had opportunity during that time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest giving the Senator from Washington 2 hours.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the request?

Mr. LUCAS. There is no request. We are trying to formulate one.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would just as soon act on the amendments now, if the Senate is willing to stay here.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. If the distinguished chairman of the committee wishes to accept the so-called Magnuson amendments, why not act on them now, get them out of the way, and not have any discussion on them?

Mr. LUCAS. I doubt whether the Senate will do that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the majority leader will agree, I am sure it would be satisfactory to all the Members on this side of the aisle to carry out the proposal of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee. In fact, I should not be averse, in order to have a unanimous-consent agreement tonight, to meet at 11:30 tomorrow morning and make these two amendments the pending business, and, at 2 o'clock, start voting on all pending amendments and motions, with 5 minutes for each Senator on each amendment or motion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. After 2 o'clock?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I make that suggestion to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to have not more than 20 minutes on the so-called cancer and heart amendment. I should like to have another 20 minutes on the ship-repair amendment. I know the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] would like to have 15 or 20 minutes. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] want some time. It will not take me very long. I do not talk all afternoon on an amendment. I think my amendments are very important, however.

Why not meet at 11 o'clock?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amendments which the Senator from Washington has in mind are amendments which are in the chapter which I handle. To my mind, they are so meritorious that they do not require a debate of 20 minutes; they could be handled in 5 minutes if their merits were discussed.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I have other responsibilities. I think the

amendments of the Senator from Washington are so good that if they require 20 minutes of discussion they should not be agreed to at all. I think there is so much merit in the proposals that the Senator from Washington should accept the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall limit myself to less than 20 minutes. Why can we not modify the agreement so as to vote at 2 o'clock? If we can meet at 11 o'clock it will accommodate a few Senators who want to make a few brief remarks.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow and proceed to the amendments which the Senator from Washington has been discussing, that those amendments be debated until not later than 2 o'clock, and that following the disposition of those amendments we proceed to vote upon each and every other amendment, each Senator to have 5 minutes, if he so desires.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the request include motions and points of order?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, how will the time be divided?

Mr. LUCAS. It will be divided equally between the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the Senator from Washington in the case of the amendments to which the Senator from Washington has referred.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it was not my understanding when I said we would approve the unanimous-consent request that the amendments were to be voted upon at 2 o'clock. I meant that the Magnuson amendments were to be debated until 2 o'clock, and at 2 o'clock the Senate would proceed to take up the amendments in turn where we left off, the pending business being the ECA appropriation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let us vote on my amendments and get them out of the way.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, there is one other important matter to which I should like to invite attention. It relates to the vocational-training program. Could it not precede the amendments offered by the Senator from Washington? It comes ahead of the Senator's amendments in the bill. It is on page 141. The amendments of the Senator from Washington follow that.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it would not make any difference so far as the offering of the amendment is concerned, whether it is offered in the way the Senator suggests or whether we take up the other amendments first. So long as the Senator has an opportunity to present it before the debate is closed, the Senator will be protected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to have it understood that if we are ready to vote on these amendments by 1:30

o'clock, we vote on them and get them out of the way.

Mr. LUCAS. That was included in my unanimous-consent request. I said, no later than 2 o'clock.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I would have to object if there is going to be any vote before 1 o'clock, because the Finance Committee is called upon to raise \$5,000,000,000 of additional revenue. We are working on the tax program presented by the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, and if we have to adjourn our meeting in the morning at 11 o'clock, or even if we have to vote before 1 o'clock or 1:30 o'clock on any of these important amendments, we would be precluded from any consideration of them or from speaking a word above them if we should be moved to say anything about them. I should like to have a definite understanding that the vote shall not begin on these amendments prior to 1 o'clock.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not think there will be any vote prior to 1 o'clock.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to have it in the agreement; otherwise, I shall object.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I further modify my request with reference to the amendments which we have just been discussing and as to which more time is desired for debate, that they be not voted on before 1 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would ask the Senator from Illinois what effect that would have on the pending question before the Senate, which is the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. LUCAS. I do not see why the Magnuson amendments cannot be disposed of first, and then we can move along with the other amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is it the Senator's request that the amendments offered by the Senator from Washington be discussed from the time of the meeting of the Senate until 1 o'clock, and then that the amendments be voted on seriatim?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And that after that, each Senator is limited to one speech of 5 minutes on all amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. After we dispose of the amendments covered by the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, will the offering of amendments be then in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. After disposing of the pending amendment, which is the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, and then when the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is disposed of, other amendments will be in order. The Chair will suggest that if the amendments which are under discussion are debated until 1 o'clock, that need not necessarily mean they will be voted

upon first. They can take their place and be voted on following the disposition of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey and the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I cannot see that it makes much difference.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it will be perfectly agreeable to the minority, I am satisfied, to proceed to vote on the two amendments covered by the unanimous-consent request, either at 1 o'clock or 2 o'clock, so far as we are concerned. It is perfectly agreeable to vote on them, provided that after the vote on them the Senate proceed to vote on the Smith amendment, which is the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would be the order, anyway. If the pending question is temporarily laid aside for the disposition of the two amendments referred to, the course which the Senator has suggested would automatically be followed.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. NEELY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, may I inquire whether there would be a disposition on the part of those in control to accept the amendment to increase the appropriation for the war against cancer by \$17,000,000? If not, I must insist on having at least 10 minutes to discuss this vital matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is one of the amendments which is under discussion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator will be afforded sufficient time to discuss the amendment.

Mr. NEELY. May I have some assurance on that point?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be glad to yield 10 or 20 minutes to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. NEELY. Ten minutes would be sufficient. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, may I ask whether the Senator from Illinois will make the time for voting 2 o'clock? Several Senators will be required to attend a meeting of a committee in Baltimore.

Mr. LUCAS. I modify my request to make it 2 o'clock. Are there any other proposals?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is it the Senator's request that the Senate meet at 11 o'clock?

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps we should meet at 11 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader for presenting the unanimous-consent request. I ask that the usual provisions be inserted in this unanimous-consent request, namely, that any motion or amendment which is pending or may be

offered is included in the agreement giving 5 minutes on each amendment after the amendments of the distinguished Senator from Washington are disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator modify his request to that extent? Let the Chair understand whether the request is that each Senator has the right to speak 5 minutes on each amendment, or whether there shall be a limitation of 10 minutes on each amendment, to be equally divided.

Mr. LUCAS. Each Senator is to have 5 minutes on each amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Each Senator will have 5 minutes on each amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. ELLENDER. All amendments must be germane.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to inquire, if the appropriation bill is passed tomorrow night, whether the Senator from Illinois contemplates a Friday session?

Mr. LUCAS. A Friday session is contemplated for the purpose of calling the calendar.

Mr. ELLENDER. All amendments must be germane.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator include in his request the elimination of amendments that are not germane?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Thursday, August 3, 1950, at the hour of 11 o'clock a. m., the Senate proceed to the consideration of certain amendments intended to be proposed to the bill H. R. 7786, the general appropriation bill for 1951, by Mr. MAGNUSON, for himself and others, relating (1) to the National Cancer and Heart Institutes and mental health activities; (2) to appropriations for vocational education; and (3) providing for repair of vessels in the national defense reserve, and consider same until 2 o'clock p. m.: *Provided*, That no vote shall be had on any of said amendments prior to the hour of 2 o'clock p. m., that the time for debate between said hours shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the amendment, and controlled, respectively, by Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. McKELLAR, and that at the hour of 2 o'clock p. m. the Senate shall proceed to vote, without further debate, upon said amendments.

Ordered, That after the disposition of the foregoing amendments, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 5 minutes upon any amendment or motion that may be pending or that may be proposed to the said bill, and that no amendment that is not germane shall be in order and points of order shall not be waived.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the announcement made by the majority leader that he proposes a call of the calendar on Friday, may I ask whether he proposes to have the calendar called from the point at which we left off at the

last call of the calendar or from the beginning of the calendar?

Mr. LUCAS. From where we left off the last time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. The Chair cannot hear Senators and does not know how anyone else can hear what is going on.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO NOMINATIONS REPORTED ADVERSELY

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make another announcement. Four or five nominations appear on the Executive Calendar which have been reported adversely by various committees. I think that probably on Tuesday next we shall try to dispose of all these nominations one way or another. They are on the calendar and we must do something with them sooner or later.

ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE OF CERTAIN COMMISSIONED OFFICERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 2160, amending the Public Health Service Act, with respect to annual and sick leave of commissioned officers, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2160) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize annual and sick leave with pay for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, to authorize the payment of accumulated and accrued annual leave in excess of sixty days, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1 and 2 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 3. (a) Sections 1 and 2 of this Act shall be effective on July 1, 1950.

"(b) Any officer who, on June 30, 1949, was credited with more than sixty days of accumulated and accrued leave, shall be compensated for so much of such leave as exceeds sixty days but does not exceed one hundred and twenty days, in a lump-sum payment on the basis of the base and longevity pay, the allowance for subsistence, and the allowance for rental of quarters (whether or not he was receiving such allowance on such date), which were applicable to him on such date under provisions of law then in effect: *Provided*, That there shall be deducted from the number of days upon which such lump-sum payment is otherwise authorized to be computed the number of days of leave in excess of thirty days taken during the period from July 1, 1949, to June 30, 1950. Payments authorized pursuant to this subsection shall be due and payable on July 1, 1950. All amounts received pursuant to this subsection shall be exempt from taxation.

"(c) The provisions of this Act shall not be applicable to an officer who has, prior to July 1, 1950, been placed on terminal leave preceding separation, retirement, or release from active duty."

And the House agree to the same.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
CLAUDE PEPPER,
M. M. NEELY,
ROBERT A. TAFT,

Per H. A. S.

H. ALEXANDER SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
GEO. HOWARD WILSON,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the conference report was considered and agreed to.

OMNIBUS MEDICAL RESEARCH BILL— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 2591, the omnibus medical research bill, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 27, 1950, pp. 11380-11382.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

EXPANSION AND DISPOSITION OF CER- TAIN NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2863) to provide for the expansion and disposition of certain national cemeteries, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed—

a. to expand existing facilities at the Rock Island National Cemetery, Rock Island, Ill., by utilizing not to exceed 30 acres of federally owned lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army adjoining the present national cemetery facility, which are surplus to military needs, and to provide for the care and maintenance thereof under the same regulations as prescribed for other national cemeteries under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army; and

b. to expand existing facilities at the Fort Leavenworth National Cemetery, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., by utilizing not to exceed 8 acres of federally owned land under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, adjoining the present national cemetery facility, which are surplus to military needs, and to provide for the care and maintenance thereof under the same regulations as prescribed for other national cemeteries under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer, without compensation therefor, to the Secretary of the Army for cemetery purposes such Government-owned land under the jurisdiction of the Depart-

ment of the Navy, located adjacent to the Barrancas National Cemetery near the city of Pensacola, Fla., as may be determined by the Secretary of the Navy to be available for the expansion of said cemetery. The lands transferred pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be constituted a part of the Barrancas National Cemetery.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CIVIL RULE FOR GUAM

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the United States signed a bill providing an organic act for the Island of Guam. It is a measure of a great deal of significance, particularly in the light of what is now going on in the Pacific area. In that connection, I desire to ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial from the New York Times of July 28, an editorial from the Washington Post of July 26, and a letter to the editor of the Washington Post written by Martha L. Jay, assistant editor, Guam Echo.

There being no objection, the editorials and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 28, 1950]

DOING JUSTICE TO GUAM

The Senate did a good thing on Wednesday in adopting, by unanimous vote, an organic act for Guam. The measure has already passed the House, and the amendments are minor. Quick agreement and Presidential signature should therefore be relatively easy. There is more reason than ever, in the light of what is happening in the Far East, for this wise and beneficent measure, and it is gratifying that action has come, at length, with such unanimity of support.

The people of Guam have been under American rule for 51 years, but during all that time the question of the establishment of the machinery for civil government and a large measure of self-government has been kept pending. A short time ago Guam's first civilian Governor was appointed and the transfer of administration from the Navy Department to Interior was scheduled for July 1, but then postponed for 1 month. The organic act that has been adopted will make this transfer automatic, but it provides for supervision rather than administration.

Under this act the people of Guam become citizens of the United States and Guam becomes an unincorporated Territory of the United States. It is clear, however, that Guam does not look to eventual statehood, but will have, rather, a special form of self-government within the large framework of the American political structure. The act contains an admirable bill of rights which embraces not only the provisions of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution but also the other constitutional stipulations in defense of individual liberty. It provides for an elected legislature and a civil judiciary integrated with our Federal courts. The Governor will be a Presidential appointee.

This organic act has the full approval of the people of Guam and that is its most important characteristic. The people of Guam do not want independence or statehood, but they do want to live under a civil government of their own choosing. It is part of our political philosophy that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed and this act, as far as Guam is concerned, establishes government by that consent.

This action of the Congress is unusually timely. It gives us the opportunity to make a demonstration of our good faith just when that good faith is being challenged by Communist propaganda. We can thus show that we are earnestly devoted to the enlargement of human liberties rather than to their restriction. We can show, moreover, that the menace of assault does not deflect us from good purposes and constructive actions. In Guam, also, the transfer to civil rule should take a burden from our armed services and make their task easier.

The people of Guam have been our faithful and loyal friends for many decades. We can now, with singular pleasure, extend our enthusiastic welcome to this group of our fellow Americans.

[From the Washington Post of July 26, 1950]

CIVIL RULE FOR GUAM

August 1 is the date which has been officially fixed for the transfer of Guam from naval to civilian rule. This transfer was supposed to take place by Presidential order on July 1 but was postponed for 30 days by the President, presumably because of the eruption in Korea. We trust that there will not be another postponement. Administration of the island is already actually in civilian hands, and a shift of authority from the Navy Department to the Interior Department would in no way impair the efficiency of naval operations in the area. Indeed, it would relieve the Navy of the burden of administering the island's internal affairs.

Guam was acquired from Spain half a century ago under an agreement which committed the United States to promote its growth toward self-government. It is high time for that agreement to be fulfilled. The House has already passed a bill, due to come up on the Consent Calendar of the Senate today, to establish an organic law giving Guamanians American citizenship, the access they now lack to the courts of the United States, and the guaranty of a bill of rights. These minimum attributes of freedom belong as a matter of natural right to any people; the people of Guam have earned them in particular by their suffering and their devotion to the United States during the war against Japan.

Passage of the organic act and realization of the transfer of administrative authority from the Navy to the Interior Department will strengthen the bonds between Guam and this country and thus enhance our security in the Pacific. These measures will serve, too, as a fresh demonstration of American adherence to democratic principles. Both should be given effect without any further delay.

CIVIL RULE FOR GUAM

Your editorials, "Puerto Rico Left Out" (July 18) and "Statehood Now" (July 19), stress the point that there is a need, particularly at this time, for the United States to set an example consistent with democratic traditions in the treatment of dependent areas.

We desire to add one more example of the treatment of dependent areas where the United States is in imminent danger of acting unwisely. On June 30, the long-planned transfer of the administration of Guam from military rule to civilian government was postponed from July 1 to August 1.

As H. R. 7273, a bill to provide a civil government for Guam, nears Senate action (scheduled for Wednesday), Guamanians stir uneasily at the thought that further postponement of the transfer may cause the death of H. R. 7273. This bill was passed by the House on voice vote on May 23. President Truman has consistently stated his approval of both the transfer of Guam government from the Navy, a military agency, to one better equipped and trained in civil administration, the Department of the Interior,

and passage of organic legislation. Both measures have been a basic part of the President's civil-rights program.

Patriotic Americans and democratic peoples watch with the grave apprehension that further postponement will provide ammunition for Communist accusations of American imperialism, broken promises, military domination, etc.—accusations which the United States can ill afford to brook at this critical time.

MARTHA L. JAY,
Assistant Editor, *Guam Echo*.

WASHINGTON.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I send to the desk a resolution amending the present cloture rule of the Senate, and ask for its appropriate reference.

The resolution proposes to change the cloture rule in the following respects:

First. Cloture may be invoked by a majority vote of those voting, instead of the present requirement of two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn.

Second. After a cloture motion is adopted, debate is limited to 1 hour for each Senator, except that any Senator may yield his time to another.

Third. Subsection 3 of the cloture rule, added last year, is repealed. This subsection of Rule 22 exempts proposals to change the Standing Rules of the Senate from application of the cloture rule, thus guaranteeing unlimited debate, if such were desired, on any motion to amend the rules of the Senate.

Mr. President, in submitting the resolution, I wish to say it is the opinion of the authors that in this time of great national crisis this is a very important defense measure, because I think it is important that we pass legislation providing for changes in the rules of the Senate which will guarantee to the American people that a successful filibuster cannot be conducted in the Senate of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 322) submitted by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yeas-and-nays vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other

matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same; except that any Senator may yield to any other Senator all or any part of the aggregate period of time which he is entitled to speak; and the Senator to whom he so yields may speak for the time so yielded in addition to any period of time which he is entitled to speak in his own right. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

SEC. 2. Subsection 3 of such rule is hereby repealed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 4. An act authorizing the advanced training in aeronautics of technical personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

S. 2655. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn M. Hryniak;

S. 3380. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1939, to redefine the term "contraband article" with respect to narcotic drugs, and for other purposes;

S. 3520. An act to strengthen the common defense by providing for the continuation and expansion of Western Hemisphere production of abacá by the United States;

H. R. 1293. An act for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co.;

H. R. 5074. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6533. An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7695. An act to provide a 5-day week for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force; and

H. R. 8909. An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and 34 other Members of the Senate, including myself. This amendment, with certain exceptions, such as military, trust funds, and so forth, proposes a 10-percent cut in the appropriations of each department or agency in the executive branch of the Government.

In view of the situation with which our country finds itself today as a result of the Korean episode, this 10-percent cut in the domestic programs is the very least which we should do. The adoption of the amendment would mean a reduction of approximately \$800,000,000 in this \$34,000,000,000 appropriation bill. This \$34,000,000,000 does not include the \$5,600,000,000 interest on the national debt, plus another \$2,500,000,000 on other items such as trust funds, and so forth.

Even after the reduction it would mean that we would still be spending more money on the domestic programs under the executive departments of our Government than was spent during either of the years 1947 or 1948, at which time the Eightieth Congress under the control of the Republican Party cut the appropriations and balanced the budget.

For instance, during the year 1947 the total appropriations were \$36,931,503,000, and in 1948 our Government was operated with a total appropriation of \$33,481,343,000.

After the Democratic Party regained control of the Congress, these appropriations were increased to \$40,476,613,000 in 1949, and in 1950 the total appropriations were \$43,495,385,000. This year's appropriation again will exceed \$43,000,000,000, excluding the additional billions which will be required as a result of the Korean incident.

The argument oftentimes is advanced that a substantial part of this increase during the past 2 years was as the result of increased military expenditures, but that statement cannot be supported. A major part of the increased appropriations during the past 2 years has been to pay for the additional cost of the domestic projects of the Fair Deal program.

For instance, the appropriations to the Department of the Interior during the past 4 years have been doubled:

1947.....	\$290,408,000
1948.....	320,603,000
1949.....	516,401,000
1950.....	646,431,000

During the past 10 years the Department of Justice appropriations have increased from \$67,135,000 in 1941 to \$135,970,000 in 1950:

1941.....	\$67,135,000
1942.....	84,215,000
1943.....	107,885,000
1944.....	114,940,000
1945.....	117,866,000
1946.....	106,650,000
1947.....	112,086,000
1948.....	116,024,000
1949.....	126,759,000
1950.....	135,970,000

The deficit of the Post Office Department has increased during the past 10 years from \$30,465,000 in 1941 to a deficit of over \$550,000,000 in 1950. During this same period the efficiency of our postal service has deteriorated by more than 50 percent. This drop in efficiency is true despite the fact that the number of the employees in the Postal Department during this same 10-year period has increased from 303,654 in 1940 to 535,745 in 1949. In fact as of January 1, 1950, there were employed in the Post Office Department alone almost as many employees as were required to operate

all branches of the Federal Government including the Postal Department as recently as 1934. Congress should authorize some increase in postal rates to offset this deficit; however, with proper management at the executive level a substantial part of this deficit could be eliminated by greater efficiency.

The appropriations for the Department of Commerce have increased over 400 percent during the past 10 years from \$147,827,000 in 1941 to \$688,200,000 in 1950:

1941	-----	\$147,827,000
1942	-----	445,437,000
1943	-----	622,846,000
1944	-----	136,200,000
1945	-----	88,313,000
1946	-----	108,469,000
1947	-----	200,112,000
1948	-----	198,372,000
1949	-----	642,899,000
1950	-----	688,200,000

The functions of these departments are practically all related to domestic programs and therefore this increase cannot be charged against the military defense of our Government. In view of the manner in which the appropriations for these domestic departments of our Government have increased there is absolutely no reason why the Byrd-Bridges amendment should not be agreed to, nor is there any reason why any of the essential services under the executive departments of our Government should be curtailed as a result of its enactment.

Not only should the Byrd-Bridges amendment be agreed to but also of equal importance is another amendment which I, with the support of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], am offering. This second amendment proposes:

First. That construction or work on any Government project authorized under this appropriation bill be postponed indefinitely; and

Second. That the construction or work on any Government project which has been commenced prior to the enactment of this act be suspended immediately unless—

(a) it is certified by the Secretary of Defense as essential to national security; or

(b) the construction work has proceeded to the point where its suspension would result in an unnecessary loss.

The President of the United States has already during the past 2 weeks issued similar instructions to the executive departments of our Government, requesting that they survey each project with the thought of determining whether or not that project could be temporarily suspended. I commend the President for taking that step and sincerely hope that he will follow through with the necessary Presidential directive, ordering the suspension of those projects which are not found to be essential to our national defense program. However, the President's orders apply only to those projects authorized by Congress under prior appropriation bills.

In view of the fact that the Senate is now in the process of passing the 1951 appropriation bill, we should accept our own responsibility and order the suspension of all nonessential Government

work, thereby telling our constituents that all of those projects in our own States which are not absolutely essential to the national defense program are being postponed indefinitely with our consent.

During World War II this same step was taken; however, unfortunately, during that period the decision to suspend Government public works programs was delayed until after a critical shortage had developed in many of the strategic materials which were needed to further our war effort. Let us not make the same mistake this time. It would be much better to suspend all Government projects at this time and then a few months later find that the action was unnecessary, in which event either Congress next January or the President by Presidential directive could order the resumption of the work. It is much safer that we make a mistake in that direction than it would be to continue Government construction at this time and then find that the materials and manpower which are being used in this work were seriously needed in those programs relating to our national security.

The adoption of these two amendments would also reduce Government expenditures at a time when the American people are on the verge of being confronted with a drastic upward tax revision and while these reductions in Government expenses will not eliminate entirely the necessity for an upward tax revision, they will reduce the percentage of that increase.

We must not overlook the fact that there is a vast difference in the financial condition of this country today as compared with the period in which we entered World War II. In 1940 our national debt was less than \$43,000,000,000, and during that year the total cost of operating our Government, including both domestic and military programs, was only \$9,305,000,000. Today we are approaching the present crisis with a national debt of over \$257,000,000,000 and an annual budget in excess of \$40,000,000,000. The interest charges alone on our national debt today are over \$5,600,000,000.

During the next few months as a result of our expanded military expenditures our country is going to be confronted with the most serious threat of inflation we have ever experienced, and it is absolutely useless for us to attempt to check this inflation through rigid controls and increased taxes and at the same time continue to aggravate the situation by pumping into our economy billions representing unnecessary Government programs.

I repeat—the very least that the Senate could do at this time in the way of economy would be to agree to the Byrd-Bridges amendment authorizing a 10 percent cut in the domestic appropriations along with the second amendment which is being offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself and which would immediately suspend all Government work not essential to national defense.

It is perfectly absurd for anyone to say that these appropriations cannot be cut to at least this extent when we consider

that the Hoover Commission has already pointed out the manner in which this Government could be reorganized on a more efficient basis resulting in a net saving of at least \$3,000,000,000 without the elimination of a single essential Government service. The program of this bipartisan commission has been in the hands of the President for more than 1 year and to date about the only portions of the recommendations which have been placed in effect by the President are those proposals which would give to the executive departments of the Government increased power and an increase in their own salaries.

On the other hand, that portion of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission which proposes a reduction in personnel of these departments by consolidating the agencies and promoting greater efficiency with a lesser force has been resisted by all departments. Actually, the number of civilian Government employees during the 3-month period between December 1949 and March 1950 was increased 5 percent representing an additional personnel of more than 100,000, bringing the total to 2,090,998 Government employees. This represents more than double the 949,418 employees on the payroll in March 1940. Incidentally this latter figure of 949,000 in March 1940 included those employees in the WPA, CCC, and the other make-work agencies.

In the face of this shameful record, and as one who has consistently reported the reorganization plans which have been submitted to the Congress by the President, I am of the firm opinion that the only way that the American people will ever get any economy in this Government or any reduction in nonessential personnel will be by cutting the appropriations of those departments, and at the same time Congress should tell the executive heads of these government agencies that they must operate their departments within the reduced budget.

Mr. President, just a brief reference to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] which would eliminate the foreign aid cut from the Byrd-Bridges amendment. I notice that the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], addressed his remarks just a few minutes ago in opposition to that amendment, and pointed out in his statement that the Committee on Appropriations had already reduced this year's authorization by \$1,000,000,000 below last year's appropriation.

Mr. President, much emphasis has been placed on that point, and that has been used as an argument against any further cut in the ECA appropriation. I point out, however, that in the very beginning, when ECA was first authorized, it was never intended that its appropriations should equal each year what they received in the prior years. The committee at that time planned for a gradual reduction in the program each year until its elimination in 1951. The reduction in the appropriation bill of this year, which is now before the Senate, is only about the same reduction which was contemplated at the time Congress acted on the ECA appropriation.

To support that statement I refer to the report put out by the Committee of European Economic Cooperation, under the supervision of the State Department. I refer to page 54 of that report published in 1947, prior to the enactment of the ECA Act. They point out to Congress that in the year 1950, which is this year we are now operating in, we should expect to and we should cut the appropriations by \$1,000,000,000 below what they were in the year 1949. They point out how that the 1949 appropriation would be cut below the 1948 appropriation, and how the program would finally end in 1951. So this reduction in the present appropriation bill does not in reality represent a cut of a single dime. It is only the reduction which

was contemplated in 1947 at the time the ECA was first authorized. So I do not think we should do a great deal of boasting about the fact that there has been a cut, because there has been up to this point no cut made in that program. It is true there has been a cut made in what the Bureau of the Budget asks. But if we are going to take as our guide here what the Bureau of the Budget asks, then we would always be cutting the appropriations, or else spending about twice as much as we have been spending.

Every Member of the Senate knows that the Bureau of the Budget always figures to ask about 50 percent more than they ever expect to receive. So I say again that there has actually been

no real cut made in the ECA program. All of these programs have merit, but they are all going to be cut unless we want to bankrupt this country.

I most certainly shall vote against the Smith amendment, and support both the Byrd-Bridges amendment and the amendment proposing to suspend all unnecessary Government works programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD tables prepared by the Bureau of the Budget showing how the appropriations for the different departments of our Government have increased during the past 10 years.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriations by organization unit for fiscal years 1941 through 1950

(NOTE.—Includes permanent appropriations and refunds of receipts; excludes public debt retirements)

[In thousands]

	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Legislative branch	\$25,230	\$29,700	\$32,057	\$47,897	\$49,562	\$55,770	\$62,517	\$61,919	\$62,413	\$66,406
The judiciary.....	11,785	12,410	12,748	13,425	13,620	15,856	17,935	20,147	21,456	24,497
Executive Office of the President:										
Bureau of the Budget.....	840	1,315	1,982	2,817	2,957	3,037	3,762	3,377	3,280	3,300
Council of Economic Advisers.....							275	350	310	300
National Security Council.....									200	200
National Resources Planning Board.....	709	1,101	806	80	29,700	13,000			13,000	13,500
Office of Censorship.....			26,500	29,600						
Office for Emergency Management.....	1,000	437,798	1,426,697	2,725,912	941,455	651,695	128,325	500	435	
Office of Price Administration.....			133,450	169,500	185,700					
Office of Government Reports.....	743						50	230		
Office of Strategic Services.....				35,000	57,000	20,000				
Petroleum Administration for War.....			4,050	6,070	6,000	3,988				
Other.....	598	549	546	529	779	2,220	1,161	2,235	2,722	3,536
Funds appropriated to the President:										
Economic cooperation, foreign assistance.....									5,074,000	3,628,380
Assistance to the Republic of Korea.....										110,000
Assistance to Greece and Turkey.....								400,000	225,000	45,000
Defense aid.....	7,000,000	11,432,738	6,287,015	32,286	3,572,471	2,683,386	5,751	500	250	100
Emergency fund for the President:										
National defense.....		200,000	150,000							
War.....	66,000	66,000								
Navy.....	34,000	34,000								
Defense housing, temporary shelter.....	20,000	200,600								
National defense housing.....	100,000									
Foreign aid, Austria, France, and Italy.....								577,000		
Foreign aid, China.....								18,000	400,000	
Foreign war relief.....		35,000								
International Children's Emergency Fund of the UN.....									35,000	
Mutual defense assistance.....										814,010
Overtime, leave, and holiday compensation.....							20,000			
Payments, Armed Forces Leave Act, 1946.....							2,431,708			
Refugee relief.....	50,000									
Relief assistance to war devastated countries.....								332,000		
Relief of Palestine refugees.....									12,000	4,000
Surplus property, care and handling overseas.....								35,348	18,300	
UNRRA.....					450,000	1,765,000				
Independent offices:										
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	135	134	50	46	42	42	222	362	1,079	5,921
American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas.....					40	40				
Atomic Energy Commission.....								175,192	621,851	703,229
Bituminous Coal Consumers Council.....	173	205	189							
Civil Service Commission.....	97,466	115,959	124,859	194,969	219,019	265,992	236,797	262,807	244,116	324,402
Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation.....		347	500	275						
Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.....								1,939		
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion.....									50	50
Displaced Persons Commission.....									3,200	4,210
Economic Cooperation Administration.....									5	180
Employees' Compensation Commission.....	6,403	9,660	11,165	11,547	15,422					
Federal Communications Commission.....	2,376	5,656	7,777	7,885	6,312	5,955	6,252	6,240	6,717	6,729
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....		159	483							
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....								2,260	3,090	2,758
Federal Power Commission.....	2,509	2,807	2,789	2,683	2,793	2,975	3,729	3,961	4,305	4,139
Federal Emergency Relief Administration.....	1									
Federal Trade Commission.....	2,300	2,360	2,050	1,958	2,054	2,174	2,850	2,955	3,622	3,723
Foreign Service Pay Adjustment.....	1,280	975	1,350	640	790	950				
Filipino Rehabilitation Commission.....						50				
General Accounting Office.....	10,913	12,355	17,545	28,465	38,480	41,964	40,300	36,517	35,791	35,070
George Washington Bicentennial Commission.....	9									
Indian Claims Commission.....							15	150	90	90
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	9,059	9,323	9,569	9,173	9,196	9,016	10,524	10,748	11,335	11,420
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.....									5	5
Maritime Labor Board.....	175	30								
Motor Carrier Claims Commission.....									50	150

¹ Represents National Security Resources Board.

Appropriations by organization unit for fiscal years 1941 through 1950—Continued

[In thousands]

	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Independent offices—Continued										
Mineral Act of October 5, 1918	\$198	\$165								
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	11,200	19,865	\$25,429	\$38,393	\$40,943	\$26,015	\$30,720	\$43,453	\$48,664	\$128,009
National Archives	933	1,078	1,045	941	1,071	1,078	1,242	1,261		
National Capital Housing Authority			12	27	19	19	19	22	28	35
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	850	1,390	200		740	394	868	354	400	715
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission								15		3,000
National Labor Relations Board	2,901	3,396	3,642	2,493	3,664	4,308	4,454	5,975	9,400	8,605
National Mediation Board	383	474	424	527	657	721	829	918		1,211
Office of Selective Service Records							5,103	4,250	2,477	
Office of Housing Expediter								24,199	22,222	22,100
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion			138	138	1,198					
Philippine War Damage Commission							10,000	70,000	95,000	184,800
Price Decontrol Board							250			
Protection of interest of United States in matters affecting oil lands in former naval reserves	26	26								
Railroad Retirement Board	132,324	152,423	231,707	277,417	324,580	307,623	317,384	705,308	652,701	758,589
Securities and Exchange Commission	5,400	5,440	4,910	4,603	4,697	4,694	5,535	5,739	6,121	5,878
Selective Service System	24,825	37,270	58,508	58,943	62,502	52,000	27,750		25,000	8,500
Smithsonian Institution	1,446	1,708	1,850	2,314	2,127	2,401	2,777	3,010	3,593	3,721
Tariff Commission	920	920	931	907	962	1,007	1,117	1,152	1,268	1,272
Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission	480									
The Tax Court of the United States	557	558	582	588	587	580	712	772	788	811
United States Maritime Commission	498,190	2,360,811	4,985,368	1,289,780	6,766,000	437,583	144,747	252,565	101,989	74,007
United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two-Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson	5									
United States University of Pennsylvania Bicentennial Commission	2									
Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission			50							
Veterans' Administration	582,026	611,034	608,147	946,637	1,517,209	4,780,630	8,352,918	6,972,714	5,962,865	6,352,430
Panama Railroad Company								10,000		
Tennessee Valley Authority	65,000	196,800	136,100			9,648	39,906	18,700	30,339	61,041
War Assets Administration							510,000	257,149		
Federal Loan Agency	1,400									
Federal Security Agency	1,009,225	1,098,891	840,194	762,754	658,033	749,668	884,925	1,045,297	1,381,206	1,574,726
Federal Works Agency	1,854,558	1,462,499	466,637	360,577	200,623	256,755	422,445	342,806		
General Services Administration									514,670	683,495
Housing and Home Finance Agency		309,501	629,380	163,251	118,804	458,527	138,162	145,205	131,496	29,878
Department of Agriculture	1,150,629	1,254,224	869,571	1,024,248	720,137	768,412	778,908	833,415	843,634	880,223
Department of Commerce	147,827	445,437	622,846	136,200	88,313	108,469	200,112	198,372	642,899	688,200
Department of Defense									6,800	191,450
Office of Secretary of Defense										
Department of the Army										
Military functions	8,483,709	75,464,199	42,820,959	59,036,403	15,457,647	21,503,953	7,305,457	4,749,853	5,820,000	6,018,795
Civil functions	274,617	309,655	343,483	110,156	115,782	367,177	1,071,882	1,447,517	1,999,464	1,583,656
Department of the Navy	3,629,234	18,686,603	23,808,553	28,527,446	29,075,688	23,010,931	4,150,609	3,642,964	3,768,392	4,366,776
Department of the Air Force								1,437,889	939,977	4,121,731
Department of the Interior	169,537	286,490	281,206	235,424	214,338	248,817	290,408	320,603	516,401	646,431
Department of Justice	67,135	84,215	107,885	114,940	117,866	106,650	112,096	116,024	126,759	135,970
Department of Labor	23,013	24,145	26,112	55,034	71,559	82,289	140,490	86,590	15,490	58,805
Post Office Department (general fund)	30,465	25,469	26,621			160,576	260,080	310,215	527,210	558,000
Department of State	23,955	31,434	37,922	53,190	55,340	102,345	193,269	315,595	350,852	300,672
Treasury Department	1,429,294	2,000,834	2,320,767	3,267,938	6,635,995	8,776,631	8,546,165	8,147,705	9,112,894	8,224,548
District of Columbia	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	8,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Total, appropriations	27,071,973	117,653,534	87,512,656	99,798,026	67,866,508	67,879,061	36,931,503	33,484,343	40,476,613	43,495,385

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEPPER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive N, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a treaty between the United States of America and Canada concerning uses of the waters of the Niagara River, signed at Washington February 27, 1950; with a reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 11).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination to the Motor-Carrier Claims Commission, the nomination to the Federal Trade Commission, the nomination to the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department, and the nominations of United States district judges, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and without objection, the nominations in

the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

RECESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, August 3, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 2 (legislative day of July 20), 1950:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

John M. Redding, of Illinois, to be Assistant Postmaster General, vice Paul Aiken, resigned.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be members of the International Claims Commission of the United States:

Josiah Marvel, Jr., of Delaware.
Raymond S. McKeough, of Illinois.
Roy G. Baker, of Texas.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 96

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 3, 1950

No. 153

Senate

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 1950)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Be to us, O God, the guiding light of this day, that with wisdom and insight we may be able to competently match its responsibilities. May our faith look up to Thee; our hearts put their trust in Thee; and our souls be hooded with the power of Thy presence. Give unto us, we beseech Thee, the motive of the day; a complete willingness to serve Thee as we seek the best ends for our fellow men. Let us be radiant diffusers of confidence by every act and service we perform, that men may see, in these days of insecurity, our faith in Him who does not change. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 2, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, August 3, 1950, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 4. An act authorizing the advanced training in aeronautics of technical personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

S. 2655. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn M. Hryniak;

S. 3380. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1939, to redefine the term "contraband article" with respect to narcotic drugs, and for other purposes;

S. 3520. An act to strengthen the common defense by providing for the continuation and expansion of Western Hemisphere production of abacá by the United States;

H. R. 1293. An act for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co.;

H. R. 5074. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Commit-

tee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6533. An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7695. An act to provide a 5-day week for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force; and

H. R. 8909. An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. TOBEY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I call up the amendments relating to the National Institutes of Health, offered by myself and a number of other Senators to the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The amendments offered by Mr. MAGNUSON, for himself, Mr. BENTON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. KERR, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCFARLAND, and Mr. LEAHY, were read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

On page 149, line 24, strike out "\$15,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$79,750,000."

On page 160, line 10, change the period to a colon and add the following: "Provided, That funds shall be transferred to the appropriations 'National Cancer Institute', 'Mental Health Activities', 'National Heart Institute', and 'Dental Health Activities' in the amounts of \$17,000,000, \$16,000,000, \$28,000,000, and \$3,000,000, respectively, and amounts so transferred shall be available for the objects specified herein under these heads and for grants for drawing plans, erection of build-

ings and acquisition of land therefor to provide facilities for research, and, with respect to dental health activities, for plans, specifications, construction and equipment of a research building and facilities for the National Institute of Dental Research."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator feel, inasmuch as we are about to start debate on these very important amendments, that there should be a quorum call?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will appreciate a quorum being called.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time taken by the quorum call to be charged to both sides, if that is agreeable.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is agreeable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Martin
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Hunt	Myers
Capehart	Ives	Neely
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kem	Russell
Darby	Kerr	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Leahy	Sparkman
Eaton	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Lodge	Taft
Ferguson	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McCarthy	Thye
George	McClellan	Tydings
Gillette	McFarland	Watkins
Graham	McKellar	Wherry
Green	McMahon	Wiley
Gurney	Magnuson	Williams
Hayden	Malone	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr.

TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in calling up the amendment relating to the National Institutes of Health, I do so of course with the full understanding that it seeks an increase for four categories of national health, namely, cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and dental care. It calls for an increase of \$64,000,000 in the amount provided by the committee for these four items. I fully appreciate the fact that in these days, with the background of war, the question of nonessential spending and essential spending becomes a very important matter for Congress to consider. Should I believe for one moment—and I am sure it can be said of the other sponsors of the amendment—that this amendment was in the category of nonessential spending I would not be so insistent on bringing the amendment to the floor. Careful perusal of the situation regarding national health, particularly these four great elements of national health, have convinced us that despite the fact that we are at war the subject falls into the category of the most essential type of spending. It is for that reason and for the specific reasons which we hope to set forth in the RECORD today, that we are asking for the increase and we hope to convince those who may not have had the facts at their disposal that this should be done.

The amendment, Mr. President, is sponsored by myself, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from

Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY]. Several other Senators, who had been apprised of the background of the facts concerning this very important problem, have come to the sponsors since the printing of the amendment and have likewise associated themselves with the amendment. Altogether, therefore, probably at least one-half of the membership of the Senate is actively in support of the amendment. That situation came about only after a considerable amount of deliberation and many conferences and communications from those who are prominent in the so-called research field of these four great subjects.

Mr. President, the proposed increase of \$64,000,000, of course, would be a part of the appropriation for the Public Health Service. We offer the amendment in order to accelerate the fight, at this vital time, against three of the greatest cripplers of our age—cancer, mental illness, and heart disease. The very important subject of dental care has been added in a smaller degree to the \$64,000,000 proposal. I know of nothing which has attracted the attention of the scientific world so much as these three subjects. Most of us have conferred, not on one but on many occasions, with the authorities in the fields of cancer, health, and mental disease.

It is the considered opinion of authorities in the health field that the appropriations now incorporated in the bill are not enough to carry out the intensive research needed to cut the enormous toll now exacted by these devastating crippers, which bear names that are bywords not only in the medical and scientific world of America, but in the average home.

The strongest pillar of our great democracy, in peace as well as in war, is the physical and mental health and well-being of our 150,000,000 citizens. In the effort to preserve the freedom and integrity of the peoples of the world against totalitarian domination, we must go into the battle with heads clear, hearts strong, and bodies unfettered by diseases which sap our strength and will to win. To achieve this, we must intensify our drive to ferret out the fifth columnist of disease before they are permitted to exact their deadly price. The Hoover Commission has pointed out the absolute need for a high level of continuing medical research in war and in peace.

Of course, the Hoover Commission's main objective was to economize and to cut such Federal spending as was possible, but in this one field they suggested that we not only continue the high level of last year, but that we intensify the fight against these three crippers of American health.

Mr. President, I am convinced that more money for research now will save this Nation millions of dollars in the years to come. To those who would pursue a penny-wise-and-pound-foolish policy, closing their eyes to the long-range gains of this program, I say, "You may not only lose your pennies, but the very heritage of democracy itself. Our best exhibit of our democratic experiment lies, not in talking about human welfare, but in continually practicing it."

Our relentless and humane fight to save thousands upon thousands of Americans every year from death at the hands of these chronic killers is the most accurate barometer I know of our real concept of human values. It is our firm answer to the totalitarianisms which hold that the individual is insignificant; particularly the weak and the sick.

Only last month the Committee on Economic Development, in its report on how to raise real wages, paid tremendous tribute to the work of medical research. In the last several generations medical research has increased our industrial output by vastly improving the health of our labor force. I wish to point out, Mr. President, that it is the basic strength of our industrial and farm production system, convertible to a smashing war machine, that is the bulwark of the Western World.

I should like to talk for a moment about the savings in medical care expenditures that arise from medical research.

Consider what has happened in the mortality rate and to costs of medical care of those suffering from infectious diseases, where the greatest strides in medical research have been made over the past decades. I quote these figures from the Hoover Commission report, to show what can be done by spending sufficient amounts of money for research, to show what it will save in the long run.

Diphtheria: 50,000 more people would have died in 1947 if the mortality rates of the year 1900 had not been cut through research. Medical care costs for this disease were cut from \$30,000,000 to \$600,000.

That indicates a saving of more than \$29,000,000, on an outlay for research involving probably not in excess of \$5,000,000, to be spent in industrial output.

Typhoid: 40,000 lives saved in 1947 as a result of the decline in typhoid mortality since 1900. The cost of the disease was cut from \$45,000,000 to \$800,000.

In that case there was a saving of more than \$44,000,000, with an outlay for research of less than \$5,000,000. The results in the treatment of these two diseases alone saved almost \$75,000,000 a year in either private expenditures or tax expenditures for medical care. This saving goes on year after year.

At this point I wish to state some facts which I think should be brought now to the attention of the United States Senate.

Cancer alone is the number two killer of our people. One out of every eight persons who died in 1947 died of cancer. Nineteen million thirty-eight thousand and five hundred persons now alive will die of cancer, unless new treatments and cures are found. I repeat that statement: More than 19,000,000—almost 20,000,000 of our people—will die of cancer unless new cures are developed as a result of further research.

One hundred eighty-nine thousand eight hundred and eleven persons died of cancer in 1947, or one out of every eight deaths.

In 1937 it was estimated that 930,000 persons were suffering from cancer and other tumors. There was an alarming

increase in the following 10 years. At least 555,000 persons are presently under treatment for cancer. Approximately 325,000 new cases of cancer are diagnosed each year. If the present alarming rate continues, one out of every five persons now alive in the United States will have cancer at some time.

Mr. President, I might even bring those figures home to the Senate in a very direct way, by saying that if we use that ratio, we find that there are 12 Members of the United States Senate who are going to have cancer, and there are eight Members of the United States Senate who have cancer and do not know it. That shows how alarming the situation is becoming and how important research is; and how necessary it is that research be supported in an adequate way.

Mr. President, much of the money we are requesting will be used for bricks and mortar, to provide the buildings which are necessary for the fine scientists and medical men who are engaging in the research. Today there are only 1,834 special cancer beds available in both private and public hospitals in the United States, for an estimated 555,000 patients under treatment for cancer.

One purpose of the amendment, of course, is to help by way of grants in aid to hospitals which specialize in cancer treatment. In contrast with the amount of assistance being given them, we find that 81,328 special beds are available for tuberculosis patients. Tuberculosis killed 48,064 persons in 1947, whereas cancer killed 188,811. We do not object to the provision of beds for tuberculosis patients, but I am calling attention to these figures to show the disparity between what is being done in the case of one great disease, which we have almost conquered now, because we have spent considerable money for research, and what is being done to combat this other great killer. Of course it is true that heart disease is the number one killer in the country.

Mr. President, in view of the alarming increase of cancer cases, there is need for a cancer clinic for at least every 100,000 persons of our population. Probably we cannot achieve that goal immediately, but certainly the funds requested by means of this amendment will go a long way toward meeting that need.

Let me present some other figures. Nearly four times as many persons died from cancer as died from tuberculosis in 1948. Nearly 330 times as many persons died from cancer in 1948 as died from infantile paralysis in the same year; yet we provide and spend approximately 10 times as much money in connection with infantile paralysis as we do in connection with cancer. Certainly I think we should provide adequate funds in both cases.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. Does the Senator from Washington know that during the past 24 hours cancer has killed more than twice as many persons in the United States as have been killed by our enemies in Korea since the 24th day of June?

Mr. President, in my opinion, it is unfortunate that all Senators are not present to hear the very important speech of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his observation. I can also state for the RECORD—and I hope Senators will read it; it is in connection with the suggestion the Senator from West Virginia has made—that nearly 2½ times as many persons died from cancer during World War II as were killed in the entire war in our Armed Forces.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. It cost the American people more than \$221,000,000 a day to fight that war against the Japanese and the Germans and the Fascists and their allies. During that war 273,000 American boys were killed by our enemies. Contemporaneously cancer killed 501,019 of the American people. During the entire war period, we appropriated for our war on cancer less than an eighth of 1 day's cost of carrying on the war against the Axis Powers.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his contribution. Of course, the more closely we examine the figures regarding the great fifth-column killers of the American people, from the point of view of health, the more startling the figures become. The same is true in the case of the statistics relating to the beds and other facilities available to take care of such patients.

Mr. President, I wish to say here that in the case of cancer, for instance, there is considerable feeling among the American people that cancer is something we cannot combat. However, the scientists and the medical men have many leads toward a solution of the problem. I look for it to be solved, for "the case to break," almost any time now; it would not surprise me to have the solution found very soon. There is now available a simple test by which to detect cancer in certain types of cases. However, most of the American people have the feeling that cancer is something like leprosy—in short, that it is a disease which cannot be cured, or that it is infectious or contagious. Mr. President, cancer is neither infectious nor contagious. It is merely a cell which has decided not to conform; and then it reproduces and forms other similar cells, and causes growths in the body, which wreck the health of the patient and finally kill him. Whenever the disease affects a patient's organs, is the most painful of all diseases, because of the pressure of the growth of the cancer cells.

For instance, there are cells in our eyes. For generation after generation those cells conform with the processes and the work of the cells pertaining to sight. In the same way, we have cells in our kidneys. Cancer is merely the situation which develops when one of the cells in the organs of the body or sometimes a cell on the surface of the skin decides not to do the work that the other cells have been doing. It goes wild, to use that term, and as it goes wild it re-

produces and causes destructive growths. I have held cancer in my hand, gobs of it. Dr. Little, in Bar Harbor, makes it, and he says if he wanted to develop it it would grow until it became as large as the Senate Chamber. That is all it is. It is not a contagious disease. It is not infectious. It is merely life itself. It is what the cell is.

Research in cancer goes completely into the realm of atomic energy, which also deals with life. We have gone a long way, and one of the real reasons why we have to deal with many scientists and medical people in this matter is because there is no one building, no one structure in which all the research can be conducted. The fellow at the University of Minnesota does one thing, the fellow at Columbia does another. Dr. Little, in Bar Harbor, does another. The correlation, through the National Cancer Institute, which, with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], I had the honor of helping to establish many years ago, when I was in the House and when he was in the Senate, is necessary in this field. The activities must all be correlated. When a cut is made—and I refer to a flat cut—in research work in heart disease, cancer, and mental illness, which is a newer field, taking scores of American lives, it is pretty hard to know which segment to cut out. It is somewhat like a centipede. If you determine to cut off 10 or 15 of its legs, you do not know just which leg you are going to cut off, because they are all correlated. As I shall later point out, in the next 10 years if this research can be continued adequately, the saving in monetary value as compared to the expenditure will amount to 20, 50, or perhaps 100 times over, let alone the saving in the lives of Americans.

That is why we propose this amendment. It is not to add new money. It is not to give too much for these projects. I remember last year we added a little too much to the appropriation for the Health Institute. The private agencies, such as the Cancer Society and the American Heart Institute met with us and said, "We have a program, and this is all the money we can use." So we cut out a great deal of the money which the House added to the bill. But this year, in meeting with these people, the Senators who are sponsoring this amendment having met both with the research people and representatives of the private agencies, we found that we had given too little to carry to this over-all program, and they are fearful that a cut might eliminate an important segment, which would result in their inability to continue the over-all research.

The Senator from West Virginia has presented some interesting figures as to costs, and, following his suggestion, I should like to refer to the inconsistency of voting billions of dollars for medical care, as we do in this country, and not paying enough attention, as we should, to medical research and training. I am not talking about health insurance or any of the proposed new legislation. I refer solely to the load carried because of groups entitled to medical care under existing legislation. I may mention the

medical-care load of the Veterans' Administration, alone. In the fiscal year of 1949 the taxpayers bore the cost of 17,000,000 patient-days for veterans with mental disorders. The cost was \$118,000,000, \$14,000,000 higher than in the fiscal year 1948. The Veterans' Administration tells me that the cost is steadily going up. In the case of the veterans alone, because we have had an utter and complete lack of research in mental disease insofar as the correlation of things that should be done, and stopping the thing when it begins, it is costing us millions of dollars more than it should.

I desire to refer to the Hoover Commission report. The Commission was looking for ways to economize in the Government. In this field it said, "Do not economize, because economy will only lead to greater costs in the future." I quote the Hoover Commission's task force report on Federal medical services:

In 1948, over 85 percent of the Federal medical expenditures * * * was for medical service—that is, the care of established disease among the Government's particular beneficiaries. Only * * * 3.9 percent was spent for research. * * * Increases in expenditure for medical care are outstripping relatively those for research. The reverse should be the case.

In the mental-health field alone, Federal expenditures would drop by at least \$12,000,000 a year if research could reduce the incidence of mental disorders by only 10 percent. We are asking for less than that for mental diseases. There is an example of the fact that if we could reduce the incidence of the disease by 10 percent, we would save the amount we are now asking for.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator from Washington knows that, of the total Federal health budget, 40 percent goes for medical care.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder, too, whether the Senator from Washington is aware of some of the reports made recently by the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force, on the matter of the care of mental patients and the rejection of men in the armed services, or their dismissal because of mental illness? I wrote the Secretary

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not have those figures, but I am sure the Senator from Minnesota will supply them in the course of this debate. But I do know, and the Senator from Minnesota, I am sure, is aware that the Veterans' Administration advises me that it is alarming the way mental diseases are increasing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. For example, in the Department of the Navy, of the total number of men rejected, 12,843 were rejected because of mental diseases. In the Department of the Air Force, 43,000 were rejected. Needless to say, in the Army, the figures were almost unbelievable. For example, the total number of rejections in the Army, which I shall

place in the RECORD, ran I think somewhere around 200,000 or 300,000, all of which indicates the tremendous waste of manpower and the tremendous cost, as the Veterans' Administration points out. Neuropsychiatric hospitals are the greatest need of the time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate that. Mr. LEHMAN rose.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I desire to yield to the Senator from New York, who has had great experience in this particular field, but before doing so, I want to repeat that the Hoover Commission which is looking into every nook and cranny of the Federal Government for ways of bringing about economy nevertheless says that "increases in expenditure for medical care are outstripping relatively those for research. The reverse should be the case."

Mr. President, listen to this: In the mental health field alone, Federal expenditures would drop by at least \$12,000,000 a year if research could reduce the incidence of mental disorders by only 10 percent.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator realizes that we have today less than 5 000 trained psychiatrists, whereas there is need for more than 15,000. I also wonder whether the Senator further realizes that in the State hospitals for the mentally ill alone, more than six times as many trained psychiatrists are needed than are now available.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know that those figures are correct. It is alarming when one digs into the situation.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I also wonder whether the Senator realizes that of the draftees who were examined in World War II, more than one-sixth were rejected because of psychoneurotic disorders.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate those figures. The Senator has had vast experience, as the able Governor of New York, with this problem. I have just quoted from the report of the Hoover Commission's task force on Federal medical services, but in this area the burden falls even more heavily on the States, which spend more than \$350,000,000 a year for the care of mental patients alone; and even \$350,000,000 is entirely inadequate, as the Senator knows.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should merely like to supplement the Senator's remarks regarding the Hoover Commission. I have a report from the Commission which states that by 1975, if research and training are not rapidly stepped up in the field of mental health, we shall need an additional 155,000 veterans' mental hospital beds instead of the present 45,000. Even more alarming is the fact that while 52 percent of the veterans' hospital beds are now used for mental cases—at this time the percentage of mental patients is 52—by 1975 the proportion will reach 75 percent of all patients. The cost of neuropsychiatric

veterans' hospitals will rise from \$125,000,000 a year, as at present, to \$375,000,000, by 1975, and—mark this—the cost of construction for the additional hospital beds to take care of sick people will amount to \$2,200,000,000 by 1975 on the basis of present prices. So it is possible to see that if we are only going to build beds for these patients, we are simply going to bankrupt ourselves to be able to take care of them. The need is for research and training, and for the facilities needed to correct this dread disease.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Federal Government itself under present laws spends well over \$3,000,000,000 for direct grants and care for these three diseases alone. The Hoover Commission and all recognized scientists and medical men agree that increased medical research expenditures will necessarily reduce the great Federal and State expenditures, which are now reaching a breaking point, to the extent that what we spend here will be worth 50 or 100 times more in years to come.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There have been plenty of examples of what research can do in the field of malaria, typhoid fever, tuberculosis, and diphtheria. All those diseases involve practically the same problems. By a concentration of effort and by the use of competent scientific personnel we have been able to reduce the costs tremendously, because we not only take care of the sick, but practice preventive medicine.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The care of the patients and the over-all strain on the national economy reduce manpower and productivity in connection with the other things we need.

Mr. President, I know we all recognize what these startling figures mean. The saving in industrial production alone has been worth 40 times over what has been expended in research in typhoid, resulting in the saving of lives. We know that medical research can save money and that it will produce results in the major critical diseases. The figures of current and projected medical care costs are not open to any argument. Increased medical research expenditures will reduce Federal and State expenditures. But, quite apart from the economy of the expanded medical research, we are faced with a basic decision as to how the nation's resources can best be deployed in these critical times. Of course, the Korean situation will not be resolved in a month or two. Does any Senator in this Chamber believe that Korea will be our last war effort? We must not be misled into ignoring the underlying well springs of our total national strength.

One of these fundamental sources of national strength is research, and high on the list is medical research.

Basic medical research is one factor of national security that should be immediately expanded. What we do now to train advanced medical research investigators, to provide them with adequate facilities and with adequate equipment, will determine our strength in medical research not only next year, but for the years ahead.

Here is what Dr. Vannevar Bush, the chief of our splendid wartime research organization and advocate of the National Science Foundation, has to say in his recent book, *Modern Arms and Free Men*:

For all its horror there were bright spots in the last war, and the brightest was the record of the medical men and those in the allied sciences who supported them. With sulfa drugs, penicillin, blood plasma, and advanced surgery, the mortality among the wounded was brought so low that the chances of survival of the wounded man who reached a front-line dressing station was extraordinarily high.

I may say, Mr. President, that the appropriation is even more important in that respect. Strangely enough, as to all other nations which either engaged with us in war or against us in war, when they draft men they are quite selective about it. No Russian scientist ever saw the front lines. As a matter of fact, the Russian scientists were given special treatment; they were placed on a pedestal, so to speak, and they were given extra rations, extra money, and extra privileges. But this Nation, typical of a democracy, drafted young men unless they were in the very advanced stages of medical school. A young man who might have had some scientific bent, or who intended to be a doctor, a research worker, or a psychiatrist, was taken in the draft like all the other boys. We were not going to make any exception for Johnny. The result was that for five long years we had a complete dearth of trained scientists and of trained basic research people.

At this time there is a great shortage of doctors and dentists in this country. There was a period of almost 7 years during which the output from American institutions of research experts and active practitioners of medicine was almost nil. So we have 7 years to catch up. I am told that in the great research fields, such as are occupied by du Pont and the General Electric Co., it is very difficult to find sufficient men who have been basically trained in research.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Agreeing with everything which the Senator from Washington has stated, as a practical proposition, following the statement he has just made of the difficulty in trying to get young men to take up research, and realizing the acuteness of the shortage of doctors even for war purposes, could we, as a practical proposition, go ahead now and get young men to engage in work in this field?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator's point entirely. My purpose in bringing it out was not that it would have the direct result of taking care of the lack in our national life, but if research work continues and we show successes, it will have a good result. It is a strange thing that young men will attend the college which has the best football team, or they will go into something which will attract their attention, as an adventure. Here is the greatest adven-

ture in modern history for a young man who is inclined to go into the research of cancer and of mental diseases.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am agreeing with every statement the Senator has made as to the absolute necessity of carrying on the program which the Senator has so ably described to the Senate this morning, but we have to be realistic about the matter. I want to help him as much as I possibly can, with the full responsibility as chairman of the subcommittee, but can we, as a practical proposition, persuade young men to go into this kind of work under the circumstances? I am asking the question in the best of faith.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I can answer that question, because I think we learned a lesson in World War II. Research men are vitally concerned with the matter, because there is this great barren field of 7 years which has, I think, influenced their thinking in connection with the very distasteful task of getting American boys into war. I think we shall watch that a little more carefully. If we have sufficient funds for research, if we have the place for research, boys will naturally want to be in that field. Many of them will want to be scientists.

I do not know that I have answered the Senator's question, but I have attempted to answer it.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. May I say a word in reply to my distinguished friend from New Mexico?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. The answer to the question of the Senator from New Mexico is that it will not be possible to induce young men and women to enter this field of activity until Congress makes it clear that not only in this year but next year and in the years to come there will be sufficient appropriations to pay them for devoting their entire time and energy to the great enterprise of reducing human suffering and saving human life.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. NEELY. The difficulty lies in the fact that there is no assurance that the Congress will provide sufficient funds to finance research for many years to come.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That was not the evidence submitted to the Committee on Appropriations. Over and over again the complaint was made—and in part this carries out the idea of the Senator from West Virginia—of the lack of facilities for these young men. There was evidence submitted to that effect. That is why an appropriation was requested for the purpose of constructing places so that the medical schools at the universities and the clinics throughout the country would have the facilities where young people could be trained. The question I had in mind and which I suggested to the Senator from Washington was a practical one.

If everything the Senator from West Virginia has stated is correct—and I will say it is correct—would nevertheless face the stern reality that no provisions of law exist at the moment under which it is possible to say that Jim Jones, for ex-

ample, at a certain State university, or Bill Smith, at another medical school, has the adaptability and the talent giving promise that he could do wonderful work in heart research. I am trying to get some information in order that I may be of some help. I want to be constructive. Basically I feel as do the Senator from Washington and the Senator from West Virginia. I know what it means. For the moment, however, I should like to know how we are to get young people to engage in this work.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to suggest that we must make a start.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We must make a start. For instance, the amendment would increase research projects on cancer. I have all the projects listed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If we cannot take care of the matter with what the committee has allowed, how are we to take care of additional projects?

Mr. MAGNUSON. For research projects we ask for an additional \$7,000,000. These projects are screened, as the Senator knows, and the screening process is really marvelous. Scientists and medical men give their services free on a revolving screening group, rotating their services at stated intervals. For example, I have before me a project at Columbia University.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is one in Utah also.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. These projects have been looked into. These are projects as to which scientists have said, "They appear to be worth while and we should go ahead with them." We are asking \$7,000,000 additional for those projects. For research fellowships the appropriation would have been \$250,000 extra, but I can appreciate the committee's holding that amount down because the National Science Foundation bill contains a medical research item. We are asking \$9,000,000 for construction of facilities. All these plans have been justified by lay organizations and the National Health Institute.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sure that every one of these projects is justified. I am sure that every one has merit. I am sure that everyone of them is necessary. Nevertheless, if those in charge of the program could not take care of the amount that was allowed by the committee, how are they going to take care of an additional amount?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have here the approved projects which would have to be cut out if the present proposed appropriation stands. This is on cancer alone. We also have some figures on mental disease. We are asking only for projects which the scientists, medical men, lay organizations, the Federal Government, the National Health Institute, and Dr. Scheele, the Surgeon General, have approved.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We had complete hearings on the subject. Not only did we have complete hearings, but we had sincere and unselfish people come before us who gave the most pathetic kind of testimony. I want the Senator from Washington to understand that we heard

all that evidence. We heard evidence given by fine, sympathetic people who are not interested in the selfish end of it at all. They came to us with tears in their eyes. We know what it means. We know the necessity. We know the dreadfulness of the disease of cancer. We know how it kills innocent and fine people. We know all that. However, I should like the Senator to make the record on what we can do as a practical matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have before me a list of pending construction-grant applications which have been approved. They range from California to Wisconsin. This comprises the whole list. In Massachusetts for example, the list shows the Beth Israel Hospital, Harvard University, and the Jewish Memorial Hospital.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, has the Senator read the hearings? He will find all that information in the hearings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. These are applications which were approved subsequent to the hearings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the list of pending construction-grant applications to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National Cancer Institute, Grants and Fellowships Branch, list of pending construction-grant applications as of Feb. 1, 1950

State and institution	CC grant No.	Amount of pending request	Individual contact	State and institution	CC grant No.	Amount of pending request	Individual contact
California:				New York—Continued			
University of Southern California	7011 (S)	\$550,000	Dr. B. O. Raulston.	Montefiore Hospital	7004	\$418,700	Dr. Daniel Lazzlo.
Stanford University	772 (RS)	400,000	L. R. Chandler.	Do	7005	373,700	Dr. H. M. Zimmerman.
Connecticut: Yale University		750,000	Dr. Geo. B. Darling.	Ohio:			
District of Columbia: George Washington University	7016 (S)	400,000	Dr. Walter A. Bloedorn.	Ohio State University	851 (S)	1,200,000	Dr. Chas. A. Doan.
Florida: Dade County Cancer Society		75,000	J. Gerald Lewis, president.	Western Reserve University	7010 (S)	350,000	Dr. J. T. Wearn.
Illinois:				Oregon:			
Loyola University (Stritch)	7008 (S)	255,000	Dr. John F. Sheehan.	University of Oregon Medical School	7013	900,000	Dr. Frank B. Queen.
Michael Reese Hospital	7022	542,000	Dr. Albert Temnenbaum.	Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh	7006 (S)	200,000	Dr. Wm. S. McElroy.
Indiana: Indiana University Medical Center	7018	485,920	Dr. Edwin A. Lawrence.	South Carolina: Medical College of the State of South Carolina	7017 (R)	250,000	Dr. Kenneth M. Lynch.
Iowa: State University of Iowa	7021	12,250	Dr. Titus C. Evans.	South Dakota: University of South Dakota School of Medicine	7019	120,000	Dr. Donald Slaughter.
Massachusetts:				Tennessee:			
Beth Israel Hospital	1022 (R)	100,000	Dr. C. F. Wilinsky.	Baroness Erlanger Hospital		250,000	Dr. S. S. Marchbanks.
Harvard University		300,000	Dr. James S. Simmons.	Vanderbilt University	7023	551,000	Dr. Howard J. Curtis.
Jewish Memorial Hospital	7020	182,500	Dr. F. Homburger.	Washington:			
Michigan: Wayne University	1033 (S)	465,000	Dr. David D. Henry.	University of Washington	7003	900,000	Dr. Stuart W. Lippincott.
North Carolina:				Northwest Cancer Foundation	7009	738,000	Dr. Simeon T. Cantril.
University of North Carolina	979	460,950	Dr. W. R. Berryhill.	Wisconsin: Marquette University School of Medicine	7007	300,000	Dr. John S. Hirschboeck.
Duke University	840 (S)	1,100,000	Dr. Wilburt C. Davison.				
New York:				Total		12,930,020	
Mount Sinai Hospital	7007	300,000	Dr. George Baehr.				

¹ Informal application.

(S) Requested over and above present active grant.

18 States and District of Columbia and 28 institutions represented.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask to have placed in the RECORD at this point a list of cancer research construction grants which have been approved since the beginning of the program.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cancer research construction grants, State and institution, approved since the beginning of the program (December 1947)

Alabama: Medical College of Alabama and the Jefferson County Health Department	\$47,280
California:	
University of California Medical School, San Francisco	1,000,000
University of California at Los Angeles	700,000
Los Angeles County Hospital	35,255
University of Southern California	200,000
Stanford University	100,000
Colorado: University of Colorado	400,000
Connecticut: Yale University	250,000
District of Columbia:	
George Washington University	250,000
Georgetown University Medical School	148,500
Georgia: Emory University	500,000
Illinois:	
University of Chicago	650,000
Loyola University—Stritch School of Medicine	200,000
Kansas: University of Kansas	200,000
Maine: Jackson Memorial Laboratory	350,000

Maryland: Johns Hopkins University	\$750,000
Massachusetts:	
Boston University School of Medicine	49,900
Massachusetts General Hospital	700,000
New England Deaconess Hospital	485,000
Tufts College Medical School	133,522
Michigan: Wayne University College of Medicine and Detroit Institute for Cancer Research	150,000
Minnesota: University of Minnesota	879,438
Missouri:	
Washington University	700,000
St. Louis University	625,000
New York:	
Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons	1,000,000
Memorial Center for Cancer and Allied Diseases	250,000
New York University—Bellevue Hospital	575,000
University of Rochester	434,368
North Carolina: Duke University	200,000
Ohio:	
Ohio State University	300,000
Western Reserve University and University Hospitals of Cleveland	300,000
Oklahoma: Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation	125,000
Oregon: University of Oregon Medical School	10,000
Pennsylvania:	
Institute for Cancer Research	198,463
University of Pennsylvania	276,203
University of Pittsburgh	200,000

South Carolina: Medical College of the State of South Carolina	\$16,000
Tennessee:	
Meharry Medical College	50,385
University of Tennessee	491,584
Texas: University of Texas	300,000
Utah: University of Utah School of Medicine	416,404
Virginia:	
Medical College of Virginia	10,588
University of Virginia School of Medicine	75,000
Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Medical School	975,000

Total of 25 States and the District of Columbia, 44 institutions..... 15,727,000

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of institutions which have expressed their intention to apply, showing the heads of the institutions involved. These institutions have gone through the preliminary screening of the so-called advisory committee.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE, GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS BRANCH, INSTITUTIONS WHICH HAVE EXPRESSED THEIR INTENTIONS TO APPLY AS OF FEBRUARY 1, 1950—STATE, INSTITUTION, AND INDIVIDUAL CONTACT

Alabama: Muscle Shoals Heart and Cancer Research Clinic, Mr. M. A. J. Phillips.
Arizona: Pima County Medical Society, Dr. L. Lindberg.
California: Cedars of Lebanon Hospital, College of Medical Evangelists, Mount Zion

Hospital, Dr. N. B. Friedman, Dr. W. F. Norwood; Dr. G. R. Biskind.

Florida: Florida State Board of Health, Dr. R. F. Sondag.

Illinois: Brokaw Hospital, Mr. L. F. Shepard.

Indiana: University of Notre Dame, Protestant Deaconess Hospital, R. H. Sweeney, C. S. C.; Mr. A. G. Hahn.

Louisiana: Louisiana State University, Tulane University of Louisiana, Dr. William W. Frye; Dr. M. E. Lapham.

Massachusetts: Children's Medical Center, Dr. Sidney Farber.

New York: Albany Medical College, Syracuse University, Dr. L. W. Gorham; Dr. Allan D. Bass.

North Carolina: Wake Forest College, Dr. C. C. Carpenter.

Pennsylvania: The American Oncologic Hospital, Mr. V. H. Frazier.

Tennessee: University of Tennessee, Dr. C. E. Brehm.

Texas: Baylor University, Dr. Warren T. Brown.

Vermont: The Mary Fletcher Hospital, the University of Vermont, L. E. Richwagon, Superintendent; Dr. W. E. Brown.

Virginia: The Memorial Hospital, Danville, Dr. T. J. Moran.

West Virginia: Alderson Broadbudd College, Dr. Joseph Peary.

San Juan, P. R.: San Juan City Hospital, Dr. Robert J. Jimenez Lopez.

Total of 16 States and 1 foreign country and 23 institutions represented.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to conclude my remarks and then I shall

be glad to yield the floor. We have further amendments which are to be discussed, and we are to vote at 2 o'clock.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only that, but the committee would like to have a little something to say, at least to complete the record and give the historical, factual background.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I also wish to place in the RECORD the effect of the amendment in its relation to cancer, mental health, heart, and mental health activities, together with the operating expenses of the National Cancer Institute, which are broken down in great detail, the mental health activities, which are also broken down in great detail, the figures on the National Heart Institute, and the figures on the dental health activities.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The effect of the amendment is as follows:

FOR CANCER ACTIVITIES

Increases the amount for grants for research projects by \$7,212,500.

Increases the amount for grants for research fellowships by \$250,000.

Adds \$9,000,000 for construction of research facilities.

Increases the amount for grants for training stipends by \$375,000.

Increases the amount for direct research by \$44,000.

Increases the amount for other direct activities by \$118,500.

FOR MENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

Increases the amount for grants for research projects by \$1,164,000.

Increases the amount for grants for research fellowships by \$50,000.

Increases the amount for grants for expansion of teaching of subjects relating to mental illness by \$2,991,000.

Increases the amount for grants for training stipends by \$910,000.

Adds \$8,000,000 for construction of research facilities.

Increases the amount for grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other preventive and control services by \$1,200,000.

Increases the amount for direct research by \$900,700.

Increases the amount for other direct activities by \$784,300.

FOR HEART ACTIVITIES

Increases the amount for grants for research projects by \$6,700,000.

Increases the amount for grants for research fellowships by \$1,000,000.

Adds \$18,000,000 for construction of research facilities.

Increases the amount for grants for expansion of teaching of medical subjects relating to heart diseases by \$800,000.

Increases the amount for grants for training stipends by \$500,000.

Increases the amount for grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other control activities by \$1,000,000.

FOR DENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

Adds \$1,100,000 for construction grants.
Adds \$1,900,000 for construction of intramural research facilities.

Operating expenses, National Cancer Institute, Public Health Service budget, 1951

Project	1950 comparable amount	Agency estimates, 1951	Bureau of Budget allowances, 1951	House bill, 1951	Senate committee report, 1951	Amendment, 1951
GRANTS						
1. Grants to medical and dental schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training:						
(a) Research projects.....	\$2,600,000	\$4,680,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$3,200,000	\$10,412,500
(b) Research fellowships.....	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	750,000
(c) Construction of research facilities:						
Obligational cash.....	0	9,000,000	0	0	0	9,000,000
Liquidating cash.....	4,175,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Contract authority.....	6,000,000	0	0	0	0	0
(d) Teaching of medical subjects:						
Obligational cash.....	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000
Contract authority.....	0	2,250,000	0	0	0	0
(e) Training stipends.....	375,000	375,000	375,000	375,000	375,000	750,000
2. Grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other control services.....	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
3. Grants for special control projects.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
DIRECT OPERATIONS						
1. Research.....	3,590,663	3,376,000	3,756,000	3,756,000	3,756,000	3,800,000
2. Other direct operations:						
(a) Technical assistance to States.....	392,388	428,000	422,000	422,000	422,000	475,000
(b) Review and approval of research and training grants.....	78,670	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000
(c) Administration.....	410,265	821,000	408,000	408,000	408,000	465,000
3. Pay increases.....	128,500	192,800	190,000	190,000	190,000	198,500
Total obligational cash.....	14,825,486	26,207,800	15,086,000	15,086,000	15,686,000	32,686,000
Total contract authority.....	6,000,000	2,250,000	0	0	0	0
Total obligational authority.....	20,825,486	28,457,800	15,086,000	15,086,000	15,686,000	32,686,000
Liquidating cash.....	4,175,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Grand total.....	25,000,486	33,457,800	20,086,000	20,086,000	20,686,000	37,686,000

Mental health activities, Public Health Service, 1951 budget

Project	1950 comparable amount	Agency estimates, 1951	Bureau of Budget allowances, 1951	House bill, 1951	Senate committee report, 1951	Amendment, 1951
GRANTS						
1. Grants to medical schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training:						
(a) Research projects:						
Obligational cash.....	\$450,000	\$1,825,000	\$724,000	\$724,000	\$780,000	\$1,944,000
Liquidating cash.....	344,000	376,000	376,000	376,000	376,000	376,000
Contract authority.....	650,000	0	0	0	0	0
(b) Research fellowships.....	100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	250,000

Mental health activities, Public Health Service, 1951 budget—Continued

Project	1950 comparable amount	Agency estimates, 1951	Bureau of Budget allowances, 1951	House bill, 1951	Senate committee report, 1951	Amendment, 1951
GRANTS—continued						
1. Grants to medical schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training—Continued						
(c) Expansion of teaching of subjects relating to mental illness:						
Obligational cash.....	\$1,544,500	\$3,251,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$3,291,000
Liquidating cash.....	406,000	1,999,000	1,999,000	1,999,000	1,999,000	1,999,000
Contract authority.....	1,500,000	809,000	0	0	0	0
(d) Training stipends.....	900,000	1,145,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,960,000
(e) Construction grants.....	0	0	0	0	0	8,000,000
2. Grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other preventive and control services.....	3,550,000	3,650,000	3,550,000	3,550,000	3,550,000	4,750,000
DIRECT OPERATIONS						
1. Research.....	319,350	933,700	599,300	599,300	599,300	1,500,000
2. Other direct operations:						
(a) Review and approval of research and training grants.....	134,284	152,900	152,500	152,500	152,500	220,000
(b) Training activities.....	224,644	224,000	232,400	232,400	232,400	700,000
(c) Technical assistance to States.....	358,140	386,100	385,200	385,200	385,200	500,000
(d) Administration.....	212,472	328,300	295,900	295,900	295,900	360,000
3. Pay increases.....	55,500	85,470	79,700	79,700	79,700	150,000
Total obligational cash.....	7,848,890	12,181,470	7,569,000	7,569,000	7,625,000	23,625,000
Total contract authority.....	2,150,000	809,000	0	0	0	0
Total obligational authority.....	9,998,890	12,990,470	7,569,000	7,569,000	7,625,000	23,625,000
Total liquidating cash.....	750,000	2,375,000	2,375,000	2,375,000	2,375,000	2,375,000
Grand total.....	10,748,890	15,365,470	9,944,000	9,944,000	10,000,000	26,000,000

Operating expenses, National Heart Institute, Public Health Service, 1951 budget

Project	1950 comparable amount	Agency estimates, 1951	Bureau of Budget allowances, 1951	House bill, 1951	Senate committee report, 1951	Amendment, 1951
GRANTS						
1. Grants to medical schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training:						
(a) Research projects.....	\$3,820,000	\$7,416,000	\$3,820,000	\$3,820,000	\$4,420,000	\$11,120,000
(b) Research fellowships.....	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	1,300,000
(c) Construction of research facilities:						
Obligational cash.....	1,600,000	8,000,000	0	0	0	18,000,000
Liquidating cash.....	0	4,309,000	4,459,000	4,459,000	4,459,000	4,459,000
Contract authority.....	4,459,000	10,000,000	0	0	0	0
(d) Expansion of teaching of medical subjects relating to heart diseases:						
Obligational cash.....	741,000	420,000	0	0	0	800,000
Liquidating cash.....	0	741,000	741,000	741,000	741,000	741,000
Contract authority.....	741,000	1,161,000	0	0	0	0
(e) Training stipends:						
Obligational cash.....	150,000	150,000	0	0	0	500,000
Liquidating cash.....	0	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Contract authority.....	150,000	0	0	0	0	0
2. Grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other control activities.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	3,000,000
DIRECT OPERATIONS						
1. Research.....	1,407,939	2,010,000	1,830,354	1,830,354	1,830,354	1,830,354
2. Other direct operations:						
(a) Review and approval of research and training grants.....	67,846	72,407	72,407	72,407	72,407	72,407
(b) Technical assistance to States.....	437,000	445,000	445,000	445,000	445,000	445,000
(c) Administration.....	219,715	401,593	221,239	221,239	221,239	221,239
(d) Pay increases.....	68,000	122,600	111,000	111,000	111,000	111,000
Total obligational cash.....	10,811,500	21,337,600	8,800,000	8,800,000	9,400,000	37,400,000
Total contract authority.....	5,350,000	11,161,000	0	0	0	0
Total obligational authority.....	16,161,500	32,498,600	8,800,000	8,800,000	9,400,000	37,400,000
Liquidating cash.....	0	5,200,000	5,350,000	5,350,000	5,350,000	5,350,000
Grand total.....	16,161,500	37,698,600	14,150,000	14,150,000	14,750,000	42,750,000

Dental health activities, Public Health Service, 1951 budget

Project	1950 comparable amount	Agency estimates, 1951	Bureau of Budget allowances, 1951	House bill, 1951	Senate committee report, 1951	Amendments, 1951
GRANTS						
1. Grants to dental schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training:						
(a) Research projects.....	\$200,000	\$810,000	\$250,000	\$225,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
(b) Research fellowships.....	35,000	130,000	75,000	50,000	75,000	75,000
(c) Traineeships.....	0	100,000	0	0	0	0
(d) Construction grants.....	0	0	0	0	0	1,100,000
DIRECT OPERATIONS						
1. Research.....	227,700	329,225	329,225	280,570	329,225	329,225
2. Construction of research facilities.....	100,000	1,900,000	0	0	0	1,900,000
3. Other direct operations:						
(a) Review and approval of research and training grants.....	14,900	15,225	15,225	15,225	15,225	15,225
(b) Technical assistance to States.....	1,241,600	1,284,000	1,214,000	1,214,000	1,214,000	1,214,000
(c) Coordination and development of dental resources.....	77,500	150,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000
(d) Administration.....	47,300	51,550	51,550	51,550	51,550	51,550
4. Pay increases.....	64,000	99,030	90,000	88,655	90,000	90,000
Total.....	2,008,000	4,869,030	2,140,000	2,040,000	2,140,000	5,140,000

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remainder of Mr. MAGNUSON's address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

These medical advances, it should be borne in mind, were the fruit of long-time, obscure, basic research done in prewar years. Sir Alexander Fleming first noticed the antibiotic effect of penicillin in 1929. He was not looking for anything to kill germs effectively. He was a fungus expert—a mycologist—studying obscure mold growths.

We must support the Flemings now at work on basic medical research in this country.

We are fortunate in that the results of medical research are applicable both to protection of the population against such diseases as cancer, heart disease, and mental health and to defense measures. Basic studies of human reactions are applicable to the problems of individuals and to mass reactions, such as mass panic. Basic studies of the action of ionizing radiation upon cells are applicable to cancer research and to protection against atomic-bomb radiation. Basic studies of the transfer of liquid across body membranes are applicable to heart disease and to treatment of burns. Basic studies of the nutritional requirements of bacteria and other micro-organisms are applicable both to protection against bacteriological warfare and to protection against venereal disease, tuberculosis, tropical diseases, and other diseases that affect persons in civilian life.

More important, the specific investigations needed for specific military medical purposes cannot be effective unless they stem from accelerated basic research.

The medical research programs now under way in the Nation's laboratories and hospitals, with the aid of Federal funds distributed through the National Institutes of Health, are the vehicles for pressing ahead on a national medical research effort.

There is another most significant reason for a stepped-up medical research effort. Fully half of the medical research carried on by all medical schools of the Nation is done by 10 institutions. That is no criticism of them, but the fact remains that we have a militarily vulnerable medical research organization.

We need more new medical research facilities to give us a strong regional research structure for peace. We have a strong obligation to disperse this structure. Compared with industrial installations, medical research facilities are cheap. This part of the economy can and should be diversified, both for scientific productivity and for national defense. But to do a bold and effective job far more is needed than the Committee on Appropriations approved for this purpose.

Research is uniquely tied to the capabilities of individuals. All the facilities—all the equipment—are useless without highly trained manpower. Adequate training facilities and adequate fellowships for the most able are critically important to the maintenance of a strong national medical research effort. The demands for trained medical research men will grow heavier over the next few years. To produce these men in time we must start training them now.

In calling for increased Federal support for medical research, I do not propose that private sources of support be squeezed out. It is vitally important that the support for research be diversified. The major private health organizations of the Nation support expanded Federal aid to medical research. Their goals—prevention and control of specific diseases and groups of diseases—are

aided by Federal support for research in non-Federal institutions.

All that I have said can be summarized quickly—expanded medical research is the means of cutting Federal expenditures; expanded medical research is essential to the protection of the Nation.

We have been faced recently with depressing examples of critical shortages due to lack of foresight, and to errors of judgment traceable to defective intelligence.

Why should we, when the logic is so clear and when advice from the best qualified sources is unanimous, make a mistake by failing to expand medical research?

Need we, with our eyes open, invite a scientific Pearl Harbor when the other course of action is clear?

If we are to have peace, failure to expand medical research now will prove to be wasteful and cruel.

If we have war, failure to expand medical research now will prove to be a blunder that will weigh heavily upon the conscience of all of us, and heavily on our national budget also.

I propose that the appropriation of the National Institutes of Health of the Public Health Service be increased from the \$15,750,000 proposed by the Appropriations Committee to \$79,750,000. I further propose that this increase of \$64,000,000 be allocated by the National Institutes of Health as follows: \$17,000,000 to the National Cancer Institute; \$16,000,000 to the National Institute of Mental Health; \$28,000,000 to the National Heart Institute; and \$3,000,000 to the National Institute of Dental Research.

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

Mr. President, up to this point in my remarks I have been presenting the general argument for the amendment. For the next few minutes I want to speak specifically on the \$17,000,000 increase we are requesting for the National Cancer Institute.

First, let me explain the composition of the \$17,000,000 increase; \$7,212,500 is to finance additional grant for research projects; \$250,000 is for additional research fellowships; \$9,000,000 is for construction of research facilities—the committee recommendation contains no funds for construction; \$375,000 is for grants for training stipends; \$44,000

is for direct research; and \$118,500 for other activities worked on directly by the Cancer Institute itself.

Most of my colleagues know the pioneering I have done in the cancer field and my continued interest in the program. Most of you have supported appropriations for the National Cancer Institute. Your action, my action, is based on the conviction that medical research can lick this disease.

In 1948, 197,000 Americans died of cancer and other malignant tumors. Cancer is the No. 2 killer of the Nation.

In addition to those who died in 1948, 930,000 citizens suffered from cancer. The National Cancer Institute, exclusive of construction funds, was able to spend only \$32.48 per death to finance research against this killer.

In 1948 we appropriated \$73,860,000 for research in control and cure of plant and animal diseases. Of this amount \$46,000,000 was appropriated to finance the campaign in Mexico for control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

We appropriated less than \$20,000,000 for cancer research. Apparently we were willing to spend over twice as much for research on cattle as for research on human beings.

Unless the appropriation for the National Cancer Institute is increased, applications totaling approximately \$13,000,000 for construction alone, from 18 States and the District of Columbia—applications representing 28 institutions will have to be rejected. This list includes two from my own State.

The University of Washington, with its newly established medical school has applied for a \$900,000 grant. The Northwest Cancer Institute, under the able direction of Mr. Simeon T. Cantril, has requested \$738,000 to get its project under way. Neither of these sums can be granted unless the appropriation for cancer research is increased.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a list showing cancer research construction grants awarded since December 1947, a list of pending construction grant applications and a list of institutions by States which have expressed their intention to apply for construction funds.

I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment we have offered.

Appropriations fact sheet (National Health Institutes amendment)

	1950 comparable amount	1951 House bill	1951 Senate bill	1951 citizens committee ¹
National Cancer Institute.....	\$25,000,486	\$20,086,000	\$20,686,000	\$37,686
Mental health activities.....	10,748,890	9,944,000	10,000,000	26,000
National Heart Institute.....	16,161,500	14,150,000	14,750,000	42,750
Dental health activities.....	2,008,000	2,040,000	2,140,000	5,140

¹ This committee is composed of outstanding citizens who have seen the need for and the benefits emanating from medical research. Last year the Senate voted the funds recommended by this committee.

This year's amendment follows the same pattern

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a copy of a letter and enclosure which I sent to Senators today under the signature of myself and that of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] on the tax-saving feature of the proposed amendment.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
July 17, 1950.

DEAR SENATOR: Many Senators believe that the appropriations for National Cancer Institute, Mental Health Activities, National Heart Institute, and Dental Health Activities

recommended by the Senate committee, in the omnibus bill, are inadequate—are insufficient to insure the volume and quality of research contemplated by the Congress when authorizing legislation was enacted. Last Friday 14 of us introduced an amendment to rectify this situation. We anticipate others will join us as cosponsors before the amendment is called up this week.

Medical and biological research bear a direct relationship to national security. The men we train, the research we perform, the facilities we construct under the cancer, mental health, heart, and dental health programs will be as indispensable in event of another world conflict as they are to the physical and mental well-being of our people in peacetime.

The economic effect of chronic disease, with prolonged illness, upon the homes of the Nation is devastating. Through research

our national-health bill can be reduced; the health of the Nation increased. Many of the contagious diseases most feared 25 years ago have been conquered.

The Nation's great killers—cancer and heart—and mental illness continue to fill our institutions. The individuals and homes afflicted speak out for adequately financed cancer, heart, mental, and dental research programs.

We invite your support and respectfully direct your attention to the enclosures.

Best personal regards,

Sincerely,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate.

FACTS ON THE MAGNUSON AMENDMENT—TAX SAVINGS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

I. What the amendment does:

Expands basic medical research, the training of medical research scientists, and the construction of medical research facilities in non-Federal hospitals, medical schools, and universities by \$64,000,000 * * * for the immediate purpose of reducing the tax cost of medical care and providing a strong medical and research structure for defense.

II. Why the amendment is proposed:

(a) To cut Federal and State medical care expenditure.

Medical research is the only means of reducing the growing Federal burden of medical care costs, which now exceed \$1,000,000,000 per year.

A 10 percent reduction in Federal and State mental health expenditures alone by re-

search would save \$45,000,000 per year in taxes.

(b) To strengthen national defense.

Medical research on a vast scale will be required in the event of war—

To protect us against bacteriological warfare.

To provide effective burn and radiation medical measures.

To combat tropical diseases.

To deal with physical problems of high-speed, high-altitude flight.

Medical research must be done, facilities built, and medical scientists trained before the emergency hits.

The Nation's medical research plant is inadequate.

The Nation has too few medical scientists.

The Nation's medical research structure is too concentrated (half of all medical school research is done in 10 institutions).

Medical research is defense research.

Cancer radiation research is atomic bomb casualty research.

Heart research on fluid balance in the body is burn casualty research.

Basic research on the endocrine system is research on stress in battle.

Mental health research on mass hysteria is research on war panic.

Basic research on microbes and viruses is research on bacteriological warfare protection.

Training medical research scientists now provides a backlog of trained people for war research.

Appropriations fact sheet (National Health Institutes amendment)

	1950 comparable amount	1951 House bill	1951 Senate bill	1951 citizens committee ¹
National Cancer Institute.....	\$25,000,486	\$20,086,000	\$20,686,000	\$37,686,000
Mental health activities.....	10,748,890	9,944,000	10,000,000	26,000,000
National Heart Institute.....	16,161,500	14,150,000	14,750,000	42,750,000
Dental health activities.....	2,008,000	2,040,000	2,140,000	5,140,000

¹ This committee is composed of outstanding citizens who have seen the need for and the benefits emanating from medical research. Last year the Senate voted the funds recommended by this committee. This year's amendment follows the same pattern.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The report of the Senate Appropriations Committee, page 72, states that there is allowed an increase of \$11,000,000 in the National Institutes of Health, including the cancer, heart, and mental health activities.

While it is true that the actual cash appropriated for these institutes shows an increase of approximately \$11,000,000, an analysis of the items indicates that there is an effective decrease of approximately \$12,000,000 in obligations authorized.

Mr. President, I ask that the remainder of the statement and the attached tabulation be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and tabulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This reduction of \$12,000,000 in obligations authorized is brought about by the cash necessary to liquidate obligations incurred in prior years and the contract authority granted in the 1950 appropriation, principally for construction grants, which is not continued in the 1951 appropriation bill. In summary, the comparison between 1950 and 1951 is as follows:

	1950	1951
Cash appropriations.....	\$52,156,013	\$63,326,000
Deduct cash necessary to liquidate prior year obligations....	4,925,000	12,725,000
Net cash available.....	47,231,013	50,601,000
Contract authority.....	15,425,000	
Net amount available for obligations.....	62,656,013	50,601,000

The above summary includes appropriations for the national institutes of health, National Cancer Institute, National Institute of Mental Health, National Heart Institute, dental-health activities, and \$100,000 appropriated in 1950 for plans and specifications for a building for the National Institute of Dental Research.

Statement comparing 1950 National Institutes of Health appropriations with 1951 allowances by Senate Appropriations Committee

	1950 comparable appropriations	1951 Senate bill
Cash appropriation:		
National Institutes of Health.....	\$11,737,137	\$15,750,000
National Cancer Institute.....	19,000,486	20,686,000
Mental health activities.....	8,598,890	10,000,000
National heart activities.....	10,811,500	14,750,000
Dental health activities.....	2,008,000	2,140,000
Total cash appropriations.....	52,156,013	63,326,000

Statement comparing 1950 National Institutes of Health appropriations with 1951 allowances by Senate Appropriations Committee—Continued

	1950 comparable appropriations	1951 Senate bill
Deduct cash required to liquidate prior year obligations:		
National Institutes of Health.....		\$5,000,000
National Cancer Institute.....	\$4,175,000	5,000,000
Mental health activities.....	750,000	2,375,000
National Heart Institute.....		5,350,000
Dental health activities.....		
Total liquidating cash.....	4,925,000	12,725,000
Net cash available for obligating.....	47,231,013	50,601,000
Contract authority:		
National Institutes of Health.....	1,925,000	
National Cancer Institute.....	6,000,000	
Mental health activities.....	2,150,000	
National Heart Institute.....	5,350,000	
Dental health activities.....		
Total contract authority.....	15,425,000	
Total available for obligating.....	62,656,013	50,601,000

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there is no question in my mind, as I stated in the beginning, that those of us who sponsored this amendment did so with the full realization that we must cut down what we call nonessential expenditures. We had many discussions with those engaged in the great worth of research into national health problems, an activity which might have the effect of saving more lives in one month, if it can be adequately developed, than are lost in a war in a whole year, even in great World War II. After consultation with those people we have come to the conclusion, and a very serious conclusion, that what is proposed is in the category of something which must be done not only for the health of the Nation, but for the defense of the Nation.

As I pointed out, it is going to save money for the Federal Government. The Hoover report says, "Go ahead and do more along this line," and it is estimated that an increase of research by even 10 percent would save as much money as we are now spending for the whole research program.

The cost of medical care to the Federal Government and the State governments runs into billions of dollars. The records show the great increase in the effectiveness of research in the three diseases the appropriation covers. So I say it is penny-wise and pound-foolish for us not to go ahead with this program in an adequate way.

The need has been carefully pointed out by the American Cancer Society, the Heart Institute, and by doctors. I have many letters from great research organizations pointing out that the sums we ask to have added can be used very efficiently on projects which are now either under way or projects which have been approved in the great research that is being undertaken.

I point out again that last year the House appropriated a great deal of money for cancer research. We had a meeting with all the same people who appeared before the House committee, and cut out much of the money in the

Senate, because it was said, "We cannot effectively spend that amount." But this year the reverse is true.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will yield in a moment. Furthermore, there is the expense of fellowships, and construction grants, for which we are asking appropriations. We found that in Columbia University there was a fine project under way, but there was no building in which to house it, and for a very small amount an additional story can be built on top of one of the buildings now there.

What happens in research is that one man does one thing at one place, and another conducts research along another line at another place, and there is another at some third place. Those activities are all correlated, and it was felt that any cut like that proposed would slow up the whole program. That is why we are asking for the amount we have stated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator yield now?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe the Senator made the point which I have been trying to make all morning. He stated that last year it was said, "We cut it out because we were not in position to handle it."

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In my opinion that is the basic point the Senate should consider today; can we use the appropriation if the extra money is given?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is the best opinion of all the great organizations, and the great men involved in this worthy enterprise, that we can. We did not set this amount of \$64,000,000. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] knows that, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] knows it. It was a figure set by those in charge of the research movement, those who said, "We can effectively spend it, and we think the return from this extra amount will be great." I would not know how to arrive at a figure, and I do not think any other Senator would. We are not in charge of these developments. It was the American Heart Institute, the American Cancer Society, the National Health Institute, and those informed as to the necessities, who fixed the figure. I have letters from the presidents of at least 46 universities in which projects are either now being processed, or, if they have no projects ready to go, in which projects have been approved, and these men say that they agree on this over-all amount.

As I have said, we ourselves did not set the figure. We would not know how to arrive at it. These organizations and men think they can use effectively the appropriation provided by the amendment, but they are afraid that with the amount now in the bill certain segments of the work would be cut out, and the whole program might bog down.

Mr. President, I shall yield the floor now. I know several others Senators want time, and I shall be glad to yield 15 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield time to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New York, unless the Senator from New Mexico desires to speak at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has just yielded to the Senator from New York 15 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not know the Senator from New Mexico wanted to speak.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall get some time from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LEHMAN. I doubt if I shall speak more than 10 minutes, certainly not more than 15.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Washington and others dealing with funds for research in cancer, heart disease, and mental hygiene.

I consider the proposed expenditure a defense expenditure, a measure which will help in our defense during the years that lie immediately ahead of us, and in our defense and security over the years ahead.

I am interested in all matters relating to the health, and therefore the welfare, of our people, but I am perhaps more familiar with the problems of mental hygiene than with any other. As Governor of New York, I devoted much time and thought to the problems of the unfortunate men, women, and children suffering from mental diseases. I had the opportunity, during the 10 years I was Governor, to visit frequently each one of our great State hospitals. In that way I was able to observe the care that was given to the patients, the custodial responsibilities of the State, the research work that was being carried on, and the amount of study and thought that was being given to this great problem.

Mr. President, I feel that people generally do not realize the size and the social and economic implications of this problem. I wonder whether people generally know that today 8,500,000 persons in the United States suffer from mental disorders. The impact of this fact on the social and economic life of the Nation is almost unimaginable; certainly it is not possible to overestimate the importance of it.

I wonder whether the Members of the Senate, and the people generally, know that from 30 to 40 percent of all patients seen by doctors have complaints which are due to emotional disorders. I wonder if they know that more than 50 percent of the Veterans' Administration hospital patients are psychiatric cases. I wonder if they have given thought to the fact that the nonhospitalized mentally ill are a very important factor in crime, delinquency, and other social problems.

Figures have been given by the distinguished Senator from Washington which were contained in the Hoover re-

port, showing that the cost of the maintenance of State hospitals was approximately \$350,000,000. That is a staggering figure, but if it errs, I think it errs on the conservative side. In New York State alone in the institutions conducted by the State, there are 115,000 mentally ill patients. One hundred and seven million dollars is provided in the budget of the State of New York for maintenance of the mental hygiene department. Of this, \$88,000,000 is merely for the upkeep of State institutions. I point out that the amount contained in the State budget for the mental hygiene department, \$107,000,000, represents more than one-third of the entire administrative budget of the State for all purposes.

In addition to that the State of New York alone has upward of \$500,000,000 invested in these institutions. I stated that there were 115,000 mentally ill patients in the institutions, but there are several times that number who are not hospitalized, or hospitalized in private institutions. Just think of the vastness of that number—from 300,000 to 400,000 mentally ill patients in the State of New York alone. And that is the number in only one State of the Union, even though, of course, it is the largest and has the greatest population.

Our State has sought to do its duty by the mentally ill. New York has recognized its responsibility. But in my opinion the State cannot do more than it is doing now even though there is great wealth in the Empire State.

The State—and I speak now of New York, but I have no doubt the same situation obtains in other States of the Union—is, I believe, giving good custodial care, but I want to point out that relatively little progress had been made until the past few years either in the prevention of mental disease or the cure of mentally-ill patients. And even now, the progress in research work carried on in the State of New York—and I am sure my remarks will carry the same weight in respect to every other State—is very slow and relatively insignificant.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The matter the Senator is now discussing is in my opinion of extreme importance. As a matter of fact, there is not an item which is being discussed in connection with the amendment of the Senator from Washington which is more worthy of consideration by this body than that of mental hygiene research. We owe a greater responsibility to the mentally ill, or those who are likely to become mentally ill, than we do to a man who can take care of and protect himself. I believe our duty in such cases is even greater than in other cases. I am glad the Senator from New York is discussing the subject.

Mr. LEHMAN. I realize, of course, that the Senator from New Mexico has the deepest sympathy for those who are in such unhappy condition, and has the greatest interest in the problem involved, and desires to help in every way possible. There is no question in my mind

about that at all. But the Senator from New Mexico a few moments ago raised the question as to how we will obtain the human material to carry on this work.

Let me point out to the Senator from New Mexico that at the outbreak of World War II, as he knows, there was a great shortage of nurses. It seemed almost impossible to recruit or train a sufficient number to care for the needy. Then, through action by the Congress of the United States, and the President and with the enthusiastic support of the people of the country, funds were made available to the Public Health Service for the recruitment and the training of volunteer nurses. During the course of the war we trained—I do not have the exact figures, but my recollection is—somewhere between fifty and one hundred thousand nurses. Even that number did not take care of all our needs. But it certainly helped not only during the war years but during the years since the war.

Furthermore, I may say that there are a great number of individuals who wait today to be trained for the medical profession, in surgery, internal medicine, or psychiatry. I can testify to the fact that I have tried to have placed in good medical schools scores and scores of well-qualified young men and women who could not be accepted, merely because there was a lack of facilities, both of space and of teachers. Those individuals are anxious to be trained. They are anxious to take up the medical profession and to accept their responsibilities in the field of research.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I recall to the Senator from New Mexico, and I know he remembers it as vividly as I do, that several years ago the Senator from New Mexico and I watched a pitiful procession of young men from the State of New Mexico and surrounding territory, who appeared before us as members of a subcommittee to voice their complaints. In many cases the real complaint was that the Government was not doing the job in the veterans' hospital in Albuquerque in regard to mental disorders. They were all men who had been incarcerated by the Japanese for many months, and who had suffered from malnutrition. Many of them were cases who needed help. Had we had the right kind of research at the inception of their treatment, that is, immediately after they were brought back to the United States, they having fought and suffered at Bataan, the Senator and I would not have had to sit and watch that pitiful parade go by.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from New York yield before he proceeds any further?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, like every other normal human being, I am intensely interested in seeing that everything possible is done to mitigate the ravages of the four diseases in question, which have been so hurtful to our people. There is nothing in the world I would not be willing to do if we would have a rea-

sonable chance of helping those suffering from such diseases, and diminishing the number of those who are suffering from the diseases. But if not enough help has been rendered, simply because we have not appropriated sufficient money, how does the Senator explain that those who came before our committee and testified, and received appropriations for research and treatment of the diseases, have \$780,206 of the present year's appropriation which they have not spent and will not spend?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I can explain that.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Washington for that purpose.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is because of the fact that the projects which must be set up are very complex. The National Health Institute tells me that the panel of advisory scientists and doctors had not approved all these items, and that last year there was very slow progress in approval being made of the items because sufficient personnel was not available. But I have placed in the RECORD, I will say to the Senator from Tennessee, all the items that have been approved.

Mr. McKELLAR. I heard them read a while ago.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; that was what they told us. I have no personal knowledge of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The officials referred to by the Senator came before our committee, and they made no such request as is now being made. Our committee went even further than those who have the matter in charge in the department asked us to go. Those who have the matter in charge came before us and asked us for \$46,320,000 in connection with the four diseases which represent the large requests, and the committee gave them \$1,500,000 more than that. Those who are going to spend the money for research and other purposes came before our committee and told us what they wanted. The committee gave them what they wanted and gave them more than they asked for. In order to be on the safe side we added another million and a half dollars.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I can answer the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are not asking for the amount now suggested. They are asking for the budget estimate. The committee has gone beyond the budget estimate.

I do not believe any Senator has a greater desire than I have to help do away with cancer, mental diseases, heart troubles, and diseases of all kinds. If it can be guaranteed that the money can be spent in such a way as to bring even to partial health those who are suffering, I should be glad to accede to the request now being made. But we have no such guaranty. Under the Senator's amendment we would add \$64,000,000 more than the Department has asked, that much more than it says it can possibly spend for the purpose.

They admit they did not spend what we appropriated for them last year. If that be the case, although we have the greatest sympathy for their work—and heaven knows we should have sympathy

for anyone who has any of these four diseases—inasmuch as the same agency which is going to handle the money we now appropriate in this connection has not been able to spend what we appropriated for it heretofore, I do not see the need for adopting the Senator's proposal.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think I can answer the Senator.

When the representatives of the Public Health Service appeared before the subcommittee, they were limited by what the budget had approved. The budget hearings were held many months ago.

In the meantime, various new projects were being established, and some of them are still in the process of being established. I know that in my own university, work has been continuing on a project for approximately 6 months, and it has just now been set up. That project had been approved, but only now has it been set up. When the budget hearings were held, the representatives of the Public Health Service thought that money was available for those purposes. All these other projects have since come along; but at the hearings before the subcommittee, the representatives of the Public Health Service were limited by the estimates the budget had approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield five more minutes to the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has only 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate that other Senators wish to speak; therefore, I shall conclude my remarks.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, when the Senator finishes I shall yield some of the time available to me to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who has had charge of this portion of the bill as chairman of the subcommittee, and has done such wonderful work in developing the facts and making research in that connection. He has the greatest sympathy, as I have and as every other member of the committee has, for such matters; and we wish to do everything in the world we can do for those who are in trouble because of the incidence of the diseases which have been mentioned.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I realize that, and I am very grateful to the Senator from Washington and to the Senator from New Mexico for permitting me to continue.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall later yield 20 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in the meantime I yield an additional 4 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 4 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in New York aside from the work of the State Psychiatric Institute and some work done in private hospitals, little progress has been made other than by means of the work done through grants made by

the National Institute of Mental Health, of the Public Health Service.

Like other States, New York has benefited greatly in its mental-health program from the annual grants of the National Institute of Mental Health. Like other States, we in New York have augmented those grants for preventive work by means of appropriations made by our State legislature. However, now we find that the funds which thus far have been made available are completely inadequate.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that in addition to what the State of New York is doing, many of the private hospitals are seeking to be helpful. One great hospital in New York, with which I have long been connected, has set up a psychiatric clinic. Psychiatrists work directly in the wards of the hospital, in consultation with the doctors who are treating the physical ailments of the patients in question. Those psychiatrists interview patients and seek to help the patients who are in the hospital because of physical disorders. It has been found that this service is of the greatest assistance in the treatment and cure of patients hospitalized for physical ailments.

The same system is now being instituted in a great many other hospitals in New York. They are eager to increase that service, and are convinced that it will do a tremendous amount of good.

I wish to point out that in the field of mental health, some of the patients suffer indescribable agony. Some of the patients have been in the State hospitals upward of 40 years, and they have no hope or chance for improvement. Yet through the help which has come by means of research, even though it has been conducted on a very limited scale, many of the patients have been improved or completely cured through psychiatric treatment or by physical or chemical treatment, such as insulin injections, electric shock treatments, heat treatments, and similar procedures.

What we need beyond everything else in connection with mental hygiene—although of course my remarks pertain to all the other various medical activities—is more research. The amount of money which has been available and which can be made available for research by the States and by private charities has been completely inadequate. It cannot be increased to any great extent. Federal grants, for which we now are asking, are the only answer.

As I have said before, Mr. President, more trained personnel are needed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair inquire how much time the Senator from Tennessee yielded to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Tennessee has gone to lunch, but he asked me to take time out of his time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the Senator from New Mexico is recognized for whatever time he wishes to take, of the time available to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not believe the Senate has had any more

important items to consider in connection with an appropriation bill than the ones now being considered. When we think of the devastating effects of mental disease, heart disease, and cancer, we can readily realize that the items now being considered are of the utmost importance to humanity in everyday life, for they result in death, sadness, torture, heartaches, tribulations of all sorts. No one realizes that more than does the chairman of the subcommittee which handled this portion of the bill.

I wish all Senators had been able to attend the long and thorough hearings. If so, they would have had a liberal education in terms of some of the most important needs of humanity. We heard many witnesses. Outstanding students of mental health appeared before our subcommittee.

Among the witnesses were Miss Isabel Leighton; Dr. Arthur Bunker; Dr. George Stevenson; Dr. Clifton T. Perkins; Mr. John C. Virden, an industrialist from Cleveland, who had had personal experience in his industrial plant with the results of the lack of understanding in mental cases; Dr. Douglas D. Bond; and Dr. Johan H. W. Van Ophuijsen, who is a director of the Creedmoor Institute for Psychobiologic Studies, in New York, that being a laboratory on mental disorders and diseases.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is a State institution.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Other witnesses were Dr. Arthur M. Sackler and Dr. C. H. Hardin Branch, of the University of Utah Medical School.

Everything that others Senators have said today concerning the serious situation caused by the lack of understanding of mental cases is correct, Mr. President. At the subcommittee hearings we received first-hand information from those who are dealing with the problem and who understand it.

As I have stated heretofore to the Senator from New York, I think we owe a greater responsibility to persons afflicted with mental diseases than we do even to those afflicted with heart disease and cancer, as devastating as they are, because persons afflicted with mental disorders or mental diseases cannot help or protect themselves. A person who has cancer, or who is suffering from a heart condition can go to a doctor and say, "What can you do for me?" and then can undergo the treatment prescribed. The mental case is different. The patient is entirely dependent on the good will, probably the charity, of his neighbors, his fellow citizens, perhaps public officials. I sympathize to the limit with persons so afflicted, and I want to go along in doing the things which should be done to help them. I think action in that direction should be a must. The public weal, public interest, social advancement, the existence of society itself, are all dependent upon what we do and the responsibility we assume along the lines suggested by the Senators who have preceded me in this discussion.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment for a very brief statement? I start it by saying that we need more trained personnel, and I emphasize that point, because I think it is

of the utmost importance. I want to point out again that there are only 5,000 trained psychiatrists in the Nation, while 15,000 are needed. State hospitals alone need six times as many psychiatrists as they have. With only 5,500 nurses in psychiatric hospitals, 1.1 percent of the Nations' nurses take care of 50 percent of its hospital beds. This situation, representing but one aspect of the need for these funds, indicates the importance, the humanitarian and national defense importance, of this amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In reference to heart research, I am sure that the country as a whole knows that among the foremost authorities on research with reference to the heart are Dr. Jones, medical director of the Helen Hay Whitney Foundation, and Dr. Paul D. White, clinical professor of medicine, Harvard University. From the professions engaged in that line of endeavor those two doctors, among others, appeared before the committee. But we also had Mr. Citizen come before the committee to talk of the devastating effects of the lack of research and understanding of heart conditions and heart diseases. We had such persons as Mrs. Arthur Baer and Miss Gloria Swanson, who came of their own accord. They were not subpoenaed. They came at their own expense, and testified concerning conditions which affect the 150,000,000 people of this country. So we know about the heart situation. Others came and talked about cancer and other matters, including dental research. The committee was entirely convinced that what they were stating was correct, and that the committee had to take its responsibility and do what was right.

How do we view it? I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee. Other members of the subcommittee are the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from California [Mr. Knowland], and other Senators. Being sympathetic toward the subject and wanting to cooperate, we worked harder than ever, as evidenced by the record, before we marked that bill. So I shall try in the next few minutes to give the Senate the history of the work of the committee in connection with this subject, a statement of what we have heretofore done, a statement of what the House has heretofore done, and what the Congress has heretofore done. I shall refer to the record which has been made, as I have stated, by those who desire that the program go forward.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. A moment ago there was an inquiry as to whether the United States Public Health agency supported in substance the amendment which is before the Senate at the present time, and there was some observation as to whether the funds which had previously been made available by the Congress had been employed. The suggestion was made, as I understood, by the distin-

guished chairman of the committee that the agency itself did not think more funds could be employed. Merely by reference to the hearings before the Senate and the testimony of Dr. Van Slyke, beginning on page 492, I observe that at page 494, Dr. Van Slyke, speaking to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the able Senator from New Mexico, said:

Mr. Chairman, in answer to your inquiry, I can say that the \$3,820,000 will suffice for carrying on projects already being supported and which should be carried on in the next fiscal year.

Then, on page 495, Dr. Van Slyke says:

I appreciate the interest of the committee in this particular problem, and recognize that there are economic considerations beyond our own particular interests. But we did ask for a larger amount of funds than this for research grants. We feel that heart disease, which is the No. 1 killer in the country, which bids fair to respond to research activities so we could cut down the toll of death and incapacity from it, justifies our asking this committee to spend or to appropriate more money so we could attack the problem more vigorously.

Later, at the middle of page 495, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee said:

Very good. We do not want to get the agency in wrong with the Budget Bureau, but we still would like to know what you gentlemen who are doing this work which we have authorized you to do, and which you are carrying on, think that is necessary. We would like to know what is necessary.

On page 500 of the hearings Dr. Van Slyke submitted an estimate of what the National Heart Institute, for example, would like to have, and it carries a \$33,000,000 request, far in excess of what the Bureau of the Budget allowed. That estimate, submitted by the National Institute, plus the new requests which have come in, made by the Citizen's Committee, a group of experts in the respective fields, which is in the amendment which is now before the Senate.

If I may, I should like to add that, according to the Surgeon General, Dr. Scheele, last year, the Heart Institute, for instance, not only used up all Congress made available to them, which was the largest appropriation they had ever had, a total of about \$16,000,000, including the contract authorizations, but they had \$22,000,000 worth of approved and worthy and meritorious research construction projects for which they had no funds at all.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, everything the Senator from Florida has stated is correct. The Senator from New Mexico has always insisted that Congress does the appropriating, not the Bureau of the Budget. But it appears that the Government departments once in a while are afraid to make a statement before a committee, because it might be contrary to the wishes of the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget might suggest that a certain amount would be sufficient for the War Department, for the national defense. I think the National Defense Agency would know more about what it wants than even the Bureau of the Budget, notwithstanding

the fact that the Budget Bureau is for that purpose making recommendations.

But I should like to state to the Senate the history of what happened. The Senate is still supreme in all these matters. We try to obtain factual information for this body, so that we can at least make a contribution, in order that the individual Senator may be able to make up his mind as to these various items. I want the Senator from Washington, the Senator from New York, and other Senators who are interested to follow the history of this item and a statement of what the amendment would do if it were agreed to.

The amendment proposed would increase the appropriation to the National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service, from \$15,750,000 to \$79,750,000, an increase of \$64,000,000, which is authorized by the amendment to be transferred to the appropriations "National Cancer Institute," "Mental Health Activities," "National Heart Institute," and "Dental Health Activities," in specified amounts.

Let us break that down and see about each one of the items.

For the National Cancer Institute, our committee has provided \$20,686,000, an increase of \$600,000 over the House allowance and over the budget estimate.

Irrespective of what the head of the Public Health Service said, I am speaking from the record made with reference to the bill. The agency which administers the funds is the Public Health Service. It is the agency which goes before the Budget Bureau and says, "For this particular purpose we need so much money." The Public Health Service requested of the Bureau of the Budget total funds in the amount of \$29,127,800—

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. In a moment. The Public Health Service requested of the Bureau of the Budget total funds in the amount of \$29,127,800, of which \$9,000,000 was to be used for grants for construction of research facilities. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington would increase the appropriation for the National Cancer Institute to \$37,686,000, which is \$8,558,200 more than was requested by the agency of the Budget Bureau.

That is the point I am trying to make. I do not say that the request to increase the amount by \$8,558,200 is wrong. In my personal opinion, it is not half enough; but I am trying to give the Senate the record as it appeared before the committee as to the request which was made by the agency which administers this particular fund.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall turn to the other figures in a moment, but there was nothing for construction in the amount allowed by the Appropriations Committee, was there? Neither the Budget Bureau nor the committee allowed anything for construction.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The agency requested of the Budget Bureau \$9,000,000. The Budget Bureau did not allow anything.

Mr. PEPPER. The Budget Bureau did not grant the request of the agency,

although the agency requested construction funds of \$9,000,000?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. And, of course, the committee limited itself substantially to the request of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Inasmuch as the House had not taken any action whatsoever, one way or the other; that is correct.

With reference to the appropriation for mental health activities the committee has provided \$10,000,000.

Please follow this carefully.

That was an increase of \$56,000 over the House allowance and over the budget estimate. The Public Health Service requested from the Budget Bureau a total of \$11,545,470. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington would give an additional \$16,000,000, or a total of \$26,000,000, to the appropriation for mental health activities, which is \$14,454,530 more than was requested of the Budget Bureau by the agency. The language of the amendment would permit the use of the funds appropriated for grants for construction purposes.

Mr. President, I am giving this information to the Senate so that the Senate can make up its own mind. I want the Senate to decide these questions, but I want it to decide after it hears the factual information from the committee on which the committee took its stand or made recommendations. I am so strongly in favor of the Senate deciding these matters that, notwithstanding the fact that there is no authorization for the use of funds in the substantive law, and that the amendment is subject to a point of order, the chairman of the subcommittee is not going to make a point of order. I want the Senate itself to take the responsibility. I am not saying that the amendment provides for too much or for too little. In my personal opinion, it is not enough, but, nevertheless, I want this information to appear in the record, and then to let each Senator decide.

For the appropriation "National Heart Institute," our committee has provided \$14,750,000, an increase of \$600,000 over the House allowance and over the budget estimate. The Public Health Service requested of the Bureau of the Budget \$33,241,600, including \$18,000,000 for grants for construction of research facilities, which item was disallowed in its entirety by the Budget Bureau. The proposed amendment would transfer to this appropriation \$28,000,000, which would make available a total of \$42,750,000, or \$9,508,400 more than was requested of the Budget Bureau.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Tennessee had allotted 20 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico, and the time of the Senator from New Mexico has now expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] told me that he was going to lunch and that I might proceed until he returned. I do not think I shall take more than 2 or 3 minutes longer.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is chairman of the subcommittee, and he

not only had charge of the hearings, but engineered, guided, and directed the consideration of this bill and has the prime responsibility for the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee has control of the time. If the Senator from New Mexico will take the responsibility, he may proceed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall take the responsibility, so long as the Senator from Tennessee is not present.

For the appropriation "Dental-health activities" our committee has provided \$2,140,000, an increase of \$100,000 over the House allowance. The Public Health Service requested of the Bureau of the Budget only \$2,609,030. This amendment would provide in addition to the committee recommendation an additional \$3,000,000 or a total of \$5,140,000, or \$2,530,970 more than was asked of the Budget Bureau.

Last year many Senators appeared before the committee with reference to this particular item. I believe there were seven or eight Senators present. If I recall correctly, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], appeared before the committee, as did several other Senators. They made a showing as to the necessity which the committee agreed was correct. It will take me only a very brief time to give a history of the appropriations and requests, the committee recommendations, and so forth, and I ask that at the completion of my remarks, which will be brief, certain tables be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the tables give the figures covering the National Institutes of Health for operating expenses. In the 1950 appropriation bill the item was \$11,737,137. The 1951 agency estimate was \$14,892,500. The Bureau of the Budget allowance was \$13,250,000. The Senate committee recommendation was \$15,750,000, or more than was requested by the agency itself, or practically \$2,000,000 more than the budget allowed.

What is the record of the National Cancer Institute? The appropriation for 1950 was \$19,000,486.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not correct to say that there were contract authorizations of an additional amount, which made the total of the contract authorization and appropriation, if I am not mistaken, \$25,486,000?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. I am merely giving the figures to the Senate. For the National Cancer Institute the 1950 appropriation was \$19,000,486. The agency's request for this year was \$29,127,800. The budget allowed \$20,086,000. The Senate committee recommended \$20,686,000, or more than the budget allowed.

Mr. PEPPER. May I say that the difference between what the Bureau of the Budget recommended, what the distinguished committee recommended to the Senate, and what is requested in the pending amendment is embraced largely

in two categories: \$9,000,000 for construction projects, which was included in the agency's request to the Bureau of the Budget, as set forth at page 477 of the hearings, which the Senate committee reduced, and \$8,000,000 for additional research projects which the agency has processed and found meritorious since that time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the Senator from Florida has stated the record correctly.

Mental health activities: The 1950 appropriation was \$10,323,890. This year the agency's request was for \$11,545,470. The budget allowed \$9,944,000. The Senate committee recommendation is \$10,000,000, or an increase over the budget allowance.

National Heart Institute: The 1950 appropriation was \$16,161,500. The agency requested this year \$33,241,600. The budget estimate allowed \$14,150,000. Notwithstanding the request of \$33,241,600, the Bureau of the Budget allowed only \$14,150,000. The committee increased the budget allowance to \$14,750,000, or \$600,000 more than the Bureau of the Budget allowed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Because of the limitation of time, it may be that I shall not have an opportunity to make a statement. As the ranking minority member of the subcommittee over which the able Senator from New Mexico presides, I know what a deep interest he has in all these humanitarian projects—heart, cancer, public health, and all the others—but I also know that he has a sense of responsibility to the over-all picture, which as a responsible chairman of a subcommittee he must possess.

I am glad he is putting the figures into the RECORD, because it seems to me that the correct procedure for those who are interested in getting additional funds—and I think a considerable case can be made out for it—would be to go before the Bureau of the Budget, present the facts, get the full endorsement of the agency which would have to administer the projects, and then come back to Congress either in a supplemental or in the next regular appropriation bill. It seems to me, in view of the fact that the committee itself has in every one of these fields, I believe, exceeded the budget estimate, and in many instances has even exceeded the request of the agency itself, that the action of the subcommittee should be supported. I merely wished to make the comment while the able chairman of the subcommittee was making his statement.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from California, I am sure, will also recall that the major part of the credit—and I think it is estimable credit—for the progress which has been made during the past few years in the field of research is due to action by the Congress of the United States. The Bureau of the Budget in the past 3 or 4 years has not seen fit to go as far as Congress was determined to go. I do not believe that any of us, seeing what has been accomplished and what the problem lying in the future is,

would go back and have done less than we have done. The question now is whether we shall continue to progress this cause of saving human life and strengthening human life, or whether we shall neglect to meet the challenge as it exists.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to finish with the presentation of these records; then I shall yield.

Dental health activities: The 1950 appropriation was \$1,908,000. For 1951 the agency requested \$2,609,030. The Bureau of the budget allowed \$2,140,000. The Senate committee agreed with the budget allowance and allowed the complete budget estimate. There was no additional allowance for dental health. It is a little lower than was requested by the agency.

Mr. President, I appreciate personally the feelings and attitude of the sponsors of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington and other Senators. If I had my way I would go even further than their amendment proposes to go. However, as the Senator from California has stated, there is such a thing as responsibility, and I am trying to be conscientious. I know how sympathetic I am to the items covered by this amendment. I know what they mean to the people of the United States, but we must act on information. If the agencies did not give us the correct information, that is not our fault. We must go on factual information, whether it hurts or not.

I wish I could go along with the amendment. I am all for it, but I cannot in justice to the Senate and to the oath I took go contrary to the information given to us by those who administer these projects. If the Agency has more information at this time, the committee has not received it. The committee would be glad to consider sympathetically any new information. It is actually leaning toward that side, and if justified it would bring in a supplemental bill. However, although it nearly breaks my heart to do so, I feel duty bound to stay with the committee's recommendations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator with reference to this item in the bill, particularly one portion of it in which I have a very deep interest, namely, the mental health provision, whether it is not true, in view of the international situation which confronts us at the moment that there is a greater need for financial assistance by Congress than there was, let us say, 3 or 4 months ago.

I raise that question because I have in my hand a report from the Department of the Army, a report from the Secretary of the Navy, a report from the Department of the Air Force, and from General Cates, of the Marine Corps, and every one of them says in his report that the very fact of mobilization, the very fact that we take men into the armed services, accelerates the problem of mental health and mental disease far

beyond all proportions experienced in normal peacetime.

The report of the Hoover Commission task force shows that in a very few years 75 percent of all of the hospital beds the Veterans' Administration has under its jurisdiction, in the 1960's and the 1970's, will be dedicated to the care of mental patients who served in the last war.

The record of inductions under the selective service shows that the one weakness in the make-up of American soldiers was mental illness. I emphasize that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If we have been negligent in not providing a sufficient number of beds for the Veterans' Administration, that is another matter. Only indirectly does the item now being considered apply to the Veterans' Administration. Of course research would help.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The record from the trained psychiatrists, from the men in the medical field, shows that the research, the teaching fellowships, the training facilities, are basic and fundamental to preparing the number of people we need at induction centers, veterans' hospitals, and in the Army itself. That is only one aspect, and, to be sure, there is a greater aspect in the total population.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I assure the Senator from Minnesota that my attitude in that respect is exactly the same as that of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know it is.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no question about it. I am merely trying to do a duty which I consider I must perform. As I stated before, so far as mental disease is concerned, I think that is the most important of all, because we are trying to take care of those who cannot take care of themselves. If a person is suffering from cancer, and knows it, at least he can complain to someone, and he can ask for a little help. He might not get it, but at least he can ask. One suffering from heart trouble is in the same situation; he might suffer personally, but he can complain to his wife or his son or his neighbor or someone else. He can go to the doctor and yell at him, "Why don't you do something?" But the poor mental case cannot do that. I think our duty to the mental sufferer is greater than to the others.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I testified before the Senator's subcommittee, and he gave us a most friendly and gracious recep-

tion. I know of his deep interest in this subject. But the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington is an amendment that is supported not merely by those of us in public life as public officials, but is supported by the best scientific brains of the country, those who have put life into the whole program of research into heart, cancer, mental, and dental health.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They are supporting 100 percent the amendment of the Senator from Washington. No one knows what can be done better than do these brilliant, capable scientists and doctors who have come to the Senator from Washington, the Senator from Montana, the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from New York, and many others, and urged us to forward a program to meet the needs of today.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I read the list of the scientists, the unselfish men and women who appeared before the committee, people who have given of their intelligence, their efforts, their work, and their money, in order to make this world a better place in which to live. I realize that.

Mr. President, all I wanted to do was to make the record clear, and give the figures as I understand them.

Mr. HUNT and Mr. MAGNUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield first to the Senator from Wyoming, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee whether I correctly understood him to say that the appropriation for dental research was less than that suggested by the budget.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, no. We agreed completely with the budget estimate.

Mr. HUNT. It was not increased?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was not increased to the amount of the request. The request was larger than the budget allowed, and the committee went along with the budget.

Mr. HUNT. The Senator is aware of the fact that the most widespread of all diseases to which the human body is heir is dental disease, is he not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would say "Yes," generally, without making an investigation. Nearly every person alive has some kind of dental difficulty.

Mr. HUNT. Is the Senator aware of the fact that in World War II, of the draftees who were rejected because of physical disability, 35 percent were not acceptable because of dental disease?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understood that to be the case.

Mr. HUNT. I know the Senator is not a physician, but from general knowledge does he know that the resultant disease conditions throughout the entire body very often have their foci of infection in the oral cavity?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have been told that over and over again.

Mr. HUNT. Does not the Senator then agree with me that the small amount appropriated for dental research is entirely inadequate, and will not the Senator also agree with me that the dental division of scientific research has constantly been neglected all along the line and never has had its fair share of attention and appropriation?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe we have had testimony to that effect, and I think it has been proved.

Mr. HUNT. While I am hopeful that the Senator may go along with the entire request in the amendment of the Senator from Washington, I would hope he can at least accept in full the amount requested for dental research because it is pitifully small and the dental research carried on today primarily is carried on by private industry and appropriation, and in the last few years, of course, two men of the University of Illinois, without aid from the Federal Government, have made great discoveries along that line.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am so deeply interested in the four items—cancer, heart, mental disease, and dental research—that I do not want to be partial to any of them.

Mr. HUNT. I agree with the Senator. I hope that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee can accept the amendment as it is written. I realize the great need in the other categories, but I would say to the Senator that of all the categories in this bill the one that has always been neglected, and still is neglected in the amendment, is money for dental research.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

EXHIBIT 1

Operating expenses, National Institutes of Health

Project	1950 comparable appropriation	1951 Agency estimates	Bureau of the Budget estimates	Senate committee recommendation	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate recommendation compared with—		
					Comparable appropriation	Agency request	Budget estimate
Grants:							
1. Grants to medical schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training:							
(a) Research projects.....	\$5,480,000	\$7,760,000	\$6,650,000	\$9,150,000	+\$3,670,000	+\$1,390,000	+\$2,500,000
(b) Research fellowships.....	515,000	515,000	515,000	515,000	0	0	0
Direct operations:							
1. Research.....	4,819,137	5,610,200	5,107,000	5,107,000	+287,863	—503,200	0
2. Other direct operations:							
(a) Review and approval of research and training grants.....	501,000	515,000	515,000	515,000	+14,000	0	0
(b) Administration.....	234,000	223,000	213,000	213,000	—21,000	—10,000	0
3. Pay increases.....	188,000	269,300	250,000	250,000	+62,000	—19,300	0
Total obligational cash.....	11,737,137	14,892,500	13,250,000	15,750,000	+4,012,863	+857,500	+2,500,000

National Cancer Institute

Project	1950 appropria- tions	Agency request, 1951	Budget esti- mates, 1951	Senate commit- tee recommen- dations, 1951	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate recommendations compared with—		
					1950 appropria- tions	Agency request	Budget esti- mates
Grants:							
1. Grants to medical and dental schools and other insti- tutions and to individuals for research and training:							
(a) Research projects.....	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$3,200,000	+\$600,000	+\$600,000	+\$600,000
(b) Research fellowships.....	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	0	0	0
(c) Construction of research facilities.....	0	9,000,000	0	0	0	-9,000,000	0
(d) Teaching of medical subjects, obligational cash.....	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	0	0	0
(e) Training stipends.....	375,000	375,000	375,000	375,000	0	0	0
2. Grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other control services.....	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	0	0	0
3. Grants for special control projects.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	0	0	0
Direct operations:							
1. Research.....	3,590,663	3,786,000	3,756,000	3,756,000	+165,337	-30,000	0
2. Other direct operations:							
(a) Technical assistance to States.....	392,388	428,000	422,000	422,000	+29,612	-6,000	0
(b) Review and approval of research and training grants.....	78,670	85,000	85,000	85,000	+6,330	0	0
(c) Administration.....	410,265	411,000	408,000	408,000	-2,265	-3,000	0
3. Pay increases.....	128,500	192,800	190,000	190,000	+61,500	-2,800	0
Total obligations.....	14,825,486	24,127,800	15,086,000	15,686,000	+860,514	-8,441,800	+600,000
Liquidating cash.....	4,175,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	+825,000	0	0
Grand total.....	19,000,486	29,127,800	20,086,000	20,686,000	+1,685,514	-8,441,800	+600,000

Mental health activities

Project	1950 compa- rable appropria- tions	Agency request, 1951	Budget esti- mates, 1951	Senate recom- mendations, 1951	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate recom- mendations compared with—		
					1950 appropria- tions	Agency request	Budget esti- mates
Grants:							
1. Grants to medical schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training:							
(a) Research projects.....	\$794,000	\$1,476,000	\$1,100,000	\$1,156,000	+\$362,000	-\$320,000	+\$56,000
(b) Research fellowships.....	100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	+100,000	0	0
(c) Expansion of teaching of subjects relating to mental illness.....	1,950,500	2,964,000	2,299,000	2,299,000	+348,500	-665,000	0
(d) Training stipends.....	900,000	1,145,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	+150,000	-95,000	0
2. Grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other preventive and control services.....	3,550,000	3,650,000	3,550,000	3,550,000	0	-100,000	0
Direct operations:							
1. Research.....	319,350	933,700	599,300	599,300	+279,950	-334,400	0
2. Other direct operations:							
(a) Review and approval of research and train- ing grants.....	134,284	152,900	152,500	152,500	+18,216	-400	0
(b) Training activities.....	224,644	232,700	232,400	232,400	+7,756	-300	0
(c) Technical assistance to States.....	358,140	385,000	385,200	385,200	+27,060	-700	0
(d) Administration.....	212,472	319,600	295,900	295,900	+83,428	-23,700	0
3. Pay increases.....	55,500	85,670	79,700	79,700	+24,200	-5,970	0
Total funds for program performance.....	8,598,890	11,545,470	9,944,000	10,000,000	+1,401,110	-1,545,470	+56,000
Adjustment for obligations incurred in advance of program performance.....	+975,000	-2,375,000	-2,375,000	-2,375,000	-3,350,000	0	0
Total obligations.....	9,573,890	9,170,470	7,569,000	7,625,000	-1,948,890	-1,545,470	+56,000
Liquidating cash.....	+750,000	+2,375,000	+2,375,000	+2,375,000	+1,625,000	0	0
Total.....	10,323,890	11,545,470	9,944,000	10,000,000	-323,890	-1,545,470	+56,000

¹ Includes \$1,725,000 contract authority. \$425,000 additional contract authority was reserved by the Budget Bureau.

National Heart Institute

Project	1950 appropria- tions	Agency request, 1951	Budget esti- mates, 1951	Senate recom- mendations, 1951	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate recommendations compared with—		
					1950 appropria- tions	Agency request	Budget esti- mates
Grants:							
1. Grants to medical schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training:							
(a) Research projects.....	\$3,820,000	\$4,120,000	\$3,820,000	\$4,420,000	+\$600,000	+\$300,000	+\$600,000
(b) Research fellowships.....	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	0	0	0
(c) Construction of research facilities.....	1,600,000	18,000,000	0	0	-1,600,000	-18,000,000	0
(d) Expansion of teaching medical subjects relat- ing to heart diseases.....	741,000	1,161,000	741,000	741,000	0	-420,000	0
(e) Training stipends.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	0	0	0
2. Grants to States for protection, diagnosis, and other control activities.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	0	0	0
Direct operations:							
1. Research.....	1,407,939	2,190,354	1,830,354	1,830,354	+422,415	-360,000	0
2. Other direct operations:							
(a) Review and approval of research and training grants.....	67,846	72,407	72,407	72,407	+4,561	0	0
(b) Technical assistance to States.....	437,000	445,000	445,000	445,000	+8,000	0	0
(c) Administration.....	219,715	221,239	221,239	221,239	+1,524	0	0

Footnote at end of table.

National Heart Institute—Continued

Project	1950 appropriations	Agency request, 1951	Budget estimates, 1951	Senate recommendations, 1951	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate recommendations compared with—		
					1950 appropriations	Agency request	Budget estimates
Direct operations—Continued							
3. Pay increases.....	\$68,000	\$122,600	\$111,000	\$111,000	+\$43,000	-\$11,600	0
Total funds for program performance.....	10,811,500	28,782,600	9,691,000	10,291,000	-520,500	-18,491,600	+\$600,000
Adjustment for obligations incurred in advance of program performance.....	+5,350,000	-741,000	-891,000	-891,000	-6,241,000	-150,000	0
Total obligations.....	16,161,500	28,041,600	8,800,000	9,400,000	-6,761,500	-18,641,600	+600,000
Liquidating cash.....	0	+5,200,000	+5,350,000	+5,350,000	+5,350,000	+150,000	0
Total.....	16,161,500	33,241,600	14,150,000	14,750,000	-1,411,500	-18,491,600	+600,000

¹ Includes \$8,000,000 cash and \$10,000,000 contract authority.

Dental health activities

Project	1950 comparable appropriations	Agency request, 1951	Budget estimates, 1951	Senate committee recommendation, 1951	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate recommendations compared with—		
					1950 appropriation	Agency request	Budget estimates
Grants:							
1. Grants to dental schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training:							
(a) Research projects.....	\$200,000	\$450,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	+\$50,000	-\$200,000	0
(b) Research fellowships.....	35,000	130,000	75,000	75,000	+40,000	-55,000	0
(c) Traineeships.....	0	100,000	0	0	0	-100,000	0
Direct operations:							
1. Research.....	227,700	329,225	329,225	329,225	+101,525	0	0
2. Other direct operations:							
(a) Review and approval of research and training grants.....	14,900	15,225	15,225	15,225	+325	0	0
(b) Technical assistance to States.....	1,241,600	1,284,000	1,214,000	1,214,000	-27,600	-70,000	0
(c) Coordination and development of dental resources.....	77,500	150,000	115,000	115,000	+37,500	-35,000	0
(d) Administration.....	47,300	51,550	51,550	51,550	+4,250	0	0
3. Pay increases.....	64,000	99,030	90,000	90,000	+26,000	-9,030	0
Total.....	1,908,000	2,609,030	2,140,000	2,140,000	+232,000	-469,030	0

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for one question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] have control of the time. The Senator from Tennessee has remaining 38 minutes and the Senator from Washington has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wanted to make merely one observation for the RECORD. I hope there has been no intimation in the debate today that the Senator from New Mexico has not been more than sympathetic with the suggestions we have made. Our only purpose in presenting the figure stated in the amendment is to present one not arrived at by us, but by men who have knowledge of what can be done. I am sure the opposition is no fault of the Senator from New Mexico, because he has been more than sympathetic.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sure the Senate will decide the question properly.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wanted to say exactly what the Senator from Washington has said. I can bear witness to the devotion of the Senator from New Mexico to the cause of health. I know that he, as the chairman of the subcommittee, works and labors day in and day out doing all he can to promote the cause of health. As I said on the Senate floor a year ago, the cause of health has no finer or more devoted or indefatigable friend than the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I know of no better evidence of that friendship than the speech the Senator has made here today. He has not risen on this floor and made any onslaught on the amendment. He has not made any attack on the amendment. All in the world he has done is to present the facts as his subcommittee gathered them. He has stated that if the matter were left to him personally he would go much further in connection with the appropriation, but he set forth the facts, and said "I leave the decision to the Senate."

Mr. President, I recognize that money in and of itself cannot find the cause for and cure of these terrible diseases. But we know that money is a most important and essential factor. We know that there must be money used for research and cure. The splendid men and women who are today devoting their lives to trying to find the answer to these questions, to find the cause and cure of these diseases which are wreaking such havoc and bringing so much suffering and death to the American people, come to us and say "We do not have the funds necessary to carry on the research. We do not have the funds necessary to enable us to find the answers to these questions."

Mr. President, I, for one, have strongly felt that in attacking these diseases and seeking to find the cure for them we should use the same imagination, the same determination, the same American skill and genius, the same fine action we

used in developing and making the atomic bomb. We did not stop to count the cost of the bomb. We said we had to have the bomb, and we got the bomb. I say today that what we should do is whatever may be necessary to find the cause and cure of these terrible diseases.

I come back to where I started, to pay my tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee for his loyal and devoted friendship to the cause of health.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made during the course of the debate with respect to the devotion of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to the cause of national health and welfare. I know he recognizes the need for these research programs and that he desires to do everything in his power to aid in bringing about an effective program that will result in eradicating these dreaded diseases or at least lessening their deadly effect to such a degree that we may have a more healthy and vigorous population. I cannot think of any program that is more important for the strengthening of our Nation and for the welfare of our people than the program for research into the causes of and cure for these fatal diseases affecting the American people.

I wish to say that after hearing the very able arguments made by the Senator from Washington and other Senators who have participated in the debate, there is very little I can say to add to the argument in support of the Magnuson

amendment. I shall not take up the time of the Senate in further discussing matters which have already been covered at great length. I should, however, like to make a few remarks with reference to the Dental Research Institute.

I am very glad to note that his amendment includes funds for research into the causes of dental diseases. All too often this is a health subject that is overlooked in favor of diseases which have been more highly dramatized, such as cancer, polio, and heart disease.

As the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] said a few moments ago, there is no disease more widespread and more apt to bring serious ill-health to the American people than dental disease. Yet we have spent very little if anything toward research into the causes of dental disease. I understand that if we spent a reasonable sum for that purpose it would be quite possible to lessen very greatly the suffering and fatal illnesses resulting directly from dental disease. Of course, I realize that it is only within the last 50 years that dental research of any kind or even dental care in a substantial degree, has been had in this country.

Unlike general medical research, relatively little support is given to dental research by private funds and foundations or by industrial interests. In fact, until the Congress passed a national dental research bill a couple of years ago, there was practically no basic research in the problems of dental health being done in this country or anywhere else. It would be a waste of time to give detailed statistics about the cost of dental diseases to the health, productivity, and happiness of the people of this country. Dental diseases and defects are almost universal. The American people now spend about a billion dollars yearly for dental services, which is about half as much as they spend for medical services.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Montana that the time under my control is not sufficient to give Senators who have already applied for and have been allotted time, sufficient time to make the statements they desire to make. If the Senator can arrange to have his statement placed in the RECORD, I would be very much obliged to him.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I will accommodate the able Senator from Tennessee. The Senator from Tennessee has also been very helpful to us in considering these problems. I do not want to take up the time of the Senate on this matter unnecessarily, and I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of my statement printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remainder of Mr. MURRAY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American Medical Association has estimated that in 1947 we were spending about \$110,000,000 for medical research but only about \$1,000,000 for dental research. In other words, we spend half as much for dental services as for medical services, but we spend only one-tenth as much for dental research as for medical research. Yet dental diseases and defects lead to various kinds of

bodily diseases affecting the health of the people and frequently constitute the direct cause of fatal illness, shortening our lives.

We are making good progress toward the solution of many of our medical problems through research, but we have hardly even begun to solve the fundamental causes and problems of dental diseases. Real advances in this field will be delayed many years under the present scale of public and private financial support. If the amendment of the Senator from Washington is approved, the three millions of added Federal funds will this year provide a very real beginning of research in the causes and cures of dental diseases. By such a program we will overcome the record of the last war, which showed that in the administration of the selective-service program a high percentage of our boys were rejected because of dental defects. This program will build a stronger nation for peace or war.

The funds which this amendment will make available for dental research will permit the dental research program in this country to be doubled. One of the most important things it will accomplish will be the construction of dental-research facilities at the various dental schools. Recently the National Advisory Dental Council asked the deans of the Nation's 41 accredited dental schools whether they needed funds to construct new or additional laboratories for research. Answers have been received from about half the schools. From their answers it is estimated that a minimum of \$2,000,000 a year for 3 years is needed for this purpose alone. These facilities will do far more than enhance the research program that is basic to the problem. They will also permit the training of additional research scientists to work on these problems.

New or enlarged research-training facilities would be established at such leading dental schools as the University of Alabama, Tufts College in Boston, Washington University and St. Louis University in St. Louis, at Northwestern University, and at the Universities of Pennsylvania and Indiana. Additional facilities would also be possible at graduate schools that are already doing outstanding fundamental research in dental disease problems. Among such institutions whose excellent present programs could be expanded, the names of the University of Chicago and the University of Rochester come to mind.

This amendment would not only enlarge research and training facilities, but it would permit an immediate and sizable increase in the use of existing facilities. As I understand it, about \$1,000,000 additional would be made available for research in the laboratories of the Public Health Service at Bethesda and for financial assistance to scientists in the Nation's university laboratories. It would also permit doubling the number of Federal fellowships granted to brilliant young research students who would thus be permitted to concentrate in this field.

My dental friends tell me that dental disease and the research problems of dentistry are divided into two major fields. The first and best known is that of caries or cavities, which are principally a scourge of childhood and the younger adult years. Less well known, but of even great importance, is the problem of periodontal disease, which is mainly a disease of the soft tissues of the mouth and is mainly a problem of the later years of life. In this latter group we find the cause of the loosening and loss of adult teeth; we find gingivitis and pyorrhea and the ulcerating type of gingivitis we laymen know and dread as trench mouth.

There are numerous other dental disease problems. One of the most important, though less frequent, is the problem of the occasional death or serious physical damage arising from infections following upon the extraction of teeth. Another major problem

that requires extensive research is the infection which may start in the mouth but makes itself known by damaging another part of the body. All of these are problems about which our dentists and our physicians know very little at the present time. The cause or origin of many of these conditions is unknown. For some of these conditions diagnosis is difficult or inaccurate and treatment is seldom effective.

Good work has been begun in the Government's own laboratories at the National Institute of Dental Research toward finding the answers that are needed. Good work has begun elsewhere. This amendment will insure the expansion of research that is needed.

I wish to speak now about a totally different aspect of fundamental research in dental diseases. This type of research is hardly distinguishable from basic research in cancer, heart disease, or the various infectious diseases. The experts in this field tell me that it requires careful and patient investigation into the basic properties of living cells by men skilled in such scientific specialties as biochemistry, biophysics, physiology, and so on. The discoveries which these scientists make in basic dental research often help solve the problems of investigators in other areas of health. Similarly, the findings of scientists working in these other fields are likely to provide clues to solving some of the basic problems of dental health.

The interchangeability of scientific skills and discovery in this whole field of medical, dental, and mental health and the related basic biological sciences is a major reason why we must support the amendment that is before us. By such support we will bring nearer the day when our people can enjoy the good health and the life span to which they are entitled. We will not only strengthen the most important of all our national resources with which we must defend our country against aggression, but we will also be adding to the basic structure of scientific equipment and manpower upon which our future strength in peace or in war primarily depends.

I would remind you that we in the Senate and our colleagues in the House have already studied and approved this program. We have made available a hundred thousand dollars to be used to plan a dental institute at Bethesda which would serve as the focal point of research in dental disease. It would also serve as a concrete symbol of our pledge to students of dentistry that if they are willing to devote their lives to research in this field, we will provide them with the place and the materials needed for their so important work.

But although those funds were appropriated and although the plans have been drawn and approved, the Dental Research Institute remains unbuilt. Unless we vote the funds requested by Senator MAGNUSON, we will have not only broken faith with our schools of dentistry and with the dental profession; but, in a time when economy is all-important, we will have been guilty of willful waste—those funds already spent for the planning of the institute will have gone down the drain.

The American Dental Association has studied this program for years. It has brought it to the attention of dentists in every State of the Union. And, after full and lengthy consideration of this institute, the American Dental Association has assured us of its great value and urges us to carry it to completion.

I am glad that Senator MAGNUSON has succeeded in bringing together in one amendment the needs of all our institutes of health. The dental profession and the people will be grateful to him for his awareness of the fact that the needs of dentistry should be handled on a coequal basis with those of medicine. I urge my colleagues to support the Magnuson amendment in full as a

great step forward in the health of the American people.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to say in conclusion that I think it would be a great misfortune for the country if the appropriation for the worthy purposes of research into deadly diseases which are embraced in the program we have been considering should be defeated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I now yield to the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to take some time at this point because I do not know whether there will be an opportunity later, to discuss the possibilities of a reconsideration of the vote by which the McCarran amendment was agreed to a couple of days ago.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator were assured that after the vote is had at 2 o'clock, sufficient time would be given to him to take up that subject, which is not related to the amendments now under discussion, would he then allow us to proceed with germane discussion of the pending amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. I know of no way to secure such assurance, because when the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into yesterday—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator from New Mexico be satisfied if I should ask and obtain unanimous consent from the Senate that the Senator from New Mexico be afforded time to discuss the subject he desires to discuss?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; that will be entirely satisfactory to me. It might also solve the problem of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from New Mexico will yield for that purpose, I ask, Mr. President, that after the vote is taken at 2 o'clock, the Senator from New Mexico be allowed to speak for 20 minutes on the subject with which he was about to deal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The unanimous-consent request is made by the Senator from Washington that the Senator from New Mexico be given 20 minutes, after the vote is had at 2 o'clock, to make a statement in connection with the McCarran amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator request that the time be given to the Senator from New Mexico after all the votes are taken following the hour of 2 o'clock on the appropriation bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; after the votes on my amendments have been taken.

Mr. IVES. On the Senator's amendments?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I now yield 5 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I was assured yesterday that I would be given 10 minutes. I cannot say what I wish

to say in 5 minutes, so I will give that time to some other Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield the Senator 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, in the 5 minutes which have been allotted to me by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I shall make but a few generalized statements in reference to the Magnuson amendment.

The amendment provides for an additional appropriation of \$64,000,000, in addition to that provided for this purpose by the Appropriations Committee. That is a substantial sum of money, but when we think of \$64,000,000 in relation to the health and welfare of the 150,000,000 American people, it is not a large appropriation—in fact, the request is small and inadequate.

Mr. President, we are not discussing a theory, but we are discussing a program which has been proved and tested. The education, teaching, and research provided by the Federal Government through the National Institutes of Health have resulted in great accomplishments.

As I have said, \$64,000,000 in relation to the 150,000,000 American people is not a large sum to appropriate, but I submit that there is no investment which the Federal Government has ever made, in terms of the amount of money invested, which has yielded such good results as those which have come from the investments made in medical research and medical teaching and facilities.

The record of the Government of the United States, through the appropriations made for the National Cancer Institute, the mental-health activities, the National Heart Institute, and the dental-health activities, is one which can go down in history as one of the great accomplishments of our Government.

The present request for an additional \$64,000,000 is not only made by a number of Senators but it is supported by a great number of scientists, doctors, and others who are engaged in the related fields of health activities and health services. The request is supported by every one of the citizens' groups which have dedicated their energies to the provision of better health in the United States.

In fact, Mr. President, let me say to the present occupant of the chair that the entire amount of the requested additional \$64,000,000 could well be used in the field of dental health.

The basic strength of the country is in its people. It is time that we recognized that fact and considered how the people are getting along in their homes and communities.

Mr. President, when we have this wonderful opportunity to make a definite improvement in our progress in the field of the health of all of our people, it is unthinkable that we should hesitate for

a moment to make this additional appropriation in order to improve the services which are so desperately needed.

The record of the doctors and others who are engaged in the various health research activities indicates that we have reached a turning point. For several years we have been making small appropriations for training, teaching and research, but now we have reached the point where the agencies are ready to go ahead with much broader programs. Now we have broken the ice, so to speak, in the field of medical research. So, Mr. President, to cut back at this time would be as foolish as it would be to make inadequate preparations for the national defense, in the name of economy. We already have a war against disease; we do not have to wait for the Communists to start that one. The war against disease should be prosecuted with relentless purpose. The adoption of this amendment will make it possible for the Government of the United States, working with the great universities and the great scientific laboratories of the Nation, to carry on a relentless war against disease, and to do so in a manner which will produce positive results.

Mr. President, I had prepared a speech on the subject of mental health, because I think it is one of the basic problems of our country. In view of the present limitation of time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the statement I have prepared, which includes a number of statistics and certain observations regarding the problems of mental health.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the subcommittee, there is much concern these days about economizing on Government expenditure. Different people have different ideas on what should be cut. I should like to bring to your attention today an expenditure that is increasing relentlessly and is bound to run away from us if Congress does not put a roadblock in its path.

For the 3 years prior to 1947, patients piled up in the State and Federal mental hospitals at the rate of 12,500 each year. The cost increased at the rate of fifty million tax dollars per year. The estimated cost of hospitalization of the mentally ill in tax supported hospitals for 1950 will be about five hundred million, as against three hundred and sixty million in 1947.

Forty percent of the Federal health budget goes for mental illness, and yet only 4.5 percent of Federal medical research is devoted to getting at the bottom of this problem.

Appropriation bodies in both the States and the Federal Government are realizing that it is to their own interest to put additional money into training and research in order to cut down the cost of hospitalization of the mentally ill.

In the case of other diseases, medical training and research should be carried on in order to cut down the cost and the misery and to save the lives of the citizenry at large. That should be done. There is no better way to spend citizens' taxes than for their own benefit. But in the case of mental illness there is an even more urgent reason for a vigorous, spirited, all-out program of research and training because the cost of hospitalization falls upon the Public Treasury itself.

It is to the self-interest of both State and Federal Governments to intensify treatment of the mentally ill, in order to outflank the gigantic and rising costs of custodial care in the hospitals.

There are more patients being admitted to our State and Federal mental hospitals than we are able to cure and send home. The reasons are that we do not have trained personnel to apply treatments that are already known and also, we are not conducting an all-out research program to find new, quicker, better treatments.

Hospitalization is the most expensive form of treatment. That is what we want to avoid from a cost standpoint. When a patient is in a hospital, the taxpayer has to pay room and board and other hospital expenses to care for him. Many of the new treatments we are on the verge of discovering will bolster up the patient so that he can be treated outside the hospital, either through a private physician or through a clinic. This kind of treatment is not only less expensive than the operating cost of the hospital, but when applied on a broad scale, will enable us to cut-back on the tremendous hospital-building program that is ahead of us, if we neglect this training and this research program.

These new developments will give us a chance to treat more intensively thousands of patients who are already in the hospitals receiving little or no treatment and are therefore stagnating, getting worse and becoming hopeless cases to be a burden on the taxpayer for the rest of their lives.

We do not have to find an absolute cure-all in order to justify this research. Psychiatry is at a turning point in its history. We are on the threshold of finding methods to improve the patient, so we can stave off a breakdown, thus avoiding the necessity for him to go into a hospital. This not only helps him, but it helps the taxpayer.

These new treatments will enable thousands of patients to leave the hospitals sooner than otherwise to get jobs to support themselves and to contribute their share to the taxes of the country instead of being a burden on the other taxpayers.

These treatments will also help patients to stay out of the hospitals once they are discharged. There is a great danger of relapse among discharged mental patients and proper treatment can keep additional thousands from going back to the hospitals.

Research and the training of personnel is by far the cheapest way to handle this problem of mental illness. The taxpayers, as well as the patients are suffering when we have a backlog of promising, approved research projects that are not being put into operation because of lack of appropriation. The same thing is true with regard to the training grants and the construction of research and training facilities.

We are in a period of economy at the present time and it may be said that we cannot afford to spend an additional \$10,000,000 on training and research. But is it economy to neglect the research and training and thereby deliberately shoot up the cost of hospitalization 10 to 15 times in one generation? What we must realize is that within this same budget, for which we are responsible, if we keep down the item on research the cost of hospitalization will go up out of our control. On the other hand, in proportion, as we increase research we cut down the cost of hospitalization many times over the amount we have paid for the research and training.

Fifty years ago we would not be able to say with so much confidence that research could furnish new weapons for man's struggle against the scourge of disease. But one by one seemingly hopeless diseases have yielded their secrets to the relentless activity of medical scientists. These discoveries are not miracles, but the result of

hard work by trained experts, the fruit of man's genius pitted against the stubborn forces of nature. We are confident of success against mental illness, because we have succeeded with other illnesses.

Many of you have probably heard something about these new treatments. First there is the electro-shock treatment and the insulin-shock treatment. Both of these are in fairly widespread use at the present time and are achieving good results, but there is a great deal of research and testing that should be done to find out more about the basic processes involved here so that we would be able to improve the results. The big thing about the shock treatment is that in many hospitals there is not enough equipment or trained personnel to apply the treatment to all those who might benefit from it. There is also not enough personnel for the out-patient clinics to treat those in the community who could be kept out of the hospitals by these and other treatments.

Pioneer work is now being done in using cortisone and ACTH, the newly found hormones, in the treatment of serious mental illness. It is possible that great new strides will be made in this field which would enable us to relieve some of the terrific overcrowding in our mental hospitals. Cortisone and ACTH are still in the research stage as far as mental illness is concerned. Lead after lead in many projects are waiting to be followed up. The sooner we set in motion these projects the sooner we will be able to capitalize on the results.

The same is true regarding new possibilities which are now opening up in the use of histamine. Startling results have already been obtained on a small scale, but a variety of possibilities have to be explored. These and many other lines of inquiry make necessary new research projects and the construction of facilities to house them. The cost would be in terms of nickels and quarters as compared to the dollars and dollars that are now being appropriated by the Federal and State Governments for locking up patients in mental institutions for years with little or no treatment.

Another new and promising treatment for patients with certain types of mental illness has been developed by the New York State Psychiatric Institute. This involves the use of intravenous injections of ether. Here again the need for further exploration and testing to the fullest extent possible would enable us to capitalize more quickly on this discovery.

These are only a few avenues of investigation which need to be put into operation. I think that if we neglect the opportunity to push ahead with this research that will save the taxpayers millions of dollars that it will be the worst so-called kind of economy. To neglect this research, to drift on and on, laying out money for hospitals running into billions over the coming years is crying economy where there is no economy, and the taxpayer will foot the bill.

Somebody might say, How do we know we will be able to cut down hospital care by the use of these treatments? We have a good example of how this can be done. Six or seven years ago in the mental hospitals in the State of Massachusetts there was a pile-up of 800 patients every year. It was easy to see that, if this continued, overcrowding would increase to the point where new hospitals would have to be built and staffed at tremendous expense. A campaign of research, training, intensified treatment in the hospitals and development of community clinics brought the situation under control.

Testimony was given by the commissioner of mental health before this very subcommittee, that Massachusetts now had leveled off its hospital population to the point where they are discharging as many patients each year as they admit. Prominent among the weapons used to achieve this result were

electro-shock and insulin-shock treatments in the hospitals to a greater degree. Other States could do the same thing if there were more trained psychiatric personnel. Massachusetts was able to achieve this result by its own efforts only because of the fact that it was a center of psychiatric training and research and had inducements to offer existing qualified personnel that other States did not have.

Thus we have in the achievement of one State a demonstration of what can be done in other sections of the country.

In 1947 veterans' neuropsychiatric hospitals cost some \$96,000,000 to operate. In 1949 they cost nearly \$125,000,000, mostly because of the increase in patients. An actuarial study by the Metropolitan Insurance Co., made for the Hoover Commission Task Force on Medical Services, states that whereas in 1948 there were about 100,000 veteran hospital beds (about one-half for the mentally ill) that by 1975, even though non-service-connected veterans would be cared for only in case of chronic illness, 250,000 beds would be required, and that three-fourths of these would be for mental illness. It was pointed out that this would be true if we did not step up treatment through training of personnel, and if we did not find new cures through research.

The Hoover Commission, whose purpose was to cut governmental expenditures, stated that—

"Transcending in importance any of our other recommendations, is the need to outflank disease by giving the highest priority to research, preventive medicine, public health, and education.

"Federal medicine has, to a large extent, developed negatively with patient care as its principal function.

"First it is the need for maximum employment of present scientific knowledge to control disease (training of personnel). But beyond application of present knowledge lies research to find new weapons.

"It is (also) imperative to maintain constantly a high level of medical research activity as a protection to us in war. Such research must be stimulated and supported to the extent which may prove necessary, to the maximum potential of the skilled manpower available to conduct it."

I might add that the Budget Bureau has not lived up to this recommendation with regard to mental health research, because it has ignored the backlog of approved but unpaid projects amounting to over a half million dollars, as well as the estimated new applications to be approved during fiscal year 1950-51 of \$825,000,000 (based on last year's experience). But even this would put into operation only the existing potential of the research apparatus. What we must do is to expand the existing potential of research, if we are to cut down the pile-up of patients, and the voracious attack on the Public Treasury now made by mental illness.

Everyone is now conscious of the fact that in our Nation we have an aging population. That means that a larger and larger proportion of Americans will be in the group over 40 years of age in the years to come.

The proportion of patients who are victims of the diseases of middle and old age, that is, the chronic diseases, will grow larger. Right now a count on an average day would show that five out of every six hospital patients in the Nation are there because of a chronic disease. Three out of that five are mental patients, or one-half the total. These mental patients are 97 percent in tax-supported hospitals. As the population ages in the years to come, the proportion of mental patients is going to increase if we continue to put so little into research and training.

Therefore as custodians of the public treasury, and as representatives of the taxpayer, we cannot keep mental health research and training at the present inadequate level.

Some people have said to me, "How can you say the President's budget asked for too little for research and training in this field? They have increased it for 1951 over 1950 by \$1,300,000." They have increased it but that is not the complete story. It is the purpose of research and training to cut down the cost of medical care, and especially of hospitalization, with its tremendous building programs. As long as the cost of maintaining and building hospitals is going up, that means not enough is being devoted to research and training. The test is not whether a few more dollars are being put into the research program than last year. The test is, are we putting enough into research and training to control mental illness in its most costly form, that is, maintenance of patients in hospitals.

That is the test, and the President's budget does not meet the test. It is not a question of blaming the Budget Bureau. That organization has a tremendously complicated task, the task of weighing off against each other countless items, to find out which are more important. On the other hand, we have a system of checks and balances in our Government, set up by the Constitution. If that system of checks and balances means anything, it means that Congress should in the interest of the people, change some of the items, when it encounters facts not taken into account by the Budget Bureau when it made its estimates.

Nobody can call it spending to increase these items of research and training, because actually it will save money in another item of the budget, that is, hospital operation and hospital building. Since the taxpayers are saddled now with the expense of maintaining the patients in hospitals, because we do not cure them, then we had better get down to the job of training people and finding new cures. We had better do it quickly, because if we do not, we will be pouring tens of millions of the taxpayers' money into the sand, because of our own neglect. I do not call that economy and I am against it.

It is an offense against the Nation as a whole, against every taxpayer in the country, against the innocent victims of mental disease, and against the conscience of every Member of Congress, to have a group of these research projects ready and waiting to go, to have next year's applications come in, with no money to carry them out. Who in this room could bear to count the number of patients sitting right now in the stench-filled backyards of our Nation's mental hospitals, doomed to a living death away from their fellow man—Americans who could be released to productive, incomparably happier lives, because of the new knowledge which could certainly come from this research activity? Who would dare to count the number of them that will be condemned to remain their helpless and dumb because we shrank from the task of finding the money to get them out?

And again, I ask, who will face the taxpayers who have to support these people in the hospitals, to the tune of half a billion and more every year? Who will do that when in 10 years the over-all hospital bill for these people will reach a cool billion annually?

I suppose it might be said, "All well and good, but where is the money coming from? We have to be practical."

I agree, we do have to be practical. But there are many places the money could come from. If we take the trouble to run down the budget and find \$10,000,000 items, we can find them. And we could find places where increases were made over last year's budget. We would not have to increase the deficit one penny.

I would take a look at all the roads that are planned to be built during the coming year, all the highways, expressways, intermediate roads, rural roads, all the wildlife

trails, and forest highways, and find three or four million dollars there which could be diverted to research and trained personnel to cure several thousand Americans who are victims of mental disease and who, without it, are going to be doomed to years of living death in the back wards of mental institutions all over our land. Are we going to legislate, as the will of the greatest Nation on earth, that a mile of back road costing \$10,000 is more important than a research or training project to apply or discover cures that can bring our own fellow-Americans forth from a mental hospital as from a tomb?

I have open in front of me, the proposed budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951. On page 1121, I see a table headed "Expenditures for civil public works." The second item calls for an increase of \$13,000,000 over the current year for public roads. I would take five million of that increase and build research and training facilities in the medical schools and mental hospitals of our land, and take a firm step toward cutting down the \$500,000,000 taxpayers now have to pay, because we build roads instead of research for mental health.

The ninth item in that table calls for an increase over last year of \$62,000,000 for "Public Buildings." These buildings are no doubt useful and in the general course of Government business are justifiable expenditures. But the sixty-two million is only the increase over last year. The total figure is one hundred and eleven million. These buildings would not pay for themselves many times over. These buildings would provide no more employment for our people in their construction than facilities for research. These buildings would not enable us to cut back on the construction of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of hospitals. But research laboratories and training facilities would do just that. They would in the long run make unnecessary hospital after hospital the country over. They would save money. These other buildings would not do that; they are straight spending, and then you have to spend more money to maintain them. These buildings would not save people, my own brother Americans, from a hopeless vegetating existence in some mental hospital. So I would cheerfully take five or ten million from that sixty-two million, and put it toward mental health research and training.

The last item on this table is called "All Other," and it calls for an increase of construction of some kind or other, for 1951, of sixty-three and a half million over 1950. And the total is one hundred and twenty-eight million. I do not know what the "All Other" refers to, but I am sure it will not pay for itself 10 or 15 times over. So, again, I would be in favor of tightening our belt on this item, whatever it is, and of taking ten million for medical research. Or perhaps I would cut out some of the cost-plus bidding in some of these contracts and save a few million that way and invest it in research and save money on hospital contracts later.

The money for research and training is there and it is not very hard to find if you just look for it. It is not a very good argument to say, as some do, that we have a deficit and cannot afford to spend the money on these projects and this research construction. In a few minutes I have shown where twice the money needed could be taken without anyone making any sacrifice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a report by the Department of the Air Force, a report by the Secretary of the Navy, and a report by the Department of the Army, all pertaining to material I requested in regard to the causes of physical disability

or rejections for service in the Armed Forces; and I also include in the request a copy of the letter I sent to the respective secretaries of the armed services.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 7, 1950.

Hon. FRANK PACE,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY PACE: I would like very much to get information as to the approximate total manpower sent overseas during the shooting phase of World War II from 1941 to 1945 in the following theaters of operation:

- European.
- Mediterranean.
- CBI (Ceylon, Burma, and India).
- Pacific.

What is the average strength of an Army division?

Please also furnish me with the following information:

1. The total number of men examined for military service during World War II.
2. The total number accepted for military service.
3. The total number rejected for—
 - (a) Medical reasons.
 - (b) Neuro-psychiatric reasons.
 - (c) All other reasons.
4. The total number of discharges after induction prior to cessation of hostilities—
 - (a) Medical reasons.
 - (b) Neuropsychiatric reasons.
 - (c) All other reasons.

I need this information as promptly as possible and I shall greatly appreciate your expediting the handling of my request.

With cordial good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, June 30, 1950.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I refer again to your letter of June 7, 1950, requesting information concerning Air Force personnel strength.

The figures covering the approximate total manpower sent overseas during World War II are not available to the Department of the Air Force, as during this period the Department of the Army consolidated totals for the entire Army, to include the Air Corps, which was then a part of the Army.

Organizationwise, the Air division is comparable to the Army division. However, the Air division may actually be described as an Air task force and its size and composition depends on the situation under which it is operating. As such, there is no figure that may be quoted as to average strength.

During World War II, the Air Corps did no recruiting and thus no figures are available as to the number of men examined, accepted, or rejected. Since Selective Service examined all men, it was not until after they had been examined that men were actually assigned to the various services. The number of discharges for medical reasons from the Air Corps after induction, during the years 1942, 1943, and 1944, are listed below:

	Officers	Enlisted	Total
Total medical.....	2,238	103,060	105,298
Neuropsychiatric.....	886	42,174	43,060
Other causes.....	1,352	60,886	62,238

Also, attached hereto is a study entitled "Analysis of the Causes of Disqualification of 164,687 Applicants Rejected for Aviation Training," which it is thought will be of

interest to you in your study of these matters.

I have checked with the Department of the Army and have been informed that they are furnishing you detailed information on the questions posed in your letter. The Air Corps figures are included in the Department of the Army figures but are not recorded separately.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN A. McCONE,
Under Secretary of the Air Force.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, June 28, 1950.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am pleased to forward below the information that can be made available in answer to the questions contained in your letter of June 7, 1950, concerning naval personnel.

Records of the total naval manpower sent overseas during the war to the various theaters of operations were not maintained. However, the peak strength of naval personnel in these theaters was as follows:

Theater	Peak strength	Date
European (continental).....	49,801	Nov. 30, 1944
North Atlantic (ashore and afloat).....	150,046	June 30, 1944
Mediterranean (ashore and afloat).....	90,175	Aug. 31, 1944
CBI (Ceylon, Burma, and India).....	(1)	
Pacific (ashore and afloat).....	1,366,716	Aug. 31, 1945

¹ Not available.

There is no Navy combat unit comparable to an Army Division. The wartime complement of an aircraft carrier is approximately 3,500 men, battleship 2,500, cruiser 1,700, and destroyer 350. Numbers of these ships together with necessary transports and auxiliaries were formed into a task force, the composition of which depended upon the mission to be accomplished and the availability of vessels.

Information is not available concerning the total number of personnel examined for service in the Navy during World War II. A total of 3,546,179 persons entered the naval service during that period.

The Bureau of Medicine and Surgery has record of the examination by Navy medical officers of 2,449,925 applicants for service in the Navy. These personnel are exclusive of selective-service inductees. The records show rejections for medical reasons prior to entry into the service of these applicants as follows:

Mental reasons..... 12,843
All other medical reasons..... 568,212

Total rejected for medical reasons..... 581,055

Information on the number of rejections of these personnel for administrative reasons (overage, police record, etc.) is not available.

During the period of World War II 485,006 persons were discharged or separated from the Navy for all reasons. The records of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery show the following invalidated from the service during that period:

Mental reasons (plus combat and operational fatigue)..... 86,008
All other medical reasons..... 179,479

Total invalidated from service. 265,487

I trust that the foregoing information satisfactorily answers your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,
DAN A. KIMBALL,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1950.
Hon. HUBERT A. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: In reply to your request for certain manpower statistics pertaining to the combat phases of World War II, a compilation has been made of the available figures. The results of their research are attached hereto as tabs A, B, and C.

It was impossible in many instances to furnish the exact data requested. For example, answers to the question relating to inductions could be obtained only from Selective Service data and consequently includes men inducted for the Navy as well as the Army. In all cases Army figures include Air Force since that service was then a branch of the Army.

The information contained in the attached tabs is the best available in the Department of the Army and I trust that it will be of assistance to you. If additional information is needed, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,
JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

PASSENGERS, INCLUDING TROOPS AND OTHERS
UNDER ARMY JURISDICTION, EMBARKED BY
SURFACE CARRIER FROM THE UNITED STATES
TO THE THEATERS OF OPERATIONS LISTED
BELOW ¹

Dec. 1, 1941–Aug. 31, 1945	
European.....	3,344,063
Mediterranean (including Central Africa and Middle East).....	1,071,642
China-Burma-India.....	253,492
Pacific ²	2,171,511

¹ Totals include Navy, Allied personnel, civilians, and prisoners of war moved on ships in Army service. A detailed break-out to show troops alone is not possible but the percentage of miscellaneous personnel is so small as to be negligible for all practical purposes.

² Does not include troops sent to Alaska.

Source: Statistical Review, World War II, Army Service Forces, War Department.

NOTE.—This tabulation does not include the small percentage of troops and other War Department personnel transported overseas by air transport, the statistics on which are not available.

World War II division strengths	
Type of division:	Average strength
Infantry.....	14,477
Mountain (Infantry).....	15,185
Airborne.....	12,842
Cavalry.....	13,054
Armored.....	11,339

By way of comparison the table of organization strengths of the present day types of divisions are shown below:

Type of division:	T. O. & E. strength
Infantry.....	18,839
Airborne.....	16,265
Airborne.....	16,265

Induction statistics	
1. Estimated number physically examined ¹	17,684,700
Acceptable.....	12,435,500
Rejected.....	5,249,200
2. Principal causes for rejection: ¹	
Manifestly disqualifying defects.....	510,500
Mental disease ²	856,200
Mental deficiency.....	676,300
Physical defects.....	2,708,700

3. Separations from the Armed Forces through Aug. 31, 1945: ¹	T. O. & E. strength
Medical.....	1,067,256
Unadaptable.....	445,246

4. Army separations from Jan. 1, 1942 through 1945: ³	
Neuro-psychiatrics.....	395,343
Medical reasons.....	604,109
Other.....	163,091

¹ Includes both Army and Navy inductees.
² Majority of psychoneurotics are included in this category.

³ Data furnished by Surgeon General, United States Army.

Source: "Physical Examination of Selective Service Registrants," Special Monograph No. 15, Vol. 1, Text, published by Selective Service System, 1947.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a letter I received from Dr. Donald W. Hastings, professor and head of the Department of Psychiatry and Neurology, University of Minnesota; and also a telegram which I have recently received from Dr. William C. Menninger, of the Menninger Institute, at Topeka, Kans.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
THE MEDICAL SCHOOL,
Minneapolis, April 29, 1949.
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I wish to thank you most appreciatively for your telegram and for the action which you took on the Senate floor in behalf of the funds to be given to the National Mental Health Act. It is heartening to realize that this most humanitarian cause has such a good friend in court.

At the risk of repeating information with which you are already well acquainted, I would like to pass on to you a few observations from the psychiatrist's standpoint, particularly from the standpoint of the psychiatrist occupied primarily with teaching and research. It is well known to you how immense is the problem presented by actually psychotic patients requiring hospitalization, and how much larger are the problems presented by the multitudes of people who have crippling neuroses, alcoholism, marital discord, certain types of criminality, etc. However, I think only a professional worker in the field is in a position to realize adequately how pitifully small is the body of sound scientific knowledge which we possess in trying to unlock these riddles, and how few are the well-trained hands and minds to help. The fundamental keys in this whole situation are (1) research and (2) training of personnel to do service, teaching, and research.

Research and training take money, and they take a lot of it. Cancer, tuberculosis, and poliomyelitis, by way of example, are similar problems which require similar help but alongside the size of the mental-health problem they are almost statistically insignificant.

Funds for training and research are not easy to come by, and up until the Congress in 1946 enacted the Mental Health Act, such funds were peculiarly difficult to come by in the field of mental health. The Mental Health Act, I can assure you from personal observation, has given this whole venture a much-needed shot in the arm, to date a small shot it is true, but nevertheless a shot. Judged by the local situation, the United

States Public Health Service has been careful in the administration of these funds. In any event, it seems to me tremendously important that the Congress gradually expand these funds for training and research compatible with the ability of the training and research centers to use them wisely, and this is a determination, it seems to me, which the United States Public Health Service is in the best position to make.

Again my sincere thanks for your help.
Most sincerely,

DONALD W. HASTINGS, M.D.,
Professor and Head, Department of
Psychiatry and Neurology.

TOPEKA, KANS., July 12, 1950.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In the name of 8,000,000 victims of serious mental illness, both civilian and veteran, in order to build a strong manpower to preserve our security in war and to protect the Public Treasury against gigantic costs for the hospitalization of mental patients who cannot be treated for lack of personnel, I urge you to vote and work to secure other votes for Humphrey amendment on Senate floor increasing appropriation to \$16,000,000 for mental health research and training, including construction and project grants.

WILLIAM C. MENNINGER, M. D.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, to begin with, I wish to state that I have no criticism whatever to make of the distinguished Senator who has been chairman of the subcommittee, for I understand the problem with which he and the other members of the subcommittee have been faced. I wish them to understand that I am fully sympathetic with their situation and the way in which they have found it necessary to resolve it.

However, I regret that I cannot agree with their findings. For that reason, I rise to speak in behalf of the amendment.

Mr. President, with billion-dollar expenditures for waging war the order of the day, an appropriation for the expansion of basic medical research—aimed at saving human life—is a happy one.

The purpose of this amendment is to enlarge training programs for medical research scientists, and extend study facilities in hospitals, medical schools, and universities. The proposed increase is a four-pronged attack on human suffering caused by cancer, mental illness, heart diseases, and dental defects.

Although the amendment proposes an increase of \$64,000,000 above the amount allowed by the Senate committee, examination of specific items reveals the compelling necessity for each expenditure.

For instance, the \$16,750,000 sum proposed for cancer research, would be broken down to provide \$7,000,000 for the conduct and expansion of existing research projects, \$9,000,000 for further laboratory construction so that additional study may be carried on, and \$750,000 to augment the technical training program for personnel.

The problem we are dealing with inspires the imagination of one who real-

izes that unless great advances in medical science are made, the next 5 years will see over 1,000,000 people die of cancer alone. The task before us is clear. What is needed is more and better training for young scientists, expanded efforts to develop effective diagnostic tests, and more laboratories equipped with the best that modern science can provide.

Progress is presently underway toward all these goals, but thus far funds have been sadly lacking. It is to remedy this defect that the proposed increase in appropriation has been offered.

The same glaring need for funds can be seen in the inadequacy of present research facilities for heart disease, mental illness, and dental health. Research aimed at discovery of causes and cures for each of these blighting diseases is a powerful force in alleviating misery.

One factor—not previously emphasized—which makes this increase especially necessary now is the present difficulty in securing top-flight medical personnel to engage in Government-financed research projects. Medical research specialists hesitate to cast their lot with a program which might be unstable or uncertain for lack of definite and continuing congressional policy. We must assert our support and approval of this worthy medical research project in terms that leave no doubt as to our future intentions.

We have before us a proposal that will bring human progress—in a real sense—beyond the realistic comprehension of anyone here. It is a truly noble task—the elimination of human suffering and disease.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield 2 minutes more, making it seven, so the Senator may have 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, since the 24th of last June—a period of 39 days—the blood-red Communist hordes of northern Korea, with bombers, tanks, and all the other modern weapons of war, to our unfeigned sorrow and everlasting regret, killed, all told, 109 of the Armed Forces of the United States in battle. During the last 24 hours cancer has killed 561 of the men, women, and children of this country.

During the entire Second World War all the Axis Powers, with unlimited supplies of the most deadly weapons that had ever been devised, killed only 273,000 of the millions whom we sent to the front to win for humanity the most destructive of all wars. But in the same period in which these enemies of democracy destroyed 273,000 precious American lives cancer killed a total of 501,019 of the American people.

According to an official report of the Treasury, the United States spent, on the average, \$221,043,000 every day of the

Second World War in order to conquer our Axis foes. But during the entire period of that war the appropriations of public funds to combat cancer, the most terrifying, agonizing and irresistible of all human scourges, amounted to less than \$25,000,000—less than it cost to defray our expense of the Second World War for 3 hours.

And please remember that, day for day, cancer killed nearly twice as many as were killed by the minions who warred against us from the attack on Pearl Harbor until our final victory was won. This contrast between the liberality with which this Nation appropriated money for defense against military aggression and our neglect to provide funds with which to combat cancer, defies comprehension, stuns the mind, and bewilders the imagination.

Forty years ago cancer was the No. 7 killer among the deadly diseases of the United States. But in the succeeding years this scourge gained on all its competing afflictions until 1938 when it became, and ever since has continued to be, the No. 2 killer of the Nation.

Within the memory of the living the death rate from cancer in this and every other land has regularly, persistently, and disastrously increased by leaps and bounds. In 1928, when I passed through this body the first anticancer bill ever approved by either House of the Congress, cancer was on the average destroying one of our people every 5 minutes and 30 seconds. In the United States last year, every time the clock ticked off 2 minutes and 30 seconds cancer sent some man, woman, or child to the dissolution of the grave. Our total cancer deaths last year reached the appalling total of 205,000.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, please come with me down the corridor of tribulation for a final farewell visit with 561 of our fellow human beings, the majority of whom will, in horrifying agony, die of cancer during the next 24 hours. If these pitiful sufferers should be arranged in the order in which they would set out upon their journey to the undiscovered country from whose bourn no traveler returns, the first one we should see would die within the next 2 minutes and 30 seconds, the second within the next 5 minutes, and so on, until this time tomorrow when the last of the 561 would have passed through the gruesome slaughterhouse, which the insatiate cancer monster tirelessly, ceaselessly, and relentlessly operates against all mankind.

At the conclusion of our visit with these 561 who had just passed into the silent land, it would be well to remember that 20,000,000 more of those living in this country will eventually be destroyed by this most distressing of all diseases.

When voting on the proposal for an increase of \$17,000,000 additional funds with which to fight cancer, please remember these simple facts: If the United States were in the regular shape of a rectangle, the entire length of its boundary line would be approximately 7,000 miles. If all the 20,000,000 who have been branded for death by cancer should be buried in a single unbroken line, it

would be necessary for the grave to be long enough to reach twice around this entire 7,000-mile boundary and extend an additional distance as great as that from Boston to Washington.

This, in brief, is the flesh and blood element of the problem to which it is sincerely hoped the Senate will give its most serious and generous consideration. But manifestly an important financial element is involved in this matter because the amendment before us contains a request for an increase of \$17,000,000 in the appropriation for the war on cancer. Please consider a few statistics which speak to the point.

On the basis formulated by Dr. Luis I. Dublin, noted statistician for the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., care and medicine for those who died of cancer in this country last year cost \$205,000,000. And upon the basis supplied by the same statistician when the economic value of those destroyed by the disease is added to the cost of the medicine and care bestowed upon the victims it appears that the world's No. 2 killer in the year 1949 extorted from the American people more than \$1,400,000,000.

For many years cancer has been steadily gaining on all the doctors and all the other scientists who have been fighting the battle against this dread disease. Medical science has conquered yellow fever, diphtheria, typhoid, smallpox, and many other dire afflictions. Medical science has even robbed leprosy and tuberculosis of their terrors. But in spite of all that physicians, surgeons, chemists, biologists, and all other scientists have amazingly accomplished, cancer is still the unconquered, unconquerable, and defiant foe of the human race. Radium, X-ray, and the surgeon's knife are the only generally approved means of combating this frightful destroyer. Every passing year adds to the demonstrations that cancer cannot be annihilated by these or any other known means, and that it is impossible, with available funds, existing facilities, and present methods to stay the progressive acceleration of its horrifying destruction in this or any other country.

For generations the world has been waging war against cancer with bows and arrows and other primitive weapons of the Stone Age. In this life-and-death struggle no country has yet supplied its scientists with sufficient funds to enable them to advance even to the age of the flintlock musket. And while we persist in feebly resisting cancer in the manner approved in our grandmother's days, this cannibalistic monster "laughs at our calamity and mocks at our fear when it cometh as desolation."

The adoption of the proposed amendment to increase the appropriation for cancer cure and prevention will enable a host of competent, eager scientists, who have long been handicapped by a lack of funds, to exchange their useless bows and arrows for weapons as modern as this afternoon, and with them proceed to win victories in keeping with the

general, hopeful, prayerful expectations of the atomic age that now prevails.

When voting on the amendment which proposes the \$17,000,000 increase in the appropriation for the present or prospective victims of cancer, let us find inspiration in the example set by the distinguished Walter Winchell who, by the most generous use of his extraordinary voice and pen, has during the last 3 years raised \$3,750,000 for the Damon Runyon Fund for cancer research. The value of the services to the present and future victims of cancer which have been or will be provided with these funds is beyond the power of computation.

Mr. Winchell is entitled to the unlimited gratitude of every humanitarian in the land for his unsurpassable service in throwing out the lifeline to an innumerable throng of suffering humanity by speeding the final conquest of the greatest scourge that has ever descended upon the human race.

Mr. President and fellow Members of the Senate, let us fully live up to our present opportunity by voting for increased funds with which to destroy the great destroyer and thus help to provide means which may heal multitudes of the afflicted, comfort throngs of the disconsolate, and bring faith, hope, and courage to millions who are in distress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

THE PORTLAND PLAN

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, it is only natural for all of us to have a deep pride in our home State as well as our country. But every once in a while something happens back in our home State that makes us straighten our shoulders and stand a little taller in genuine pride.

Today the Maine congressional delegation stands a little taller and with shoulders squared because of something that has happened back in my beloved State of Maine. This coming Sunday evening will mark the launching of the Portland plan. The Portland plan will be a campaign against hoarding. It will be a voluntary campaign on the part of private rank-and-file citizens who recognize that patriotism is not always measured in military uniforms but as well in civilian restraint.

It will not be an involuntary rationing-control program invoked by the Government. It will be American civilian patriotism at its best. I hope with all my heart that the Portland plan launched in Portland, Maine, on Sunday will spread to the four corners of our country and be a crushing victory over the challenge of selfish, hysterical hoarding.

The story of the Portland plan requires no elaborate presentation. It is simply told in its slogan of "Hoarding helps communism." Those three words speak such telling truth that any additional words are mere surplusage.

I commend the Portland plan to every Member of Congress and to every Ameri-

can for adoption in his own State, city, and home.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the details of the Portland plan, the pledge card which goes with it, and also the story which brought about the Portland plan. It is very worth while and is most interesting, I think.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PORTLAND PLAN

Purpose: To conduct a campaign and to obtain signatures of the majority of citizens in the community pledging not to hoard.

Name of organization: Home Defenders of Freedom.

Slogan: "Hoarding helps communism."

Pledge: "As a patriotic American, I wish to be counted as one of the Home Defenders of Freedom. I pledge that I will not buy more than my normal needs during this war emergency."

"I make this pledge because I know that in so doing I am making a very real contribution to the cause of freedom and the security of my country."

Anticipated result: If this campaign is successfully completed in many communities, the trend toward scare buying and hoarding can be stopped, prices stabilized, and all the gyrations of prices and supply of basic commodities at retail, wholesale, and manufacturing level can be overcome and stopped.

Sponsors of program: Local chamber of commerce and retail trade board.

Result of sponsorship: Local business can for the first time organize a cooperative consumer effort to protect the individual's economic security. If we fail and prices rise and scarcities begin, it is the local merchant who, because of his direct contact with the consumer, will take the blame.

Plan of operation: A suitable promotional and advertising build-up is planned in advance of a mass meeting which provides a kick-off for this program. The promotional technique used includes radio, newspaper, theater trailers, bus signs, slugs in advertising, loud-speaker announcements at race tracks and ball games, and any other vehicle that can be thought up.

Mass meeting August 6 at stadium: The Governor, Senators, and Congressional Representatives are present and speaking; the city manager is chairman of the meeting and master of ceremonies. Other guests, such as from theater circles, are invited. Attempts are made to get whatever national figures are available. The mass meeting is preceded by a parade—parade to include units of the National Guard who are likely to be called into service and veterans' organizations, including such bands as may be available. The mass meeting is held at night; efforts made to obtain national radio coverage. The conclusion of the meeting is a mass verbal pledge by the assemblage.

Campaign August 7 through August 12: Campaign for 1 week—booths set up in as many retail stores, banks, theaters as possible—complete distribution in all grocery stores in area as well. The individual signs the pledge which is placed in a box and eventually returned to headquarters for counting. For this pledge he or she received buttons to be worn for the entire family and two stickers—one for the automobile and one for home. Speakers will be on call to go to large industrial units in order to reach many hundreds or even thousands at one meeting and obtain pledges at that time. During the week publicity is organized with many photographs, radio interviews of the average citizen consumer at the time of

pledge, as well as any and all comments by the people and by well-known personages. Advertising slugs to be in newspaper by all advertisers possible.

Follow-up: A continued follow-up to be made to request patriotic citizens who have signed pledges to continue wearing their buttons, particularly while shopping, in order to be counted as one of those who refuses to hoard.

Greater Portland, a community of 100,000, will be the first community in this country to inaugurate a voluntary cooperative pledging of its thousands of citizens to become home defenders of freedom, and to pledge not to hoard because they believe that hoarding helps communism. Portland can set the example for the entire country because the same action can be taken in every community in America, no matter how large and no matter how small. The effort alone will immeasurably contribute to the spiritual strength and courage of our people.

Although there may be battles and wars in Korea and in other far distant lands, the real conclusive battle between the ideologies of communism and democracy will be fought and won or lost on our own home front. We can lose our freedom and democratic way of life without having a single Russian soldier set foot on our continent. The deterioration of our home front can be the means of our self-destruction.

The individual is confused, not only about whether or not there will be a world war III but he is confused about whether or not there will be scarcities of commodities, and inflation. Individual confusion multiplied by millions of people can bring about economic chaos. We can witness each individual helping to bring about the destruction of our economic stability, just as a horse bringing about self-destruction by heedlessly rushing back into the burning barn. On the other hand, if the individual knows his neighbor will not hoard he in turn will not hoard, and that destructive process will stop. It is lack of unity of purpose which is so dangerous. Portland can provide an example of unity in a community. In unity of purpose such as no hoarding can be and will be economic safety.

There is no other decision that the people can make today that will contribute more to real civilian defense than the simple decision of self-restraint in buying. Continued panic buying will bring about needless scarcities, increase the cost of living, depreciate the value of savings and insurance, and will needlessly add billions to the cost of war preparations, which will ultimately result in a breakdown of our national financial security.

No hoarder who thereby helps the cause of communism can possibly have self-respect.

In 1932, President Roosevelt gave courage to the people of this country by stating simply, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." Today we have nothing to fear but the lack of our own self-restraint. The hoarder at home does this country more harm than a thousand Communists in Russia.

On our western shores the first civilian air-raid warning posts have gone into 24-hour operation. Our greater danger lies not from without but from within. Have we the spirit to maintain a patriotic home front? As United States Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH said in her column of July 24, "The point is that no one can gain from hoarding food or other commodities by Americans—except Joe Stalin and his associates."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator from

Maine failed to utilize 2 minutes of her time. Does the Senator from Tennessee wish to yield that 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Maine?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yielded 5 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Maine did not use 2 minutes of her time. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield 2 minutes to her colleague?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I want very heartily to second what my colleague [Mrs. SMITH] has so appropriately said, and to invite the attention not alone of the women of the country, but of the men as well, as they have apparently been coequal, and also the attention of the Senate to the cartoon on hoarding drawn by Mr. Berryman, which I hope will appear in many places outside of Washington, because I do not think the message is needed in Washington alone.

I may say in connection with what has been referred to as the Portland plan, that as the boys go away to war, and as the supporters of the Portland plan say farewell to them, they ask all who remain behind to pledge themselves not to hoard, as the best method of fighting communism. The poster which is being used in Washington will also be used in Maine and, I trust, in many other places. It shows men as well as women indulging in this nefarious and unfortunate practice of hoarding while our boys are overseas.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point some additional remarks which I shall send to the desk, which go more fully into the subject now pending before the Senate. Following that, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a statement on the so-called Magnuson amendment to which I have the honor to be a party, and an explanation of the effect of that amendment.

I also ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement submitted to the Bureau of the Budget by the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart Institute, the Mental Health Institute, and the Dental Health Institute, showing the great need for additional funds for research in these fields.

I should add, Mr. President, that the funds which are requested are not adequate at the present time, because new needs have risen since the estimates were submitted.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD at the end of Senator PEPPER's statement.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it was said a moment ago by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, whom I

commend for his heartfelt interest in this subject and for his gracious indulgence to his colleagues in the presentation of the amendment, that he had a responsibility. The able chairman of the subcommittee referred to his responsibility to the subcommittee of which he has the honor to be the chairman. But, Mr. President, the Senate, while recognizing its responsibility to its distinguished committee, to the chairman of the full committee, and to the chairman of the subcommittee, has a higher responsibility—a responsibility to the people of the United States of America, who, day by day and year by year, are dying from the anguish of cancer and from the greatest killer of them all, heart disease, from the vagaries of mental disease and disability, and from all that follows in the wake of dental diseases and disability as well.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I stated that the Senate had the greater responsibility in this particular matter.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. The Senator was very able and fair in the way he handled the matter.

Mr. President, it is refreshing that in the midst of death and making provision for killing people, the Senate pauses to make provision for life and the saving of the human personality and the lengthening of human life.

Mr. President, the total amount provided by this amendment is \$79,750,000. Surely, Mr. President, the Senate will vote for this amendment to save countless lives as a result of improved research in these vital health fields.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEPPER

There is not one of us here who has not time and again first agonized with the suffering of a loved one and then felt the heavy hand of premature death within our own homes. Beyond these walls, throughout all the homes in this land, there is hardly one that has not known cancer or heart disease or mental illness.

This intimate universal knowledge of the consequences of these diseases has made it comparatively easy to secure private and public funds with which to fight them. Because of this fact, the human and natural thing is to approach these problems by instinct and emotion, rather than with the methods of logic, or the balance sheet, or an inventory of national resources.

The speakers in support of this amendment have emphasized its importance to national strength in terms of a healthier population and of increased scientific manpower for an era when science may ultimately mean the difference between national freedom and national subjugation.

I know those who have thought on this subject share the utter conviction of the necessity for more research if we hope ever to reduce the terrible and steadily mounting public cost of caring for the victims of long-term disabling illnesses such as cancer, heart disease, mental disease, arthritis, multiple sclerosis, and the many others which cannot now be prevented or cured.

As you all know, I have been especially interested in health and medical problems throughout my years in the Senate. I co-sponsored the bills on which are based the laws establishing the cancer, heart, mental, and dental research programs. It has been a source of real satisfaction for me through all of these years that political and

personal differences are nearly always cast aside by my colleagues here when we are considering the appropriations for medical research. For the most part our only differences have been upon the question of the most effective methods.

I think our main concern here and now is the question of method. Upon this question I do not see any real differences among us. In the testimony of experts before our committees, and from our past experience, there can be derived only one answer as to method—and that is more research.

Research by whom? Again there is only one answer—research by scientists in our medical and dental schools, hospitals, and laboratories. It does not matter where they are nor whether they are operated by government or under private auspices.

Research requires more than highly trained men and women. They must have a roof over their head and walls around them. They must have laboratory benches, and chemicals, and they must frequently have complicated and expensive apparatus.

These people and these things require money. They require time. The time and the money are in inverse ratio. The less money, the more time; the more money, the less time.

This amendment, therefore, is simply buying time, because we believe time is important.

What assurances do we have that more effective methods for the prevention and control of the chronic disabling illnesses can be had in less time if we spend more money for this purpose now? Actually, there is no absolute assurance. However, past performance in medical research when it is given liberal financial support give every reason to believe that results well worth the expenditure will be forthcoming.

Let me briefly sketch for you a few of the advances which would not have been possible had not large sums of public and private funds been made available to medical scientists in the last few years.

For the first time in history effective treatment drugs for arthritis are available. These drugs are also of great value in treating a wide variety of other serious ailments for which no effective treatment had hitherto existed. ACTH and cortisone and similar compounds would not now be at their present stage of development had not two great industrial organizations devoted millions of dollars to basic research in cooperation with scientists at Mayo Bros. and other medical-research institutions.

Penicillin would not have been available to save the lives of thousands of American soldiers and civilians in the last war had not both industry and Government poured scores of millions of dollars into research which quickly found the means for large-scale production. The Senators should remember also that the very real hope we now have for conquering syphilis in the next few years would not have been possible had not sizable Federal appropriations permitted the mass testing of penicillin as a treatment for this disease.

These few examples, however, only show the dramatic end results of research speeded up by additional money. They reveal the one-third of the iceberg that can be seen above the ocean's surface. Unseen are the years—even generations—of basic investigations, usually hampered by lack of money, lack of space, lack of manpower and equipment, because of the lack of public understanding and interest.

However, in recent years the Congress has recognized the need for basic research and has liberally supported the efforts by the Public Health Service to solve in its own laboratories some of the basic problems which form the submerged two-thirds of the problems of chronic disease. The Congress has also supported basic private research in these fields by authorizing the Public Health

Service to allocate Federal funds to research projects in our universities and research hospitals throughout the country.

Let me tell you of just a few of the basic advances which have been made in these public and private institutions which give us reason to believe that increased support will bring the desired results sooner. In the last few years in the laboratories of the Public Health Service's National Cancer Institute, out of thousands of chemicals tested for their ability to produce cancer, more than 300 have been found capable of producing tumors in various species of animals. This may lead to precise knowledge regarding the cause and prevention of cancer in humans due to environmental causes.

This same Government agency has developed a technique for growing large cultures of cancer cells, and also of normal cells, from a single cell taken from various parts of the body. This accomplishment greatly increases the possibility of ultimately developing cancer-destroying drugs and of finding out the cause of cancer.

This same group just last year developed a new method for the production of a substance hitherto very scarce which is of critical value in the diagnosis and treatment of cancer of the prostate.

In the National Heart Institute, which was established by congressional action only 2 years ago, cooperative studies with various medical schools have shown that in addition to German measles during pregnancy, congenital heart disease can be caused by other conditions such as mumps, prolonged bleeding, and diarrhea. They have also found a method for producing in animals certain heart conditions which the scientists are confident will lead to the discovery of new methods for treating these conditions in human patients.

Research in private institutions aided by Heart Institute grants has developed techniques for grafting arteries that have been injured in warfare or by industrial and automobile accidents. This means that a condition which formerly resulted frequently in thrombosis, or required amputation, may now be treated with greater chance of success.

Valuable new knowledge of the effect of diet on high-blood pressure is just another one of the many other important achievements recently recorded by joint Federal and private research in the field of heart disease.

The National Institute of Mental Health has just recently reported important new research evidence on the dangers from indiscriminate use of certain types of sleeping pills. In this connection, some years ago these scientists also developed methods of testing whether any new drug or compound is likely to prove habit-forming in man. Without this knowledge it is unquestionable that thousands of Americans might have become drug addicts before the need of controlling certain new drugs was discovered.

Important new basic knowledge on multiple sclerosis; on the psychological effects of certain types of brain surgery; and in the whole field of psychological and psychiatric testing have arisen from research done in this agency or by private institutions aided by Federal grants.

The National Institute of Dental Research, whose scientists pioneered in the discovery that fluoride would prevent the formation of cavities in children and young people, has moved on into the study of the dental diseases which cause nearly every older person endless expense, suffering, and disability. There is not time to describe to you now the several important, fundamental discoveries which have already come as a direct result of increased appropriations for dental research made by the Congress in the last year or so.

I could go back into the history of the National Institutes of Health and describe to

you scores of extremely important research accomplishments with respect to such infectious diseases as typhus, Rocky Mountain spotted fever, rabies, Q fever, hookworm, pellagra, encephalitis, and amoebic dysentery. But I am confining myself to the chronic diseases which are acknowledged to be our greatest medical problems of today.

This amendment would permit intensified support of a program which has already aided nongovernmental investigators in the last few years to develop for the first time a very promising new treatment for stomach ulcers. It has aided in the discovery of the danger of incompatible blood types between mother and the newborn child, which has already resulted in a saving of the lives of thousands of infants. Grants have materially aided such other work of great importance such as that which should soon result in vastly increasing the supply and reducing the price of ACTH and cortisone.

The period which I have discussed is a period of increased congressional interest in medical research. It began in 1938 when the Congress made its first appropriation to the National Cancer Institute. That appropriation was \$400,000. For the next 9 years, the cancer appropriations seldom exceeded \$500,000 annually. In 1947, the Congress surveyed the results of these first years and decided to increase its support. That year the appropriation was about four and a quarter million dollars. Each year since, the appropriation has been increased until last year it amounted to approximately \$21,000,000.

Other speakers have told you the details of how this money has been spent and have shown you that increased Federal appropriations have stimulated increased non-Federal expenditure for medical research. Here are some figures. Over this same period, public contributions to the annual campaign of the American Cancer Society have grown from around \$200,000 to approximately \$14,000,000 in 1949.

Our appropriations for heart disease started with \$1,600,000 in 1948 and totaled around \$16,000,000 last year.

In fiscal 1946, only \$34,000 was appropriated for heart research; in 1947, \$416,000; in 1948, \$1,650,000; in 1949, \$2,835,000; in 1950, \$16,075,000; a total of \$21,010,000 for the 5-year period.

Over this same period, public contributions to the appeal of the American Heart Association have approximately doubled. Much the same story could be told about other organized public drives. Increased Federal expenditures have stimulated increased private support of research.

The national mental health research program was approved by Congress in 1946. Congressional appropriations in fiscal 1947 were less than \$50,000; in 1948, \$5,086,000; in 1949, \$8,783,000; in 1950, \$10,015,000; a total of about \$24,000,000 for mental health research activities in this 4-year period.

The pattern and the path is clear. Properly supported, scientists can solve many of our most pressing medical problems. Experience and logic have shown that the greater the support the sooner the solution.

If we desire to speed the day of greater national strength, productivity, health, and happiness and the day when costs of caring for the chronically ill are reduced, there is only one answer. We must support this amendment.

EFFECTS OF THE MAGNUSON AMENDMENT FOR CANCER ACTIVITIES

Increases the amount for grants for research projects by \$7,212,500.

Increases the amount for awards for research fellowships by \$250,000.

Adds \$9,000,000 for construction of research facilities.

Increases the amount for grants for training stipends by \$375,000.

Increases the amount for direct research by \$44,000.

Increases the amount for other direct activities by \$118,500.

FOR MENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

Increases the amount for grants for research projects by \$1,164,000.

Increases the amount for awards for research fellowships by \$50,000.

Increases the amount for grants for expansion of teaching of subjects relating to mental illness by \$2,991,000.

Increases the amount for grants for training stipends by \$910,000.

Adds \$8,000,000 for construction of research facilities.

Increases the amount for grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other preventive and control services by \$1,200,000.

Increases the amount for direct research by \$900,700.

Increases the amount for other direct activities by \$784,300.

FOR HEART ACTIVITIES

Increases the amount for grants for research projects by \$6,700,000.

Increases the amount for awards for research fellowships by \$1,000,000.

Adds \$18,000,000 for construction of research facilities.

Increases the amount for grants for expansion of teaching of medical subjects relating to heart diseases by \$800,000.

Increases the amount for grants for training stipends by \$500,000.

Increases the amount for grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other control activities by \$1,000,000.

FOR DENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

Adds \$1,100,000 for construction grants.

Adds \$1,900,000 for construction of intramural research facilities.

Number and amount of research grants in fiscal 1950 by the United States Public Health Service

Item	Number	Amount
Heart.....	388	\$3,964,057
Cancer.....	316	2,708,082
Mental.....	75	805,408
Dental.....	37	205,248
General.....	712	5,917,156
Total.....	1,528	13,599,951

The following is a comparison of the requests made by the United States Public Health Service and the amounts allowed by the Bureau of the Budget for the National Cancer Institute, National Heart Institute, the mental and dental health activities in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951:

Operating expenses, National Cancer Institute

	Agency estimates, 1951 ¹	Bureau of the Budget allowances, 1951	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Grants:			
1. Grants to medical and dental schools and other institutions and individuals for research and training:			
(a) Research projects.....	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	0
(b) Research fellowships.....	500,000	500,000	0
(c) Construction of research facilities.....	9,000,000	0	-\$9,000,000
(d) Teaching of medical subjects.....	2,250,000	2,250,000	0
(e) Training stipends.....	375,000	375,000	0
2. Grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other control services.....	3,500,000	3,500,000	0
3. Grants for special control projects.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	0
Direct operations:			
1. Research.....	3,786,000	3,756,000	-\$30,000
2. Other direct operations:			
(a) Technical assistance to States.....	428,000	422,000	-\$6,000
(b) Review and approval of research and training grants.....	85,000	85,000	0
(c) Administration.....	411,000	408,000	-\$3,000
3. Pay increases.....	192,800	190,000	-\$2,800
Total obligations.....	24,127,800	15,086,000	-\$9,041,800
Liquidating cash.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	0
Total.....	29,127,800	20,086,000	-\$9,041,800

¹ Excludes estimates for forward financing.

Operating expenses, National Heart Institute

	Agency estimates, 1951 ¹	Bureau of the Budget allowances, 1951	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Grants:			
1. Grants to medical schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training:			
(a) Research projects.....	\$4,120,000	\$3,820,000	-\$300,000
(b) Research fellowships.....	300,000	300,000	0
(c) Construction of research facilities.....	18,000,000	0	-\$18,000,000
(d) Expansion of teaching of medical subjects relating to heart diseases.....	1,161,000	741,000	-\$420,000
(e) Training stipends.....	150,000	150,000	0
2. Grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other control activities.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	0
Direct operations:			
1. Research.....	2,990,354	1,830,354	-\$1,160,000
2. Other direct operations:			
(a) Review and approval of research and training grants.....	72,407	72,407	0
(b) Technical assistance to States.....	445,000	445,000	0
(c) Administration.....	221,239	221,239	0
3. Pay increases.....	122,600	111,000	-\$11,600
Total funds for program performance.....	28,782,600	9,691,000	-\$19,091,600
Adjustment for obligations incurred in advance of program performance.....	741,000	891,000	+\$150,000
Total obligations.....	28,041,600	8,800,000	-\$19,241,600
Liquidating cash.....	5,200,000	5,350,000	+\$150,000
Total.....	33,241,600	14,150,000	-\$19,091,600

¹ Excludes estimates for forward financing.

² Includes \$8,000,000 cash and \$10,000,000 contract authorization.

³ Some of the obligations for teaching grants and training stipends are incurred 1 year

in advance of program performance. By means of the adjustment line shown in this schedule, the amounts by activity reflect actual performance levels.

⁴ Includes \$10,000,000 contract authorization for construction of research facilities.

Mental health activities

Appropriation title	Agency estimates, 1951 ¹	Bureau of the Budget allowances, 1951	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Grants:			
1. Grants to medical schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training:			
(a) Research projects.....	² \$1,476,000	² \$1,100,000	—\$376,000
(b) Research fellowships.....	200,000	200,000	0
(c) Expansion of teaching of subjects relating to mental illness.....	² 2,964,000	² 2,299,000	—665,000
(d) Training stipends.....	1,145,000	1,050,000	—95,000
2. Grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other preventive and control services.....	3,650,000	3,550,000	—100,000
Direct operations:			
1. Research.....	933,700	599,300	—334,400
2. Other direct operations:			
(a) Review and approval of research and training grants.....	152,900	152,500	—400
(b) Training activities.....	232,700	232,400	—300
(c) Technical assistance to States.....	385,900	385,200	—700
(d) Administration.....	319,600	295,900	—23,700
3. Pay increases.....	85,670	79,700	—5,970
Total funds for program performance.....	11,545,470	9,944,000	—1,601,470
Adjustment for obligations incurred in advance of program performance.....	² —2,375,000	² —2,375,000	0
Total obligations.....	9,170,470	7,569,000	—1,601,470
Liquidating cash.....	³ 2,375,000	³ 2,375,000	0
Total.....	11,545,470	9,944,000	—1,601,470

¹ Excludes estimates for forward financing.
² Some of the obligations for grants for research projects and teaching are incurred several years in advance of actual program performance. By means of the adjustment

line shown in this schedule, the amounts by activity reflect the actual performance levels.
³ Liquidating cash includes amounts as follows: \$1,999,000, expansion of teaching of subjects relating to mental illness; \$376,000, research projects.

Dental health activities

Title	Agency estimates, 1951 ¹	Bureau of the Budget allowances, 1951	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Grants:			
1. Grants to dental schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training:			
(a) Research projects.....	\$450,000	\$250,000	—\$200,000
(b) Research fellowships.....	130,000	75,000	—55,000
(c) Traineeships.....	100,000	0	—100,000
Direct operations:			
1. Research.....	329,225	329,225	0
2. Other direct operations:			
(a) Review and approval of research and training grants.....	15,225	15,225	0
(b) Technical assistance to States.....	1,284,000	1,214,000	—70,000
(c) Coordination and development of dental resources.....	150,000	115,000	—35,000
(d) Administration.....	51,550	51,550	0
3. Pay increases.....	99,030	90,000	—9,030
Total.....	2,609,030	2,140,000	—469,030

¹ Excludes estimates for forward financing.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a statement entitled "What Are We Doing About Cancer?"; following that, a tabulation as to the effect of the amendment upon cancer research construction allocations; following that a fact sheet pertaining to diseases of the heart and circulation; following that a tabulation by the Federal Security Agency of pending cardiovascular research construction application; following that, some material on the mental health situation in the United States today, together with a list of requests for construction granted for research in the mental health field; and, following that, a so-called dental fact sheet presenting the problem in respect to dental health.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ARE WE DOING ABOUT CANCER?

I. HOW MANY PEOPLE DIE OF CANCER IN THE UNITED STATES?

1. The No. 2 killer of our people in 1948 was cancer (1).
2. One out of every eight people who died in 1948 died of cancer (1).
3. About 20,000,000 people now alive will die of cancer unless new treatments and cures are found (2).
4. 197,042 persons died of cancer in 1949 in the United States, or one out of every 8 deaths (1).

II. HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE SUFFERING FROM CANCER IN THE UNITED STATES?

1. In 1937, it was estimated that 930,000 people were suffering from cancer and other tumors (3). No more recent estimate is available.
2. At least 600,000 people are presently under treatment for cancer or other malignant neoplasms (4).
 - (a) About 325,000 new cases of cancer are diagnosed each year (4).
3. About 1 out of every 5 people now alive in the United States will have cancer at some time in his life unless new treatments and cures are found (4).

III. WHAT IS BEING DONE TO HELP CANCER SUFFERERS?

1. There were only 15 special cancer hospitals having 1,492 beds registered by the American Medical Association in 1949. In addition there were 5 related institutions (such as nursing homes and infirmaries, which give certain medical and nursing care), with 718 beds (5).
 - (a) In contrast with this, 99,757 special beds are available for tuberculosis patients (6); tuberculosis killed 43,833 people in 1948, while cancer killed 197,042 (1).
2. We have only about 129 cancer detection centers approved by the American College of Surgeons (for people with no apparent symptoms), in the United States; or one detection center to every 1,120,000 people (7).
3. We have only about 503 approved cancer treatment and diagnostic clinics, of which 74 are cancer diagnostic (only) clinics in the United States (8).

- (a) There is need of a cancer clinic for every 100,000 population, one within a radius of 30 to 50 miles from each patient (7).

IV. HOW MUCH MONEY IS AVAILABLE FOR RESEARCH TO FIND NEW TREATMENTS AND CURES FOR CANCER?

1. About \$12,938,898 divided as follows (see appendix I):

(a) Government funds:

The National Cancer Institute, USPHS, and the Atomic Energy Commission have appropriations for cancer research for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949, of about \$7,781,398.

(b) Non-Government funds:

Voluntary agencies allocated approximately \$5,157,500. (See appendix I.)

2. This means that we are spending about \$65.67 per cancer death annually, or \$21.56 per known case.

(a) In contrast, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis allocated \$2,479,617 for research in 1948, or about \$1,303 per death (10).

(b) Congress authorized the expenditure of \$45,889,811 by the Department of Agriculture in 1949, for the campaign of control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease now being conducted in Mexico in cooperation with the Mexican Government (11).

V. DO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES WANT MORE DONE ABOUT CANCER RESEARCH?

1. Yes. In a Nation-wide poll, 82 percent of the people questioned said they believed that \$200,000,000 should be spent by the Government for cancer research (12).

VI. HOW MUCH MONEY HAS THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY RAISED FOR EDUCATION AND SERVICE TO CANCER PATIENTS, AND FOR LAY AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION IN THIS FIELD EXCLUDING RESEARCH?

1. The American Cancer Society and all its State and local divisions raised about \$10,200,000 for the purpose in 1949, over and above the amount raised for research (13).

(a) This is in contrast with \$832,862 raised nationally by the society in 1944, and \$372,057.17 in 1943 when no funds were allocated to research (14).

VII. HOW MUCH IS THE GOVERNMENT SPENDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CANCER CLINICS AND SERVICES?

1. The National Cancer Institute, United States Public Health Service, has about \$3,500,000 for the year ending June 30, 1950, for grants-in-aid to States for establishment of clinics and services to cancer patients, and \$2,250,000 for teaching grants and \$375,000 for trainees, to medical schools (9).

(a) This makes a total of about \$16,325,000 for service and education in this field, both from voluntary organizations and Government funds, to be spent over a 14-month period.

2. In contrast to this, Congress made available to the United States Public Health Service alone for grants-in-aid to States to establish clinics and services—\$13,403,000 for control of venereal diseases, and \$6,790,000 for tuberculosis control (15).

(a) Only 11,616 deaths were attributed to syphilis in 1948 and 43,833 deaths to tuberculosis; but cancer killed 197,042 people in the same year (1).

VIII. HOW DOES WHAT WE SPEND ON CANCER RESEARCH COMPARE WITH WHAT WE SPEND ON OTHER THINGS?

1. In contrast with the total of about \$12,938,898 which is available from public and private sources, for cancer research:

(a) The people of the United States spent approximately (16): \$6,048,000 for dog and pet medicaments in 1948; \$5,844,000 for bath salts, tablets, and oils; \$4,667,000 for elastic stockings; \$2,750,000 for waveset lotions; \$2,625,000 for eye lotions.

IX. HOW DO DEATHS FROM CANCER COMPARE WITH DEATHS FROM OTHER DISEASES?

1. The No. 2 killer of the United States is cancer. Only diseases of the heart and arteries cause more deaths (17).

(a) More than four times as many people died of cancer as of tuberculosis in 1948 (17).

(b) Nearly 104 times as many people died of cancer in 1948, as died of infantile paralysis in the same year (17).

(c) Nearly two and a half times as many people died of cancer during World War II as were killed in action in the Armed Forces (18).

X. IS CANCER PRIMARILY A DISEASE OF OLD AGE?

1. No. Of 197,042 deaths in 1948 from cancer and other malignant tumors (1):

(a) 97,606, or over half, were under 65 years old.

(b) 18,855, or about 10 percent, were under 45 years old.

(c) 2,775, or about 1½ percent, were under 25 years old.

XI. WHAT ARE THE LEADS IN THE FIELD OF CANCER RESEARCH?

1. There are leads in cancer research in many directions, including:

(a) Uses of radioactive materials, both as methods of treatment and as research tools.

(b) Use of nitrogen mustards in the treatment of leukemia and Hodgkins disease.

(c) Antibiotic substances and chemical compounds which affect cancer tissue.

(d) Use of hormones, including ACTH and cortisone in leukemia, lymphosarcoma, and other types of cancer; also use of estrogens and androgens in the treatment of cancer

of the breast, and estrogens in cancer of the prostate gland.

(e) Studies in nutrition.

(f) Improved methods of surgery; new methods in the use of X-ray.

APPENDIX I

Funds available for cancer research

GOVERNMENT FUNDS

1. National Cancer Institute, U. S. Public Health Service for fiscal year 1949-50 (9):

Intra-mural research	\$3,300,000
Research projects (grants-in-aid)	2,600,000
Research fellowships	500,000

Total..... 6,400,000

2. Atomic Energy Commission, Division of Biology and Medicine (for fiscal year 1949-50 (19))..... 1,381,398

Total Government funds.. 7,781,398

NON-GOVERNMENT FUNDS

1. American Cancer Society (13) (for 1949-50 program beginning July 1, 1949—figures as of Nov. 15, 1949) approximate..... \$3,400,000

2. Damon Runyon Memorial Fund (14) (for 1949) approximate..... 1,000,000

3. Babe Ruth Cancer Fund (14) for the period Sept. 1, 1949, to Aug. 31, 1950..... 107,500

4. Other voluntary agencies throughout the (20) country—estimated annually at about a minimum of..... 650,000

Total non-Government funds..... 5,157,500

Total all funds (approximate)..... 12,938,898

¹ Grants totaling \$2,500,000 have been made from July 1947 to Dec. 31, 1949, or an average of \$1,000,000 annually.

REFERENCE LIST

(1) National Office of Vital Statistics (1 out of 7.33 in 1948; 1 out of 7.61 in 1947).

(2) Thirteen and sixty-four one-hundredths percent of the total deaths in 1948 were caused by cancer; 13.64 percent of 150,000,000 (estimated 1950 United States population) is 20,460,000.

(3) The Problem of Chronic Disease, by George St. J. Perrott, Chief, Division of Public Health Methods, United States Public Health Service, presented at joint session of American psychiatric Association and American Society for Research in Psychosomatic Problems, May 15, 1944.

(4) Estimates contained in letters from John R. Heller, Director, National Cancer Institute, United States Public Health Service, September 13, 1949, and November 10, 1949.

(5) Journal of the American Medical Association, May 7, 1949, volume 140, No. 1, pages 37-96: Seven governmental hospitals with 766 beds, 6 nonprofit hospitals with 524 beds, 2 proprietary hospitals with 202 beds.

(6) United States Public Health Service, Division of Tuberculosis: Index of Hospitals and Sanatoria With Tuberculosis Beds as of January 1, 1949.

(7) Cancer-control letter, Federal Security Agency, National Cancer Institute, No. 16, dated March 28, 1949.

(8) Bulletin of the American College of Surgeons, December 1948.

(9) Distribution of United States Public Health Service funds, National Institutes of Health, Division of Research Grants and

Fellowships, fiscal year 1950, National Cancer Institute:

Cash:

Intramural research	\$3,300,000
Research projects (grants-in-aid)	2,600,000
Research fellowships	500,000
Research construction grants	4,175,000
Trainees	375,000
Teaching grants	2,250,000
Grants-in-aid to States	3,500,000
Other	2,200,000

Total..... 18,900,000

Contract authority:

Construction grants	6,000,000
---------------------	-----------

Total cash and contract authority..... 24,900,000

(10) National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, 1948 Annual Report.

(11) Letter from Bureau of the Budget, Office of the Director, dated September 15, 1949.

(12) Report of Gallup poll in New York World-Telegram, June 12, 1946.

(13) American Cancer Society, New York; Clifton Read, December 29, 1949.

(14) American Cancer Society, New York; J. H. Teeter, December 13, 1949.

(15) National Institutes of Health, Division of Research Grants and Fellowships, chart dated November 29, 1949.

(16) Drug Topics, volume 93, No. 20, September 26, 1949, page 2. Published by Topics Publishing Co., New York, N. Y.

(17) National Office of Vital Statistics. 1948 death—tuberculosis, 43,833; heart and circulation, 637,679; infantile paralysis, 1,895; cancer, 197,042.

(18) Killed in action in World War II, 282,025 (World Almanac 1949, p. 326; World Almanac 1946, p. 44). Cancer deaths for same period, 678,883. (National Office of Vital Statistics.)

(19) Atomic Energy Commission, Division of Biology and Medicine, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Finley, December 20, 1949.

(20) Survey conducted by Dr. C. P. Rhoads for the Committee on Growth for American Cancer Society, 1946.

Tabulation of pending cancer research construction applications, by State and institution

	Amount of application
Illinois: Michael Reese Hospital, Chicago.....	\$542,000
Indiana: Indiana University Medical Center, Indianapolis.....	485,920
Massachusetts: Jewish Memorial Hospital, Roxbury.....	182,500
New York:	
Montefiore Hospital, New York City.....	418,700
Montefiore Hospital, New York City.....	373,700
Mt. Sinai Hospital, New York City.....	300,000
North Carolina: Duke University, Durham.....	125,000
Oklahoma: Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation, Oklahoma City.....	125,000
Oregon: University of Oregon, Portland.....	900,000
South Dakota: University of South Dakota Medical School, Vermillion.....	120,000
Tennessee: Vanderbilt University, Nashville.....	551,100
Washington:	
University of Washington, Seattle.....	900,000
Northwest Cancer Foundation, Seattle.....	738,000
Wisconsin: Marquette University School of Medicine, Milwaukee.....	300,000
Total.....	6,061,920

In addition to the applications tabulated above, other meritorious requests were reduced by approximately \$11,500,000 due to lack of funds and the following institutions have indicated their intentions to make applications at such time as funds are made available to the National Cancer Institute:

Alabama: Muscle Shoals Heart and Cancer Research Clinic, Listerhill.

Arizona: Pima County Medical Society, Tucson.

California: Cedars of Lebanon Hospital, Los Angeles; College of Medical Evangelists, Los Angeles; Mount Zion Hospital, San Francisco.

Florida: Florida State Board of Health, Jacksonville.

Illinois: Brokaw Hospital, Bloomington.

Indiana: University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame; Protestant Deaconess Hospital, Evansville.

Louisiana: Louisiana State University, New Orleans; Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans.

Minnesota: University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

New York: Albany Medical College, Albany; New York Infirmary Building Fund, New York City; Syracuse University, Syracuse; New York University, New York City.

North Carolina: Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem.

Pennsylvania: The American Oncologic Hospital, Philadelphia; Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia, Philadelphia; Wills Hospital, Philadelphia; University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; Institute for Cancer Research, Philadelphia.

Tennessee: University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Texas: Baylor University, Houston.

Vermont: The Mary Fletcher Hospital, Burlington; The University of Vermont, Burlington.

Virginia: The Memorial Hospital, Danville.

West Virginia: Alderson Broaddus College, Philippi.

San Juan, P. I.: San Juan City Hospital, San Juan.

DISEASES OF THE HEART AND CIRCULATION

I. HOW MANY PEOPLE DIE OF DISEASES OF THE HEART AND CIRCULATION EVERY YEAR IN THE UNITED STATES?

1. The number one killer of our people is heart disease (1).

2. More than 1 in every 3 deaths is due to a disease of the heart and circulation (2).

3. Six hundred thirty-seven thousands six hundred and seventy-nine human beings died of diseases of the heart and circulation in 1948 (2):

Heart diseases.....	471,469
Intracranial lesions of vascular origin.....	131,036
Acute rheumatic fever.....	927
Other circulatory diseases.....	34,247

4. More than 66,000,000 Americans now alive will die of diseases of the heart and circulation unless new treatments and cures are found (3).

5. During World War II, 1,967,468 people died in the United States of diseases of the heart and circulation (4). This is nearly eight times as many people as were killed in action in the Armed Forces (5).

II. HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE SUFFERING FROM DISEASES OF THE HEART AND CIRCULATION IN THE UNITED STATES?

1. Between 9,000,000 and 10,000,000 people are suffering from diseases of the heart and circulation (6).

2. In contrast with this, 670,302 Americans were wounded in action in World War II (7).

3. A total of at least 152,000,000 workdays a year are lost because of diseases of the heart and circulation (8).

III. HOW DO DEATHS FROM DISEASES OF THE HEART AND CIRCULATION COMPARE WITH DEATHS FROM OTHER DISEASES?

1. More than 44 percent of all deaths are caused by diseases of the heart and circulation (3).

2. Diseases of the heart and circulation kill:

(a) Over three times as many people as cancer (9).

(b) Over fourteen times as many people as tuberculosis (9).

(c) Over 1,700 people every day. This is more people than die of scarlet fever and diphtheria in a whole year in the United States (9).

IV. HOW MANY DOCTORS SPECIALIZE IN DISEASES OF THE HEART?

1. Only 420 physicians are certified by the American Board of Internal Medicine as specialists in the field of cardiovascular disease (10).

(a) There are an additional 5,000 qualified specialists in internal medicine, the majority of whom give special attention to cardiovascular diseases (11).

V. WHAT FACILITIES ARE AVAILABLE FOR SPECIAL CARE OF PEOPLE WITH DISEASES OF THE HEART AND CIRCULATION?

1. For the minimum number of 9,000,000 people suffering from diseases of the heart and circulation, there are in the entire United States less than 200 beds set aside for clinical research in diseases of the heart and circulation to find new treatments and cures for these diseases (12).

VI. HOW MUCH MONEY IS AVAILABLE FOR RESEARCH IN THIS FIELD ANNUALLY?

1. About \$7,217,015 divided as follows (appendix I):

(a) Public funds:

The National Heart Institute, USPHS, has appropriations for research for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949, of about \$5,462,400.

(b) Private funds:

Leading voluntary agencies interested in cardiovascular diseases allocated for 1949 approximately \$1,754,615.

2. In other words, we are spending only about \$11.31 per death annually for research to find causes and cures of the greatest killer of our people.

VII. HOW DOES THIS COMPARE WITH WHAT WE SPEND ON OTHER RESEARCH?

1. In contrast with the total of about \$7,217,015 being spent for research in diseases of the heart and circulation:

(a) Congress appropriated a total of \$77,351,628 for the Research Administration of the Department of Agriculture for 1949 (13).

(b) Congress authorized the expenditure of \$45,889,811 by the Department of Agriculture in 1949, for the program of control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease now being conducted in Mexico in cooperation with the Mexican Government (14).

(c) For industrial research, to improve manufactured products (excluding atomic energy) (15):

American industry is spending \$450,000,000 a year.

The United States Government spends \$625,000,000 a year.

Universities and other agencies are spending \$85,000,000 a year.

This means that Americans are spending a total of \$1,160,000,000 for industrial research, but only about \$7,217,015 to save the lives of people suffering from diseases of the heart and circulation, the No. 1 killer.

2. We live in an economy where, in 1945, American manufacturers spent these amounts for industrial research:

Bendix Aviation Corp., for research and engineering, approximately (16).....	\$18,150,000
--	--------------

Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., for development, testing and experimental expenditures (16).....

\$3,286,234

3. About \$12,938,898 is being spent in the field of cancer research—the second cause of death in the United States (17). This contrasts with only about \$7,217,015 for diseases of the heart and circulation, the first cause of death.

4. The total amount available from all sources for research in diseases of the heart and circulation is about one-third the amount voted by Congress for forest roads and trails for 1949 (18).

5. Forty-two million two hundred and sixty-eight thousand dollars is spent annually for stomach sweeteners (19), in contrast with about \$7,217,015 spent for research in diseases of the heart and circulation.

VIII. IS HEART DISEASE PRIMARILY A DISEASE OF OLD AGE?

1. No. Of the 637,679 people who died from diseases of the heart and circulation in 1948, 217,636, or one-third, were under 65 years of age (2).

2. In 1948, more children died of diseases of the heart than the total number of deaths of people of all ages from infantile paralysis (20).

(a) Among children under 15, more than twice as many died of diseases of the heart in 1948 as died of infantile paralysis (20).

IX. DO PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES THINK MORE RESEARCH IN THIS FIELD IS NECESSARY?

1. Seventy-nine percent of the people questioned in a recent poll were in favor of the Government's spending \$200,000,000 for research to find the causes and cure of diseases of the heart; and 80 percent were willing to pay more taxes to provide the money (21).

APPENDIX I

Funds available for research in diseases of the heart and circulation

PUBLIC FUNDS

1. National Heart Institute, through U. S. Public Health Service, for fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949 (22):	
Intramural research.....	\$1,350,000
Research projects (grants-in-aid).....	3,820,000
Research fellowships.....	292,400
Total, public funds.....	5,462,400

PRIVATE FUNDS

1. Helen Hay Whitney Foundation (23) approximately.....	200,000
2. New York Heart Association (24).....	1,287,335
3. Life Insurance Medical Research Fund (25).....	667,280
4. American Heart Association (26).....	1,380,000
5. Other affiliates of American Heart Association throughout the country (27).....	220,000
Total, private funds.....	1,754,615

Total, all funds (approximate).....	7,217,015
-------------------------------------	-----------

¹ In addition to contribution of \$67,500 to American Heart Association.

² Includes contribution of \$67,500 from New York Heart Association.

REFERENCE LIST

(1) National Office of Vital Statistics (1 out of 2.26 deaths in 1948; 1 out of 2.31 deaths in 1947).

(2) National Office of Vital Statistics: Total deaths 1948—1,444,327; deaths from diseases of the heart and circulation, 637,679.

(3) Forty-four and fifteen hundredths percent of the total deaths in 1948 were caused by diseases of the heart and circulation; 44.15 percent of 150,000,000 (estimated 1949 United States population) is 66,225,000.

(4) National Office of Vital Statistics.

(5) Killed in action in World War II—Army, 176,432; Navy (died overseas) 72,269; total, 249,701 (World Almanac 1948, p. 551.)

(6) Dr. Rolla E. Dyer, director, National Institutes of Health; estimate based on analysis of the health of the Nation, 1940 (memorandum date May 28, 1947).

(7) Wounded casualties in World War II—Army, 571,822; Navy, 98,480; total, 679,302 (World Almanac 1948, p. 551).

(8) National Health Survey, 1938.

(9) National Office of Vital Statistics. 1948 deaths: Cancer, 197,042; tuberculosis, 43,833; scarlet fever, 68; diphtheria, 634.

(10) American Board of Internal Medicine—letter dated October 15, 1949.

(11) Dr. Charles Connor, American Heart Association—letter dated September 21, 1949. Based on listings in Directory of Medical Specialists, Volume 4, 1949.

(12) Fact brought out in hearings before Senators BRIDGES and PEPPER on need for additional research funds for heart disease, by group of heart specialists, April 24, 1947.

(13) United States Budget, fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, p. 279.

(14) Bureau of the Budget, Office of the Director—letter dated September 15, 1949.

(15) "Science and Public Policy—A Report to the President," by the President's Scientific Research Board, volume I, page 12. August 27, 1947.

(16) National Industrial Conference Board.

(17) Government funds for fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949: \$7,781,398; voluntary agencies: approximately \$5,157,500; total: \$12,938,898.

(18) \$22,550,000 was appropriated for forest development roads and trails for 1949. United States Budget, fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, page 361.

(19) Drug Topics—volume 93, No. 20—September 26, 1949, page 2. Published by Topics Publishing Co., New York, N. Y.

(20) National Office of Vital Statistics: 1948—deaths of children under 15 from heart diseases: 2,278; from infantile paralysis, 1,085; total deaths from infantile paralysis, 1,895.

(21) Poll conducted by American Institute of Public Opinion, Princeton, N. J., June 26, 1948.

(22) Distribution of United States Public Health Service funds, National Institutes of Health, Division of Research Grants and Fellowships, fiscal year 1950, National Heart Institute:

Cash:

Intramural research	\$1,350,000
Research projects (grants-in-aid)	3,820,000
Research fellowships.....	292,400
Research construction grants.....	1,600,000
Trainees	150,000
Teaching grants.....	741,000
Grants-in-aid to States.....	2,000,000
Other.....	764,000
Total	10,717,400

Contract authority:

Construction grants	4,459,000
Trainees	150,000
Teaching grants.....	741,000

Total cash and contract authority

16,067,400

(23) Helen Hay Whitney Foundation—Fiscal year beginning January 1, 1949.

(24) New York Heart Association—Fiscal year beginning January 1, 1949.

(25) Life Insurance Medical Research Fund—Fiscal year beginning January 1, 1949.

(26) American Heart Association—Fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949.

(27) For 1949. Dr. Charles Connor, American Heart Association—Telephone conversation, December 19, 1949.

Tabulation of pending cardiovascular research construction applications, by State and institution

	Amount of application
Alabama: Medical College of Alabama and Jefferson Health Department, Birmingham.....	\$416,931
California:	
University of California Medical School, San Francisco.....	1,250,000
University of California Medical School, Los Angeles.....	884,736
District of Columbia: Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.....	909,960
Georgia: Emory University, Atlanta.....	500,000
Illinois:	
University of Illinois, Chicago.....	2,350,000
Loyola University (Stritch School of Medicine), Chicago.....	116,000
Michael Reese Hospital, Chicago.....	2,647,950
Mount Sinai Hospital, Chicago.....	125,000
Massachusetts:	
Boston University School of Medicine, Boston.....	58,810
Children's Medical Center, Boston.....	450,000
Jewish Memorial Hospital, Roxbury.....	128,500
New England Center Hospital, Boston.....	220,000
Michigan: Wayne University, Detroit.....	377,226
Missouri: Washington University, St. Louis.....	300,000
New York:	
Bellevue Hospital, New York City.....	150,000
University of Buffalo, Buffalo.....	96,583
Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York City.....	1,000,000
Cornell University, New York City.....	200,000
Montefiore Hospital, New York City.....	418,700
Mount Sinai Hospital, New York City.....	300,000
New York Hospital, New York City.....	800,000
University of Rochester, Rochester.....	414,368
North Carolina:	
Bowman Gray School of Medicine of Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem.....	848,900
Duke University, Durham.....	1,347,000
Duke University, Durham.....	45,000
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.....	516,800
Ohio: Western Reserve University, Cleveland.....	275,000
Oklahoma: Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation, Oklahoma City.....	225,000
Oregon: University of Oregon, Portland.....	230,000
Pennsylvania:	
Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia, Philadelphia.....	1,000,000
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.....	500,000
Temple University Hospital and Medical School, Philadelphia.....	900,000
Woman's Medical School of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.....	169,645
South Carolina: Medical College of the State of South Carolina, Charleston.....	485,000

	Amount of application
Tennessee:	
University of Tennessee, Memphis.....	468,600
Vanderbilt University, Nashville.....	503,700
Texas: Southwestern Medical College of University of Texas, Dallas.....	500,000
Washington: University of Washington, Seattle.....	500,000
West Virginia: University of West Virginia, Morgantown.....	5,860

Total pending applications. 22, 635, 269

In addition to the applications tabulated above, other meritorious requests were reduced by approximately \$6,500,000 due to lack of funds.

WHAT IS THE MENTAL HEALTH SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES TODAY?

I. HOW MANY PEOPLE IN THE UNITED STATES ARE SUFFERING FROM SOME FORM OF MENTAL ILLNESS?

1. About 8,500,000 people in the United States are suffering from some form of mental illness (1).

(a) This means that more than 1 in every 18 persons is now suffering from some form of mental illness.

2. One out of every ten persons will need psychiatric care at some time during his life (2).

(a) This means that about 15,000,000 persons now living in the United States will require psychiatric care at some time (2).

3. One out of every eighteen persons will spend some part of his life in a mental hospital (3).

(a) This means that about 8,334,000 people now living in the United States will be hospitalized for mental illness at one time or another.

4. Severe mental illness:

(a) One out of every two hospital beds in the United States is occupied by a mental patient (2).

(b) 664,399 or 54 percent of the 1,217,154 patients comprising the average daily hospital census in 1948, were patients in nervous and mental hospitals (4).

(c) 305,000 patients, new and old, were admitted to mental hospitals in 1948 (4). Of this total, 210,000 were new patients (4).

(d) Prewar studies showed that at any one time there are about 1,000,000 persons sufficiently disabled by mental illness to warrant hospitalization, although only a little more than 600,000 get it (5).

5. Minor mental illness:

(a) About 50 percent of general practitioners' patients suffer from some form of mental illness (6) (7).

(b) About 30 percent of hospitalized general medical and surgical cases are more or less neurotic (8).

II. WHAT IS THE COST OF MENTAL ILLNESS TO OUR NATIONAL ECONOMY?

1. Including hospitalization and loss in earnings, the complete loss to the Nation annually from serious mental illness alone, would reach a billion and a half dollars (9).

2. In 1947 taxpayers spent over \$360,000,000 to maintain patients in the Nation's public mental hospitals (1).

III. WHAT DID SELECTIVE SERVICE EXAMINATIONS SHOW ABOUT THE PEOPLE'S MENTAL HEALTH?

1. Rejection before induction: About 1,846,000, or 38 percent, of the 5,000,000 men rejected before induction were rejected for neuropsychiatric disorders (10).

(a) About 12 percent, or 1 out of 8, of the 15,000,000 men examined were rejected for neuropsychiatric reasons (10).

2. Discharge after induction: Of the men discharged for medical disability after induc-

tion, about 387,000 (or 37 percent of Army medical discharges) were discharged from the Army, and 76,621 (or 32.4 percent of Navy medical discharges) were discharged from the Navy, for neuropsychiatric reasons (10) (11).

(a) This means that more than 1 out of 3 men medically discharged from the Armed Forces were discharged for neuropsychiatric reasons.

(b) This is exclusive of the 163,000 Army men and 91,563 Navy men discharged administratively for such reasons as psychopathic personality, mental deficiency, drug addiction, or homosexuality (10) (11).

IV. HOW MANY HOSPITALS FOR MENTAL DISEASE ARE THERE IN THE UNITED STATES?

1. About 586 hospitals, with a capacity of 691,499 beds (4).

(a) 97.7 percent of all mental patients are in public hospitals (12). 84.2 percent are in State hospitals (12).

Only about 2.3 percent of mental patients are cared for in private hospitals (12).

2. There is an immediate need for 350,000 more beds for mentally ill patients (13).

V. HOW MANY CLINICS FOR MENTAL DISEASE ARE THERE IN THE UNITED STATES?

1. About 855 clinics, including both part and full time clinics. This includes all those organized by communities, divisions of State or county governments, and the Veterans' Administration (14).

(a) 6 States are without a single community psychiatric clinic of any type; and there are vast areas in other States where no psychiatric help is available (1).

(b) At least 1,500 full-time community clinics are needed (15).

VI. HOW MUCH IS BEING SPENT TO RUN THESE CLINICS AND HOSPITALS TO TAKE CARE OF MENTAL PATIENTS IN THE UNITED STATES?

1. About \$400,000,000 was spent in 1947 to provide long-term hospital care for 651,000 mental patients (16).

(a) Virtually all of this money comes out of tax funds.

2. In contrast to this, the people of the United States spent about \$1,115,000,000 for service in beauty parlors and barber shops in 1948 (17).

VII. HOW MUCH IS THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE SPENDING FOR RESEARCH TO PREVENT AND CURE MENTAL ILLNESS?

1. About \$1,223,200 for research has been allocated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949 (18).

(a) On the basis of 664,399 (4) patients in mental and nervous hospitals, this means that the United States Public Health Service is spending only about \$1.84 per year for research for new treatments and cures for each hospitalized case.

(b) In contrast, the Department of Agriculture spent in 1949 \$73,860,691 for research in control and cure of plant and animal diseases. This includes \$45,889,811 for the eradication of foot and mouth disease (19).

(c) \$100,000 was spent for research fellowships (18).

VIII. HOW MUCH IS UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE SPENDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH CLINICS AND SERVICES?

1. \$3,550,000 has been allotted for grants-in-aid to States for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949 (18).

(a) These funds are to be matched by State funds at the rate of 50 cents for each Federal dollar (20).

IX. HOW MUCH WAS BEING SPENT FOR RESEARCH ON MENTAL HEALTH IN BOTH PRIVATE AND PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS AND CLINICS IN THE UNITED STATES IN 1947?

1. Approximately \$3,322,411 was available, divided approximately as follows:

Public funds (including Veterans' Administration (22), approximately (21).....	\$2,249,516
Private funds, about (21).....	716,895

2. On the basis of 664,399 (4) patients in mental and nervous hospitals, this would indicate that the amount spent in 1947 per individual hospital case, employing both private and public funds, is less than \$5.

(a) This figure compares with \$94 per patient for research in infantile paralysis (23).

3. In contrast, the Nation spent \$8,800,000,000 for alcoholic beverages alone in 1948 (24), an average of about \$59 annually for each man, woman, and child.

X. IN HOW MANY INSTITUTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES IS RESEARCH IN THIS FIELD BEING CONDUCTED?

1. Results of a recent poll of mental institutions, nervous hospitals, medical schools and universities, etc., show that there are about 161 of these institutions that have research facilities and are engaged in research in one or more of the phases of mental illness (21).

(a) About 80 percent or \$2,534,896 of the approximate total of \$3,322,411 is being spent by 20 institutions throughout the country. Of these, 3 are supported by Federal Government; 7 are supported by State governments; 10 are privately supported (21).

(b) Of this \$2,534,896, \$2,089,262, or 82 percent, comes from public sources; \$445,634, or 18 percent, comes from private sources (21).

XI. DO THE 664,399 PATIENTS IN MENTAL HOSPITALS RECEIVE ADEQUATE CARE?

1. No. The average cost of State, county, and city hospital long-term patient maintenance in the United States was only \$549 per year, or \$1.50 per day in 1947 (25), and \$1.26 per day in 1942 (26).

(a) The average cost of food for these patients was only 22 cents per day in 1942 (26).

(b) These figures compare with \$5 per patient per day for acute and recovering mental hospital patients and \$2.50 per patient per day for chronic cases which were considered the minimum standard (27), and a little more than \$13 per ward patient per day in a general hospital, average cost in New York City in 1948 (28).

2. Whereas the approved APA standards are:

(a) For psychiatrists: Observation and acutely ill patients 1-30; reeducation service 1-75; convalescent 1-50; continuous treatment and senile 1-200.

(b) For nurses: Observation and acutely ill patients 1-4; convalescent 1-10; reeducation service 1-25; continuous treatment and senile 1-40 or 50.

(c) For the Army: One psychiatrist to each 50 patients.

The actual ratio is 1 psychiatrist to each 387 patients and 1 graduate nurse to each 120 patients (1).

3. It is estimated that there are the following deficiencies in State hospital employees:

(a) All employees, 42 percent (29).
(b) Clinical psychologists, 91.9 percent (29).
(c) Social workers, 70.8 percent (29).
(d) Trained nurses, 80 percent (30).
(e) Attendants, 50 percent (30).

XII. HOW MANY DOCTORS AND OTHER MEDICAL PERSONNEL SPECIALIZE IN THE CARE OF MENTAL PATIENTS?

1. In 1948 there were 4,765 psychiatrists in the United States, many of whom are administrators or retired (1). Of these, only 2,463 hold diplomas from the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology (1).

(a) The present need in the United States is for at least 18,785 more psychiatrists (1).

(1) There are approximately 8,099 graduate nurses specializing in psychiatry in the United States (4), 50,320 other nurses and attendants (4), and 1,011 psychiatric social workers (1).

a. The National League of Nursing Education estimates our need is at least 47,000 psychiatric nurses (31), or almost six times the number we now have.

b. Of the 1,163 State accredited nursing schools (4) in the country, only 32 are located in mental hospitals. Fourteen States have no training facilities in psychiatric nursing (5).

(2) There are approximately 1,500 trained clinical psychologists (32) and at least 1,700 more needed (33).

(b) It has been estimated that 6,000 new psychiatric social workers are needed in this country (34).

REFERENCE LIST

(1) Statistics Pertinent to Psychiatry in the United States, report No. 7, Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, March 1949.

(2) Former Surgeon General Thomas Parran in One Out of Ten, This Week, November 17, 1946.

(3) The Hospital Survey for New York, volume II, page 947.

(4) Journal of the American Medical Association, hospital number, May 7, 1949, pages 29, 30, 34.

(5) National Committee for Mental Hygiene, 1946 annual report, pages 9, 21.

(6) Dr. William C. Menninger¹ quoting C. A. Rymer: Psychiatric Education, American Journal of Psychiatry, 102: 548-551, January 1946.

(7) Dr. William C. Menninger² quoting F. G. Ebaugh: The Care of the Psychiatric Patient in General Hospitals, Chicago American Hospital Association, 1940.

(8) Dr. William C. Menninger¹ quoting B. Mittelman et al.: Personality and Psychosomatic Disturbances in Patients in Medical and Surgical Wards, Psychosomatic Medicine, 7:220-223; July 1945.

(9) Computation by Dallas Pratt, M. D., National Mental Health Foundation, January 1947. Quoted in bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, volume 12, No. 1, January 1948, page 8.

(10) Dr. William C. Menninger¹ quoting Medical Statistics Division, Surgeon General's Office, 1946.

(11) Dr. William C. Menninger² quoting F. J. Braceland: Psychiatric Lessons From World War II, American Journal of Psychiatry, 103: 587-593, March 1947.

(12) Patients in Mental Institutions, 1946, United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, page 11.

(13) National Committee for Mental Hygiene, 1947 annual report, page 9.

(14) Directory of Psychiatric Clinics, National Committee for Mental Hygiene, 1948.

(15) Dr. George Stevenson, medical director, National Committee for Mental Hygiene, in personal interview. "At least 1,500 full-time community clinics should be planned

¹From Challenge to Psychiatry, a paper compiled by Dr. William C. Menninger.

²From Facts and Statistics of Significance for Psychiatry, a paper compiled by Dr. William C. Menninger. Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, January 1948.

for on the basis of one clinic to each 100,000 people, which has proved practical. This does not entirely fill the need."

(16) Estimate of Mental Hygiene Division, United States Public Health Service, from J. AMA October 1948, volume 133, No. 7, page 517.

(17) Survey of Current Business, July 1949, national income number, United States Department of Commerce, page 23.

(18) Distribution of USPHS funds by types—fiscal year 1950; chart from National Institutes of Health, Division of Research Grants and Fellowships:

Intramural research.....	\$329,200
Project grants-in-aid research..	794,000
Research fellows.....	100,000
Trainees.....	920,000
Teaching grants.....	1,985,000
Grants-in-aid to States.....	3,550,000
Other.....	983,090

Total cash..... 8,662,290

Contract authority:

Research grants. (Of this amount, it is proposed to only \$225,000 and allow the balance of \$425,000 to remain unobligated).....	650,000
Teaching grants.....	1,500,000

Total of cash and contract authority..... 10,812,290

(19) Budget of the United States, fiscal year ending June 30, 1950. Letter from Kenneth Stiks, Office of the Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D. C., September 15, 1949.

(20) National Mental Health Act, 1946.

(21) Survey of Research in Mental Institutions, National Committee for Mental Hygiene, March 1948. Public funds: \$2,249,516. Private funds: \$716,895.

(22) Letter dated August 13, 1948; from E. H. Cushing, M. D., Assistant Medical Director for Research and Education, Veterans' Administration: Research in Mental Health, \$356,000.

(23) Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, volume 12, No. 1, January 1948, page 13. Chart on research.

(24) Office of Business Economics, release 242—June 20, 1949, Department of Commerce.

(25) Press release September 1948, Mental Hygiene Division, United States Public Health Service.

(26) Dr. William C. Menninger quoting from Patients in Mental Institutions, 1942, Bureau of the Census, 1944.

(27) National Committee for Mental Hygiene, 1947 annual report, page 11.

(28) United Hospital Fund, 1948 annual report, page 6.

(29) Dr. William C. Menninger² quoting R. H. Felix: Psychiatric Plans of the United States Public Health Service, Mental Hygiene 30: 381-389, July 1946.

(30) The Nation's Health by Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, September 1948.

(31) Dr. William C. Menninger¹ quoting National League of Nursing Education, 1945. Pamphlet on "New Frontiers in Psychiatric Nursing."

(32) Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, volume 12, No. 1, January 1948, quoting Pepper, C.: National Mental Health Act, Senate Report No. 1353, May 16, 1946.

(33) Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, volume 12, No. 1, January 1948, quoting Communication from Dr. David Rapaport, dated February 15, 1947.

(34) Miss E. L. Martin, secretary, Division on Hospital Service, National Committee for Mental Hygiene, letter dated October 4, 1949.

¹ From Challenge to Psychiatry, a paper compiled by Dr. William C. Menninger.

² From Facts and Statistics of Significance for Psychiatry, a paper compiled by Dr. William C. Menninger. Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, January 1948.

Mental health activities

REQUESTS FOR CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

Michael Reese Hospital (Illinois)	\$1,000,000
University of Texas (Texas).....	500,000
Washington University (Missouri).....	1,000,000
University of Michigan (Michigan).....	800,000
Boston University (Massachusetts).....	300,000
Menninger Foundation (Kansas).....	856,000
Temple University (Pennsylvania).....	750,000
University of Rochester (New York).....	233,260
Langley Porter Clinic (California).....	350,000
University of Wisconsin Medical School-Hospital.....	550,000

Total (10 institutions).... 6,739,260

REQUESTS NOT SPECIFYING AMOUNTS

University of Cincinnati (Ohio).
Institute of Psychoanalysis (Illinois).
Pinel Foundation (Washington).
University of Chicago (Illinois).
Massachusetts Memorial Hospital (Massachusetts).
University of Washington (Seattle, Wash.)
Six institutions.
Total institutions, 16.

DENTAL FACT SHEET

THE PROBLEM

The American Medical Association has estimated that Americans spend a total of nearly \$1,000,000,000 a year for dental care and treatment, much of it preventable. This is about one-half of what they spend for medical services.

Yet, less than \$1,000,000 a year is being spent on dental research, as against \$110,000,000 for medical research.

Dental disease strikes almost every individual, causes much suffering, the loss of many man-hours of productivity, and is expensive.

Apart from dental caries and periodontal disease, dental diseases frequently causes or aggravates other serious bodily ailments. Of all selectees examined during World War II between November 1940 and December 1943, nearly 12 percent had defective teeth. (This rejection rate was so high that standards had to be lowered still further and extensive dental rehabilitation programs undertaken by the armed services.)

WHAT IS NEEDED

An augmented program of basic research into the fundamental aspects of diseases of the mouth.

Strengthened training program to provide an adequate number of skilled laboratory and clinical research personnel.

Expanded research facilities which will provide opportunity to link dental research more closely to basic medical research in other fields.

A strengthened program of control activities, with particular emphasis on preventive dentistry and the extension of fluorine programs.

WHAT IS PROPOSED

To add \$1,900,000 for the construction of intramural research facilities.

To add \$1,100,000 for construction grants.

THE KIND OF PROGRESS THAT IS BEING MADE

New and improved techniques for treating and preventing dental caries, pyorrhea, and other dental illnesses.

Fluorine studies, both reduction of caries by topical application, and partial control through introduction of fluorine into community water supply.

Fundamental knowledge on the causes of diseases of the soft tissues is being obtained.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask leave to insert certain newspaper clippings which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the newspaper clippings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 16, 1950]

CANCER SCIENTISTS GATHER IN PARIS—250 OF 850 HAIL FROM UNITED STATES—BELGIAN SEES NEAR CONTROL WON WITHIN 10 YEARS

(By Waldemar Kaempffert)

PARIS, July 15.—Scientists who officially represent 55 countries have assembled in Paris to participate in the Fifth International Cancer Congress which will be ceremoniously opened tomorrow by President Vincent Auriol. About 850 cancer specialists are in attendance and of these more than 250 are from the United States.

No official representatives of the Soviet Union are present. All invitations addressed to the Soviet Union have remained unanswered.

At a meeting of the general assembly, the governing body of the International Union Against Cancer, which organization arranges these congresses, Vietnam was elected a member.

Though the scientific sessions will not begin till Monday, the International Research Commission and the general assembly, both integral parts of International Union Against Cancer, took steps to unify action against cancer.

The International Research Commission is an autonomous body composed of scientists appointed by their governments, one scientist to each government. Yet this research commission is part of international union and the union is, in turn, a nongovernmental agency of the World Health Organization.

It is the purpose of the research commission of the general assembly, and hence of the international union, to unify cancer research and education on a continental scale.

Last May, representatives of European governments met in Brussels, Belgium, and created a European Cancer Society. The enormous influence of the United States in bringing about a consolidated attack on cancer was manifest today in an action taken by the general assembly on this new European Cancer Society.

Both the founders of the new European society and the general assembly were struck by the fact that in the United States there are many State and local cancer societies, yet all work for a common cause under the auspices and direction of the American Cancer Society which formulates policies, raises money in annual drives, and distributes it throughout the country.

It is the intention of the founders of the European Cancer Society and of the General Assembly of the International Union to follow as closely as possible the American pattern. But the General Assembly of the International Union, while approving the aims of the new European society, stipulated that it regard itself as a section of the union even though it will be autonomous.

There was no marked opposition to this amendment.

This Fifth International Cancer Congress is the first of world-wide scope to be held since the outbreak of World War II. Much is expected of it. In an interview today Dr. Jay Maisin, director of the Cancer Institute at the University of Louvain and an eminent European authority, said that this international congress was necessary to bring cancer research scientists together. Like many others in attendance, he saw great prospects ahead.

"In the rather near future," he said, "we may expect a solution, not of the whole cancer problem, but of a considerable part of it. That is, we shall know better than we do now how to control cancer."

When he was asked what he meant by "near future," Dr. Maisin answered:

"About 10 years."

He added that those who were attending the congress were working in such diverse fields as chemistry, heredity, endocrinology, and viruses.

"It is highly important to find out just how some chemicals and agents produce cancers," Dr. Maisin said. "It is a mode of action that we must discover and when it is discovered we shall know just what cancer is and know its real nature. And when we know that we shall come close to understanding the mechanism of life itself."

During the course of this same interview, Dr. A. Claude, formerly of Rockefeller Institute, explained how he had been using the electron microscope to find out what makes a normal cell go wild and behave in an anarchical way.

Cancer students do not agree whether the disturbing cause always lies outside or whether it sometimes lies inside the cell. Dr. Claude said his work seemed to indicate that "much of the cause of cancer lies right in the cell itself," but he does not know what that cause is.

The next International Congress Against Cancer will be held in Rio de Janeiro in 1953.

[From the Washington Star of July 17, 1950]
NONSHRINK CHEMICAL IS FOUND TO SLOW
UP CERTAIN CANCERS

(By Alton L. Blakeslee)

PARIS, July 17.—A chemical made to prevent clothes from shrinking is able to shrink or halt some cancers for a time, experts from 50 nations were told today.

The chemical is called TEM. It was described to the Fifth International Cancer Research Congress by Dr. C. Chester Stock and Sonja M. Buckley of the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research at New York's Memorial Hospital.

About 800 scientists are attending the congress, which opened today at the Sorbonne.

TEM hits at such cancers of the lymphatic tissue as Hodgkins disease and at some cases of leukemia, or cancer of the blood, Dr. Stock said. As with other treatments for these diseases, its effects are temporary.

Dr. Stock's team tested 3,000 chemicals for their anticancer value. Only nine were found to stop cancer growth or make cancers shrink in laboratory trials using mice. Such a low batting average is typical of the myriad problems in cancer research.

TEM was developed originally as an anti-shrinkage chemical for textiles. As a drug it has been used at Memorial Hospital on some humans with Hodgkins disease or leukemia. It is reported as effective against the two cancers as the nitrogen mustards, the wartime poison-gas chemicals. But TEM can be swallowed as a pill and does not nauseate human beings. Nitrogen mustards are given by injection.

Neither TEM nor nitrogen mustards cures these diseases but patients feel better for a time.

[From the Washington Star, July 15, 1950]
SOME CANCER CONTROL SEEN IN 10 YEARS

PARIS, July 15.—Humans can hope for some medical controls of cancer in perhaps 10 years, Dr. Jean Maisin, famous Belgian scientist, said today.

"We can't hope to solve the whole cancer question in that time," he said, "for the line between cancer and normal life is too fine."

But, he asserted that new developments "are brewing in laboratories throughout the world. They will very possibly lead to some medical aids to control cancer."

Dr. Maisin is secretary-general of the International Union Against Cancer, which mapped new world-wide strategy for cancer control at a meeting today. He is director of the Cancer Institute at the University of Louvain.

The union, composed of scientific organizations in 55 nations, sponsors the Fifth International Cancer Research Congress, which opens at the Sorbonne in Paris Monday. More than 800 scientists, including about 250 Americans, will attend to present or hear the latest reports on advance in cancer research.

Unparalleled progress toward eventual control of cancer will be reported at the sessions, said Dr. E. V. Cowdry, of St. Louis, president of the last congress held in St. Louis in 1947.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at 2 o'clock the Senate will vote on the cancer and health amendment. As for the other amendment, relating to ship repair, all I ask is that I may be allowed a short time in which to explain it, and then that the Senate may vote on it.

I merely want to add, Mr. President, in the short time which remains, that the figure provided for in the amendment, \$64,000,000, is not a figure arrived at by the sponsors of the amendment. It is arrived at by doctors and scientists in charge of the great laboratories who say that that amount of money is required for research work in the coming year.

Mr. HUNT subsequently said. Mr. President, earlier in the session today I had intended to address myself to the Magnuson amendment designated as "D." However, time ran out. I did not have that privilege. So I now request unanimous consent that the remarks I had intended to make be incorporated in the RECORD immediately preceding the vote on the Magnuson amendment lettered "D."

There being no objection, Mr. Hunt's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUNT

I fully support the views of the distinguished Senators who are sponsors of this amendment. It surely is not necessary to speak at length on the need for more funds in the field of human-disease research.

Surely all four of the institutes of health research referred to in the amendment deserves our full support.

Not because it is of greater importance but because of the knowledge I have of the profession of dentistry, I will limit my remarks to comments on this amendment in terms of dental needs.

What I say with reference to dental health and the need for research in that field is, of course, equally applicable to the other fields of health, namely, cancer, heart, and mental conditions.

There is no disease more widely spread than dental disease. Diseases of the mouth, teeth, and supporting tissues affect everyone of us. Yet funds for dental research, in my opinion, always have been totally inadequate, in fact almost nonexistent.

Regardless of how widespread dental diseases are and even though we know that in World War II 35 percent of all draftees rejected for physical disability were due to dental ill health—yet today less than \$1,000,000 a year is being spent on dental research and training from all sources.

On the other hand, American citizens spent approximately \$1,000,000,000 last year for dental care and treatment.

We have always approached the problem of dental care from the standpoint of restoration and reconstruction instead of prevention.

We must have additional funds for research grants-in-aid and research laboratories to support the present modest requests from universities, dental schools, and other organizations for funds.

As I have set out—dental disease is a universal affliction of our people. Its destructive nature causes much suffering, the loss of many man-hours of productivity, the loss of the general health of our people, and it is expensive.

To give you some idea as to how extensive dental diseases exist—you may be surprised to learn that at the age of 6 more than 8 out of 10 children have one or more decayed teeth. By the time a boy or girl reaches the age of 18, nine teeth in the average mouth have become decayed, and several of necessity have been extracted.

Science has proven long ago that a dental disease often is the foci of infection or the primary liaison which causes other conditions such as arthritis, heart disease, infections of the kidneys, and gastro-intestinal ulcers.

Previously I referred to the number of rejections of drafted men in World War II because of general health and to be more specific 188,000 out of the first 2,000,000 men in the earliest days of the Selective Service System were rejected even though dental requirements were not too exacting or severe.

Everyone seems to be in agreement that the only hope of successfully attacking this problem of dental disease is through research, and I strongly urge you gentlemen to support the amendment for more research in the medical and dental sciences.

That research will bring benefits not just to this generation but the generation yet unborn will be the greatest benefactors of what we do now in attempting to search out the cause and to cure these various human ailments.

Not only will we have accomplished a great thing for humanity if through research we can find the causes or quicker cures for diseases, but we will also have effected a tremendous economy for you will agree with me that the cost of being ill is one of the greatest problems facing this country today.

And so, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will give its full support to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington and the Senators from other States in support of this increased appropriation, the \$3,000,000 requested for research in the field of dental disease is actually insignificant as compared with the crying need and demand for such research.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Anderson	Flanders	Kem
Brewster	Fulbright	Kerr
Bricker	George	Kilgore
Bridges	Gillette	Knowland
Butler	Graham	Langer
Byrd	Green	Leahy
Capehart	Gurney	Lehman
Chapman	Hayden	Lodge
Chavez	Hendrickson	Lucas
Connally	Hickenlooper	McCarran
Cordon	Hill	McCarthy
Darby	Hoey	McClellan
Donnell	Holland	McFarland
Douglas	Humphrey	McKellar
Dworshak	Hunt	McMahon
Eastland	Ives	Magnuson
Eaton	Johnson, Colo.	Malone
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Martin

Maybank
Millikin
Morse
Mundt
Murray
Myers
Neely
O'Connor
O'Mahoney

Pepper
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Schoeppel
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Stennis
Taft

Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah
Thye
Tydings
Watkins
Wherry
Wiley
Williams
Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington and other Senators, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 149, line 24, it is proposed to strike out "\$15,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$79,750,000"; and on page 150, line 10, to change the period to a colon and add the following: "Provided, That funds shall be transferred to the appropriations 'National Cancer Institute,' 'Mental Health Activities,' 'National Heart Institute,' and 'Dental Health Activities' in the amounts of \$17,000,000, \$16,000,000, \$28,000,000, and \$3,000,000, respectively, and amounts so transferred shall be available for the objects specified herein under these heads and for grants for drawing plans, erection of buildings and acquisition of land therefor to provide facilities for research, and, with respect to dental health activities, for plans, specifications, construction and equipment of a research building and facilities for the National Institute of Dental Research."

Mr. MAGNUSON and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and

the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—36

Aiken
Bricker
Capehart
Chapman
Eaton
Flanders
Graham
Green
Hill
Humphrey
Hunt
Ives

Johnston, S. C.
Kerr
Kilgore
Langer
Leahy
Lehman
Lodge
Lucas
McCarran
McCarthy
McFarland
McMahon

Magnuson
Maybank
Morse
Murray
Myers
Neely
Pepper
Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah
Wiley
Williams
Young

NAYS—48

Anderson
Brewster
Bridges
Butler
Byrd
Chavez
Connally
Cordon
Darby
Donnell
Douglas
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Ferguson
Fulbright

George
Gillette
Gurney
Hayden
Hendrickson
Hickenlooper
Hoey
Holland
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Tex.
Kem
Knowland
McClellan
McKellar
Malone
Martin

Millikin
Mundt
O'Connor
O'Mahoney
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Schoeppel
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Stennis
Taft
Thye
Tydings
Watkins
Wherry

NOT VOTING—12

Benton
Cain
Downey
Frear

Jenner
Kefauver
Long
Sparkman

Taylor
Tobey
Vandenberg
Withers

So the amendment offered by Mr. MAGNUSON for himself and other Senators was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the next amendment I have pending is to add \$25,000,000 for ship repairs. I wonder if I could ask unanimous consent that I might have 5 minutes to explain the amendment, inasmuch as we had no time whatsoever to explain it because of the time taken on the cancer amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may ask unanimous consent. Under the agreement as it was entered into, it would take unanimous consent to get the time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no reason to object to the Senator having 5 minutes in which to explain the amendment, but I feel that if there is any opposition the same right should be accorded to whoever may oppose the amendment. I think the unanimous consent request ought to be modified.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that each side may have 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington and other Senators will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 329, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "\$9,271,700" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$10,076,330."

On page 329, line 25, to strike out "\$436,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$511,370."

On page 330, between lines 2 and 3, to insert the following:

Repair of vessels in the national defense reserve pursuant to section 11 (2) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 41), \$24,120,000: *Provided*, That the invitations for bid for survey or repair of vessels shall provide that (1) the bidder shall provide for and pay for the movement of the vessels to his repair site and that he shall be reimbursed for the actual cost as determined by the Commission of such movement but not in excess of 10 percent of his bid for such survey or repair and (2) the bidder shall, as directed by the Commission, after completion of the repairs move the vessel to a reserve fleet site designated by the Commission and the Commission shall reimburse the bidder for the actual cost as determined by the Commission of such movement: *And provided further*, That the sums appropriated herein shall be available for the reimbursement provided hereinbefore.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, after the vote at 2 o'clock on the amendments offered by me and other Senators relating to the cancer and heart and other activities, the Senate agreed to vote on my amendment, which provides for an appropriation of \$25,000,000 for the repair of vessels—134 in number, in the national defense reserve.

These ships are stationed in a laid-up fleet of 464 ships, and they are not to be confused with commercial vessels. They are ships placed in the custody of the Maritime Commission by the Navy and the military, and they include vessels in such categories as hospital ships, ammunition ships, LST's, and repair ships. They are ships of no commercial value whatsoever, but they belong to the so-called auxiliary fleet.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me finish this thought and I shall be glad to yield.

Last year the Senate adopted the same amendment overwhelmingly. It was not accepted in the conference committee, but the situation this year has changed. There is even greater need for these ships because the Joint Chiefs of Staff have picked out 134 ships they will need. The ships are widely distributed on the coasts—some on the west coast, some in the Gulf, and some on the Atlantic coast. The ship-repair yards are completely shutdown; there is no work in them at all. The ships have to be repaired ultimately, and the great need for them now was evidenced by the fact that the President of the United States in his last message to the Congress sought to include an amount for repairs of these very ships. I think we can hasten what he sought by adopting the amendment.

I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator whether the amendment offered by him, which is pending, is an amendment which in substance has the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President of the United States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It does.

Mr. TYDINGS. And the ships in question are for national defense?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They are for national defense. They are not commercial ships. Commercial ships are also

being pulled out by the Maritime Commission, for cargo vessels.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not this the same amendment the Senator offered last year, in which I joined, involving 134 ships? The President has already asked for \$18,000,000 to recondition 85 ships, and the pending amendment calls for repairs to 134 ships at a cost of \$25,000,000; does it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, and they are ships which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have picked out.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senate adopts the amendment, it will go to conference with the House, and be considered in connection with the President's recommendation, will it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, and it would speed the matter up considerably.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is not this practically the same amendment the Senator offered before the chapter on the independent offices appropriations which contains the maritime appropriation, was considered by the committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not the same amendment with respect to which I said there was at that time no budget estimate?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator's amendment then is for \$25,000,000?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that a budget estimate for \$18,000,000 is now under consideration in the House, and in connection with the supplemental bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator will understand therefore why, as chairman of the subcommittee dealing with the independent offices chapter of the bill, I feel that his amendment should be rejected so that it may be considered on the supplemental bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is taking my time. I do not think the amendment should be rejected at all, because the work should have been done a year ago, and the Senate so said. The main purpose of the amendment now is to speed up the work. These ships are lying unrepaired, and the quicker they are repaired the better. The President concurs, the Bureau of the Budget, the Joint Chiefs of Staff concur, and the quicker we get to work on these vessels the better. The ships are needed in this war.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator accept an amendment to his amendment in line with the request made by the President of the United States, which I hold in my hand, for \$18,000,000?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be glad to do so. Then there will be no conflict. I have had no opportunity to do so since the amendment was offered.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should then like to offer that as an amendment to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I modify my amendment to read \$18,000,000 instead of \$25,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment. The amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator rise in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. CORDON. In opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CORDON. I rise not in opposition to what is sought to be done; but it is the opinion of the Senator from Oregon that we will serve the defense interests better if we do not include the item in the general appropriation bill. A supplemental appropriation bill is now being prepared. I think everyone understands that the general appropriation bill must go through conference. Every one of the departmental appropriations must be discussed, and agreements must be reached by a conference committee. Discussions in the conference committee may continue for an interminable length of time. On the other hand, the supplemental appropriation bill will be brought before us very shortly. That bill now carries an estimate for \$18,000,000, for the purpose sought by the Senator from Washington. If needed, another supplemental appropriation bill will come to us.

In my opinion, we can secure final action on the supplemental appropriation bill, with the Senator's item in it, more quickly, and the appropriation will be made more expeditiously in that way, than if the item were placed in the bill we are now considering, which must be sent to an interminable conference, where the point will be raised that an item for this subject is contained in the supplemental bill which will soon be before us. It seems to me that strategy would be in favor of holding a hearing on this matter as a supplemental item, and placing the item in that bill. The result, I believe, will be far more effective and we will have a better chance of action at an early date.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in view of the trouble we know we will have on the item in conference, I hope the Senator from Washington will give ear to what the distinguished Senator from Oregon has just said. I believe it would be better to have the item carried in the supplemental bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I simply want the RECORD to be perfectly clear that what I seek to do is what the Senator from Washington seeks to do by his amendment, but from the knowledge I have in the premises I believe the prop-

er procedure is to place the item in the supplemental measure, and not add it to the bill we are now considering.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, I would be in favor of using the method which would result in the quickest action, whether that be by placing the item in the pending bill or in the supplemental bill. The work must be done, and done quickly. The supplemental bill may not come to us until the pending bill is agreed to in conference. The ships must be repaired. They are needed. The President, the Chiefs of Staff, the Bureau of the Budget all are agreed that they are needed. There surely can be no harm in placing the item in the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in reference to what the Senator from Washington has just said, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that the testimony before our committee was to the effect that the Military Establishment had had the authority and could have proceeded with this work at any time within the past 12 months had they seen fit to do so. The only reason they have not done so is because there has been an argument as to who should spend the money, the Maritime Commission or the Military Establishment.

Mr. CORDON. There is a great deal of truth in that statement, to my knowledge. Orderly procedure would dictate the handling of the matter in connection with the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of the fact that this matter was before the subcommittee charged with the handling of the independent-officers chapter, in view of the fact that there was no budget estimate and that the item was rejected at that time in view of the fact that there is a budget estimate now for less than the amount provided by the amendment, and that the Senator from Washington has accepted an amendment in line with that estimate, but, primarily, in view of the fact that the regular order is to have the matter considered in committee in connection with the supplemental appropriation bill, and that it is always unwise to legislate from the floor, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask for a division. On a division the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me relating to the Bridges-Byrd amendment.

There being no objection, Mr. LEHMAN's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**STATEMENT BY SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN
ON FLOOR OF SENATE ON BRIDGES AMENDMENT**

Mr. President, during the past few weeks of deliberation by this body on the appropriations bill I have said many times that I am strongly in favor of making cuts in the bill as reported out by the committee. I have tried to make it very clear that because of the sudden critical turn of events in Korea I would support amendments which would decrease those funds in the bill in any and every case where such a cut would not hurt or interfere with national defense, public health and welfare, or the efficient operation of the essential Government activities.

I have sought to implement my words by my votes here on the floor. I have supported many of the amendments proposed by my friend the very able and distinguished junior Senator from Illinois. I supported and voted for the amendment introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire, the Senator from Michigan, and the Senator from Massachusetts which would have cut the civil-functions chapter—rivers and harbors and flood-control projects—by 50 percent. None of these amendments, which would have trimmed the appropriations items in this bill at the time of their individual consideration, were approved except the one provision regarding the construction of the new Senate Office Building. I voted to delete that item, at some cost to the efficient operation of my own office.

Mr. President, I am now confronted, as is every Member of this body, with the decision as to whether I will vote for the amendment of the senior Senator from New Hampshire to cut the entire bill by 10 percent across the board. I decided not to make this decision without hearing all the expressions of sentiment, both in favor of and in opposition to this amendment. I have followed very closely and attentively the debate on the amendment. I have read what I could on both sides of this question, practically hoping to be convinced that this amendment would be performing two worthy purposes—first, that it could be effecting necessary economies in this bill; second, that it would be in the national interest.

Mr. President, I have now come to the conclusion that this amendment performs neither of these two functions. I say this with regret, but I say it most sincerely. The method employed to effect the 10-percent cut in this amendment is bad government. It is a delegation of power to the Executive which abdicates the most fundamental powers and duties of the Congress—the duty to approve or disapprove Government functions by appropriating for them. It places in the hands of the Executive the mandate and the discretion to cut any item, however essential we may deem it.

For example, the theoretical share of the Interior Department in this cut would be some \$60,000,000. Under the amendment introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, the Secretary of the Interior could attain this cut by merely cutting the Missouri River Basin project construction and rehabilitation funds by two-thirds of the figure recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee. Thus, all the other offices and agencies in his Department would be spared by this one discretionary act of the Department head.

Mr. President, I believe that this amendment is far from being in the national interest. Some offices and agencies of the Federal Government that contribute the most to the mental and physical well-being of our people would be curtailed and in some cases even crippled.

It is true, as I have stated many times in the past few weeks, that our primary emphasis must be on our national defense activities. But I, for one, Mr. President, do not wish this emphasis to be used as a means of dealing a damaging blow to the social progress which is so vital to our democracy. This Nation and the world may well be in for a period of many years of emphasis on defense against aggressor nations. In this period of time, whether short or long, the outcome of the international struggle depends greatly on the physical strength and the high morale of the American people. Therefore, I cannot support an amendment which I now believe would harm this spiritual and physical strength by curtailing funds for housing, the farm program, education, power development and many other programs to which I might refer.

I wish to say again to my colleagues that, even though I believe further and extensive economies for which I voted could have and should have been made in various items in this bill, I cannot support the means devised in this amendment to attain this end.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In light of the fact that my amendment to the Byrd-Bridges amendment contains four different propositions, and in light of the fact that several Senators have expressed to me a desire to vote separately on the several propositions, my parliamentary inquiry is whether I am privileged to invoke rule XVIII and ask that the several propositions be divided for the purpose of voting, namely:

First, the proposition that the paragraph headed "Economic cooperation" in title I of chapter X-B be included among the items exempted by section 1003 (a) of the Bridges-Byrd amendment.

Second, that the paragraph headed "International children's welfare work" in title I of chapter X-b be likewise included among the items exempted.

Third, that the paragraph headed "International development" in title I of chapter X-b be likewise included among the items exempted.

Fourth, that the paragraph headed "Aid to Palestine refugees" in title III of chapter X-B be likewise included among the exemptions.

I should like to ask a ruling on that point, because I wish to present the matter in that manner, at the request of some of my colleagues.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to rule XVIII of the Senate, which is as follows:

If the question in debate contains several propositions, any Senator may have the same divided, except a motion to strike out and insert, which shall not be divided.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. May I be recognized by the Chair for a moment as to that? While there is an expression in the amendment with reference to striking out, it is simply for the purpose of orderly arrangement. The words "paragraph headed 'Mutual defense assistance'" are stricken out, but the words "mutual defense assistance" are later inserted, so virtually there is no

striking out, except to change the form. The words are retained. Had I drawn the amendment a little differently there would have been no need to strike out at all.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New Jersey is:

On page 2, lines 24 and 25, strike out the words "paragraph headed 'Mutual Defense Assistance'" and insert in lieu thereof the following—

Setting out certain words.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I call the Chair's attention to the fact, that the words stricken out "Mutual defense assistance" are repeated again, but in a little different order. It was simply a matter of arrangement that the amendment was worded in that way. There are no real words stricken out.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Permit the Senator from New Jersey to finish his statement.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Does the Chair rule that that procedure cannot be followed?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks that procedure cannot be followed under the rule.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to ask if a unanimous consent request would be in order, so that I may accommodate my colleagues who would like to have these different items voted on separately? I ask unanimous consent that the four items be voted on separately.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Can an argument be made or a parliamentary inquiry propounded in regard to a proposition on which the Chair has already ruled and concluded his ruling?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks that is a matter within the discretion of the Chair. If the Chair wishes to have a Senator make a little further statement, that is in the discretion of the Chair, just as in the case of an argument on a point of order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the time for this purpose being charged to either side?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Could not the Senator from New Jersey modify his own amendment?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Of course the Senator from New Jersey could modify his amendment or could withdraw it, for the amendment is entirely in the control of the Senator from New Jersey, until the yeas and nays have been ordered on the question of agreeing to it. So the Senator from New Jersey can withdraw the amendment or can modify it in any way he may see fit to do.

Mr. AIKEN. Could not the Senator modify the amendment, which is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senator can modify it by striking out all but one item; it is within his power to modify his amendment in any way he may see fit to do.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I am not going to object, let me say that the situation simply is that the Senator from New Jersey can withdraw all but one of the amendments, and can have them voted on separately. So why not have the votes taken now on the amendments?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, let me say that I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Was not I to be recognized after the two amendments were voted on, under the previous agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from New Mexico is entitled to 20 minutes, whenever he wishes to proceed.

Mr. ANDERSON. I desire to proceed now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. It is my understanding, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered last evening, that immediately after the vote on the Magnuson amendment, the amendment of the Senator from Virginia will be the pending question, and that not more than 5 minutes are to be allowed to any Senator in connection with the further proceedings relative to that amendment. Of course, that agreement might have been modified in my absence from the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Nebraska that the agreement was modified so as to give the Senator from New Mexico the right to speak for 20 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from New Mexico feels that his remarks should come immediately before the vote on the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey. Of course, I have no objection to having him given unanimous consent to speak for any length of time. However, it seems to me that if we could have the votes taken on these amendments, and then have the Senator from New Mexico present his remarks, that would expedite matters.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have no objection to speaking at any time. I felt that under the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered

yesterday afternoon, I was required to speak early this afternoon. However, when there was discussion earlier today, I thought I should withhold my remarks for a certain length of time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that if the Senator from New Mexico will permit the votes on these amendments to be taken now, I shall deeply appreciate it.

Mr. ANDERSON. How many amendments are there?

Mr. WHERRY. Four, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there are probably 12 or 15 amendments.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then I desire to proceed at this time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from New Mexico may proceed for 20 minutes.

THE MCCARRAN AMENDMENT PROVIDING FOR A
LOAN TO SPAIN

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly with reference to the adoption, a day or two ago, of the so-called McCarran amendment. I do not know whether there will or will not be a motion to reconsider the vote by which the McCarran amendment was agreed to. I hope there will be, but unquestionably the matter of the McCarran amendment will come before the Senate again if the Senate does not agree to reconsider it. So I think it desirable that we consider the implications of the so-called McCarran amendment.

At the outset, I think it necessary for me to establish the fact that I have not been opposed to trading with Spain. Let me call attention to the fact that on May 22, 1947, the Commodity Credit Corporation, with which I was then associated in a rather responsible position, attempted to trade with Spain in the handling of tobacco. Every effort was made to deal with Spain and to make such trading with Spain possible. At that time a docket on that subject came before the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I was then in a position where I could have either killed it or supported it. I supported it very vigorously, and provided for the sale of 12,000,000 pounds of United States fire-cured tobacco and additional supplies of tobacco which might be made available to the Spanish tobacco monopoly in Spain. I felt then that this matter should be handled by the Export-Import Bank.

However, the Export-Import Bank was not willing to handle it. Every possible appeal was taken by the Department of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Treasury and to various other governmental officials, in order that American commodities might move in their normal path and that there might be normal dealings with Spain.

Again, on a subsequent date, while I was a Member of the United States Senate, a committee of Senators met with a representative of Spain, Mr. Andres Moreno, general manager of the Banco Hispano-Americano, of Spain; and we discussed the need which Spain had for agricultural commodities. As a result of that discussion, a committee was appointed to meet with the Export-Im-

port Bank and to urge it to provide for the procurement of certain agricultural commodities by Spain. It was not an accident that I was designated as the one to speak to the Export-Import Bank, because the Senators there present recognized that I did believe in trying to trade with Spain in the case of our agricultural commodities.

I did confer with the Export-Import Bank; and immediately thereafter the Export-Import Bank met with Mr. Moreno and discussed the desire of Spain for funds through loans in order that it might deal with this Government in regard to the procurement of agricultural commodities.

Therefore, I say that the vote I cast against the McCarran amendment was not a vote against trading with Spain, but was a vote against doing it on a compulsory basis within the framework of ECA.

At this time I desire to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post, the editorial being entitled "Spanish Omelet." In the closing sentences of the editorial we find the following:

But the sinister aspect of the vote is the harm that will be done in western Europe to the American standing. A week or so ago much disquiet was expressed in the Senate over the success of Soviet propaganda against America. The theme song is America's alleged antidemocracy. In this respect the vote on the loan to Spain was as good as an appropriation of many times the loan to the publicity chest of Moscow. It will be played up as proof of the mockery of the democratic pretensions of America; surely that is patent enough. This is a heavy price to pay for bribing the enemy of your enemy to be your friend.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 3, 1950]

SPANISH OMELET

That the enemy of your enemy is your friend is the theory which gives plausibility to the Senate resolution to lend \$100,000,000 to Franco's Spain. But it is a theory entertained only by primitive minds, and is utterly at variance with logic, or common sense. Worse, in the present case the illusion is terribly harmful, for the vote will alienate many of our true friends, and will erode our moral standing all over free Europe. Whether the theory had much to do with the Senate vote is problematical. What is known is that many elements conspired to tack Spain onto the beneficiaries of Marshall aid without benefit of theory. A wing of the Catholic Church has never ceased to plug financial aid for Franco, though Vatican-Madrid relations are not exactly cordial. For the last year or so cotton interests, thinking of business with Franco, have joined the backers. Then the military, worrying over beachheads in Europe, have never hidden their views about the need for a friendly Spain, though the anticommunism of Franco surely requires no activation along the route of bribery. Finally, sparking the whole campaign, a Spain lobby has been subjecting Members of Congress to tremendous pressure, concentrating of late upon the Republicans, and indulging in much the same tactics as the China lobby practices.

At any time, of course, the Spanish Government could apply for a loan to the Export-Import Bank. But the bank sets certain criteria, such as a reasonable prospect of repayment, which the loan lobby knows that Madrid could not meet. That is the reason for this extraordinary alternative. If the vote is allowed to stand, ECA will presumably set up a mission in Madrid and proceed to invite Franco's government to offer a program of requirements. It will be an isolated mission. ECA cannot expect to get its European opposite number, the Organization of European Economic Cooperation to participate, for the members of OEEC have already refused to open their door to admit Franco, and are bound to resent the pressure of America back of Franco. This has long been known to the administration. Why, then, was it so apathetic toward the loan proposal? The surmise is that it felt any further struggle to be useless. At least, however, there should have been a reminder of what the vote would mean in terms of damaged prestige.

From the first, this newspaper has never been in favor of the severance of ambassadorial relations. But recognition is one thing, financial aid of the present official character, another. The one merely takes cognizance of a fact, the other is a special favor, and, in the context of the existing absence of ambassadorial relations, looks ludicrous. But the sinister aspect of the vote is the harm that will be done in western Europe to the American standing. A week or so ago much disquiet was expressed in the Senate over the success of Soviet propaganda against America. The theme song is America's alleged antidemocracy. In this respect the vote on the loan to Spain was a good as an appropriation of many times the loan to the publicity chest of Moscow. It will be played up as proof of the mockery of the democratic pretensions of America; surely that is patent enough. This is a heavy price to pay for bribing the enemy of your enemy to be your friend.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate the important consideration that \$100,000,000 granted as a loan to Spain under these circumstances is far more valuable to the Soviet Government than \$100,000,000 which Russia itself might spend for propaganda. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the terms we use in the McCarran amendment, when we provide that the Administrator is "authorized and directed" to do these things. A year ago the Senate—and very properly so, I think—adopted a resolution authorizing the Export-Import Bank to deal with Spain.

However, the present McCarran amendment, as amended by the modified O'Mahoney amendment, goes far beyond that, for it says:

Provided further, That the Administrator is authorized and directed to issue notes from time to time during the fiscal year 1951 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to make such purchases, in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate \$100,000,000 for the purpose of assistance to Spain—

And so forth. There is a provision that requires the Government of the United States to make this money available to Spain. Both the State Department and the Export-Import Bank are agreeable to a consideration of the needs of Spain, but they believe that there should be an orderly way in which this should be done. I do not condone what

has been done in the past. I think the Export-Import Bank might have reached out and made some credit available to Spain on terms that we could approve, but I want to remind the Senate that this \$100,000,000 is not all that will be asked.

When Señor Moreno came to this country and appealed to the Export-Import Bank for funds, he was asked how much would be needed to restore the Spanish economy. The figure supplied by him in an official capacity at that time, May 1949, was between \$700,000,000 and \$1,275,000,000. This \$100,000,000 is merely the start. I desire to call that to the attention of the Senate, because only this afternoon we have voted down an amendment increasing the appropriation for heart and cancer research, with which we are all very sympathetic. That amendment proposed an increase of \$60,000,000 or \$65,000,000, and if it were not for the fact that we had become involved in other sums like aid to Spain, it might have been possible to consider favorably the heart and cancer amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I accept the statement that the State Department agrees that something should be done, and that it should be done correctly; but, does not my colleague agree with me that once in a while the Senate can do things correctly?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes; I realize that the Senate can sometimes do things correctly. But I also realize the fact that a year ago an amendment was adopted which permitted Spain to come here and apply for loans, and up to this date the total amount of the loans for which Spain is applying is \$700,000, and that is a long way from \$100,000,000. I think we should have done very well had we insisted that a much smaller amount would be more appropriate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. ANDERSON. I had no opportunity to discuss this question the other day, and I have been trying to get time to discuss it. I shall, of course, be glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator remember that the application of Spain for a loan has been pending now for some 7 or 8 months?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I do; and I have said to the distinguished Senator that I believe that the Export-Import Bank should have done something about it, particularly in view of the fact that the State Department has recommended that that particular loan be granted. The difficulty, it seems to me, is that in the ECA Act, of which this has been made a part it is stated, and I quote the exact words—

It is declared to be the policy of the United States to encourage these countries through joint organization—

To do certain things. Now it just happens that Spain is not a member of that

joint organization, and here responsibility is being imposed upon ECA which it cannot carry out through the joint organization. There is no machinery to do that. It cannot work through the European offices. It has to set up a separate and solely individual organization in Spain to handle aid to Spain, and I think it is wrong here for us to proceed in that way.

I admit, as the distinguished Senator from Nevada, chairman of the Judiciary Committee and author of this amendment, indicated to the Senate recently, that there is \$100,000,000 worth of needs in Spain, and he supplied to the Senate a table pointing out the \$100,000,000 worth of needs. No one questions that Spain needs \$100,000,000. The significant thing is that Spain needs many, many times that amount—700,000,000 or \$1,275,000,000—and I desire to point out to the Senate that it is impossible to get that much money for Spain in the present circumstances of our budget.

Yes, they have indicated that they could do with less, and here and there they have made offers for less. But I point out that when the actual time for filing projects which offer some opportunity for repayment under the terms of the Export-Import Bank is laid down to them, \$700,000 is all Spain would apply for.

I was interested recently in listening to the arguments which were made as to the military desirability of aid to Spain, and I should like to call to the attention of Members of the Senate an editorial in the Christian Science Monitor of about 30 days ago, which mentioned the fact that the hopes for peace were increasing, that arrangements for closer military coordination seemed to make possible the defense of western Europe. The editorial says:

This is a great change from strategic concepts advanced as recently as last summer which assumed that the Red army could not be halted short of the Pyrenees. This view gave military support to American politicians who for their own reasons wanted to play with Franco. The military men wanted bases in Spain to insure a foothold on the Continent.

These words I think are significant:

That defense plan was politically disastrous. It not only outraged all the anti-Fascist elements in Europe; it appeared to have abandoned America's democratic friends to Soviet occupation.

And there we are with the whole military story bared. If it be true that we are to abandon France and Belgium and Holland to the Soviet Government and try to make our stand behind the Pyrenees, then we have completely destroyed the hopes of those people who believed that our pacts meant something to them. I also wish to call attention to the closing paragraph of that editorial, which reads:

The other warning has to do with the assumption that the basic problem of peace can be solved by military means alone. A false reliance on military power can cause the free nations to lose sight of the fact that this is primarily a struggle of ideas. It can lead them to neglect the moral and mental measures required even to halt Russia—and much more necessary to halt communism. Finally it doesn't spur them to develop among themselves the basic sense of brother-

hood and the necessary political and economic cooperation essential to positive peace-making.

Mr. President, I think that expresses the idea that many people have. We should like to see some assistance to Spain and many of us have been working toward that end. But we think it may be a mistake to do it through ECA, where we are depending upon mutual assistance from many European countries who have decided they do not want this type of procedure in Spain. If we suddenly say we will sweep away that mutual agreement, that we will proceed to deal unilaterally with Spain and in complete violation of what we have pledged ourselves to in ECA, then we treat our allied countries badly indeed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was wondering whether the Senator had observed that the keystone of our North Atlantic defense program, the key nation is the Republic of France, and that this action taken by the advice apparently of military minds over the advice of those who are formulating a policy of political organization, is an action which runs counter to the definite purposes and proposals of the French Government, a government around which we are building the bulwark of our strength for the defense of western Europe.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that not only is that true, but it also runs completely contrary to the advices of the British Government, contrary to the advice of the Governments of Holland and Belgium. I wonder how in the world we explain it to those people. I recognize that there are European nations which are trading with Spain, and I say to my friend that I have myself suggested the desirability of trading with Spain within the powers of the Export-Import Bank, but that I believe we should do it that way, and in no other way.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me make one further comment. I think it is significant that time after time we were told this was militarily a wise thing to do. In other words, it seemed desirable to accept the decision of military people on what the State Department should do. I wonder how the military department would like it if the State Department tried to begin deciding which particular type of tanks the Army should use, and when it should use them. The State Department recognizes the right of the military people to make the decision on military weapons, and I do not believe that Department will appreciate the advice of the military department as to how to run the State Department.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it seems to me that what we have done in the Senate in voting \$100,000,000 is contrary to the spirit of a resolution adopted—

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, 20 minutes' time was yielded to the Senator from New Mexico, not to other Senators to make speeches.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor. He can yield only for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that this action is contrary to the spirit of a resolution adopted more than a year ago by the United Nations, is it not a fact that it is an affront to the members of the OEEC who have consistently and vigorously refused to include Franco as one of them, and that these friendly and allied nations will inevitably resent our action in defiance of their attitude? Is it not a fact that this gives the Soviet government a propaganda weapon which it will use to the fullest extent in advancing the thesis that we are not sincerely democratic, but that we are ready to support a Fascist government? Finally, is not a fact that it is a direct repudiation of our own State Department and will undoubtedly make our Government's task in relation to other countries far more difficult than it has been?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to conclude, but I shall yield to my colleague from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not also a fact that the action taken day before yesterday would also be contrary to the ideas of the Communists in the French Parliament, and is it not contrary to the ideas of the Communists in Italy?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not able to express an opinion as to the number of Communist members of the French Parliament, or anything of that nature, but I do say that the State Department, having decided upon a program, and this country having launched upon the ECA program and a mutual-aid pact, I do not think we should turn around and say we will no longer ask the advice and counsel of our European friends, but that we will proceed to handle matters in a completely unilateral fashion.

I point out that I think the aid ought to have some strings tied to it. I think Spain ought to be required to follow conditions laid down for ECA loans. I think the money sent to Spain ought to be spent for the benefit of the people of Spain, and should contribute as well to the general economic welfare of Europe. If the total appropriation were required to go through the Export-Import Bank so they might negotiate with Spain, they might approve only those projects which contributed to the economic health of Europe. But, under the amendment, the

Spanish Government can ask for money for any purpose, and the Secretary is directed to take the note.

I do not object to authorization, but I do object to direction which ties the hands of ECA, of the Export-Import Bank and of the State Department completely.

I want to say a word, Mr. President, with reference to those Senators who voted for the McCarran amendment and for the O'Mahoney substitute. I recognize that a great majority felt they were assisting in saving ECA. If the McCarran amendment provided for \$100,000,000 and was to be included in over-all ECA funds in a way which would be harmful to the program, I can understand why many Senators would support the O'Mahoney amendment in a desire to help ECA. I hope the opportunity comes for us to continue to work in Europe.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Has not the Senator's time been consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has half a minute left.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if I have only half a minute, I shall use it to say that we should try to support the State Department in what it is now doing in Europe. I think acceptance of the McCarran amendment would probably be bad news to the countries of Europe, and I think the Senate ought to reverse itself. I agree that something should be done in the way of more assistance to Spain, and I have tried to show that on two different occasions that I have gone far out of my way to try to make possible some agricultural trading with Spain. But this action, it seems to me, destroys the opportunity of the State Department to do efficient work and to require cooperation from Spain, and I think the amendment is an extremely bad one and should be finally rejected by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not more than 10 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the first branch of the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey exempting the ECA from the provisions of the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I understand that we are about to branch off the amendment affecting the ECA appropriation. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, yesterday the question was raised on the floor that the ECA was or might be engaged in projects which would not directly help the military effort. I made the statement, which was challenged by some Senators, that I was convinced,

from my talks with Mr. Hoffman and other persons, that the ECA was reconsidering the whole program since the Korean war began, and was relating its entire operations to the military effort.

I pointed out that certain products were being handled in one form or another, such as machine tools, railroad transportation, and power plants, which would directly aid the military effort. I stated that all these matters were being carefully considered. Last night, for fear I had overstated the case, I called up Mr. Foster and asked him to read the RECORD and write me in regard to my statement. I have received from Mr. Foster a letter which I should like to read to the Senate as my contribution to the discussion at this time. The letter is as follows:

AUGUST 3, 1950.

Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALEX: In connection with the debate yesterday in the Senate on various overseas projects, it has been suggested that you would like to have some comment from me. At the start let me emphasize the fact that since the invasion of Korea there has been a general reorientation of ECA thinking with respect to the entire program, including the various projects of assistance in dependent overseas territories of Marshall-plan countries in Europe. Every project presented to us is being examined with the fullest consideration of the direct contribution which it can make to the meeting of collective defense needs of the free peoples. Already these territories provide significant amounts of strategic materials now required in increasing quantities by the United States and other North Atlantic treaty powers and the direct contribution that these areas can make to the support of the participating countries in Europe is in many cases an important item.

So far as concerns the specific project in British Honduras which has been much mentioned in the last few days, I should point out that this, like the other projects that were shown by ECA to the Senate Appropriations Committee, was presented by us before the start of hostilities in Korea and only on an illustrative basis. For the Honduran program, for example, we have not yet even received an application and when that application is received you may be sure that, however justifiable the project may be on economic grounds, it will be screened and scrutinized not in the light of circumstances as they existed last May but in light of the more urgent and particular needs of the present time.

To be quite specific, decisions with respect to projects in overseas territories are now guided by:

- (1) The direct contributions which these territories are making and can increasingly make to the rearmament effort;
- (2) Their present and potential value in the maintenance of free world economies, especially those of western Europe;
- (3) The political importance of these territories in the cold war; and
- (4) Their military importance in the event of an outbreak of general hostilities.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM FOSTER,
Acting Administrator.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is a part of the war effort. That is the position which I have taken from the beginning and that is why I ask that the ECA be exempted from the provisions of the Byrd-Bridges amendment providing for a 10-percent cut.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely want to say that from what I heard it appeared that this is a long-range program of the ECA, and it will use the money for something else. Representatives of the ECA justified the appropriations for 22 projects which they said they would use under this appropriation if they could get the money.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will say to the Senator that they are simply reorienting their entire program in line with the war situation.

Mr. WHERRY. If they intend to change the basis upon which the appropriations are made, they should come before the Appropriations Committee and justify the new appropriations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I may say to the distinguished Senator that I asked Mr. Foster that question, and he said it was not possible, since the Korean situation, to justify all these individual changes.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask him whether he does not feel that the Committee on Appropriations has the right to consider the question, as the Committee on Foreign Relations has the right to do so? Therefore, why should not those who seek additional appropriations come before the committee and justify the new basis on which those appropriations are being asked?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I speak in behalf of the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey to exempt ECA. Yesterday I listened to speech after speech which was made in favor of imposing a further reduction of 10 percent, or \$245,000,000, in the funds appropriated to carry on the Marshall plan. If one of the Senators who made those speeches said one word about the great gain to come to our country from the Marshall plan in the event of a world-wide war against communism, I failed to hear it. Every Senator who spoke on the subject expressed a perfect willingness to supply arms to the people of Europe, but said nothing about an increase in their willingness to use those arms to resist a Communist attack.

Mr. President, it is utterly useless to put a rifle in the hands of a man only to have him throw it down and run away at the first sign of danger. Every general who has commanded great armies, from Napoleon to Eisenhower, has asserted the truth of the maxim that morale is to matériel as 10 is to 1. The soldier who does not have the will to fight, however well armed he may be, is a liability, not an asset.

Some Senators seem to have forgotten that it was the address of former Secretary of State Marshall and the prompt action of Congress in implementing his recommendations which prevented some countries in Europe, notably France and Italy, from adopting a Communist form

of government. We acted in the nick of time, or those nations would have followed Poland and Czechoslovakia behind the iron curtain. Indeed, our line of defense would be at the Pyrenees instead of east of the Rhine.

The Marshall plan has given the men of western Europe something to live for. Their children are no longer weakened by malnutrition. Their wives are no longer clad in rags. They and their families are better sheltered. They themselves are not the slaves of a government which has no power to do anything except obey the orders of the Politburo in Moscow. The men and women of western Europe know that the Marshall plan is the catalyst which made it possible for them to arise from the depths of despair to see hope of a happy future. Convincing proof of this is that in every election held in every country in western Europe since the adoption of the Marshall plan there has been a reduction in the number of votes cast for Communist Party candidates.

I still assert the truth of what I said before, that the chief justification for the money which we have spent and will spend for implementing the Marshall plan is our own national defense. The people of western Europe know that the United States has helped them to help themselves, and consequently they are willing to help us in defending the peace of the world.

We cannot carry a war to our greatest potential enemy by sitting at home. We must have bases nearer to him if he is to be punished until he cries for peace. Certainly it is to our advantage not only to have those bases surrounded by friendly people but to have those people cheerfully join with us in fighting the menace which they know is just as deadly to their liberties as it is to our own.

Therefore, let me emphasize that every Marshall-plan dollar has a greater value than any dollar which this Nation may spend for any type of armament, from a rifle cartridge to an atom bomb, to be used in defending its right to exist in a free world.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I am compelled to oppose the proposal to exempt ECA from the 10-percent over-all reduction called for by the Bridges-Byrd amendment. In my judgment, it is not in keeping with our efforts to provide whatever is necessary to bring the Korean war to a successful conclusion, and at the same time to preserve a solvent America.

ECA is feeding inflation in two ways. First, the competition for our limited supply of goods between domestic and foreign purchasers, the latter using United States gifts of dollars, is serving to increase prices in this country. In some cases prices are already rising at an alarming rate. Second, ECA is to an extent responsible for our unbalanced budgets during the last 2 years and for the resulting rise in a monstrous national debt.

Mr. President, the Kansas City Star is running a series of syndicated articles which undertake to give "a voice to the little man who is never heard, you and

me and the guy next door, and probing what is on people's minds these days."

The reporter came across an independent grocer who was persuaded to "let down his hair." Among other things, this man said: "When you add on crazy taxes to make this nutty country a Santa Claus for the family of nations, excepting ourselves, what can we expect but busting inflation? I am ashamed to ask the prices I must charge for foodstuffs if I am to stay in business. What else can I do?"

How are we to meet this problem? The President has suggested a system of limited controls over certain phases of our economy. Others advocate all-out controls over prices, wages, and so forth; in other words, total economic mobilization.

We have learned from experience that police-state controls afford over a period of time no sound solution to the problem of inflation. Controls attack only the effects of inflation, not the cause. Inflation can be effectively stemmed only by bringing about a balance between supply and demand, and by avoiding deficit financing by paying as we go.

We must provide whatever is necessary in Korea. We should eliminate all unnecessary domestic expenditures. For example, this is no time for building, with the taxpayers' money, pleasure-boat harbors. We must also eliminate unnecessary foreign expenditures. There is no reason why the ECA program should not take its share of the reduction.

Does it make sense to reduce the amount to be appropriated for the construction of badly needed domestic projects in this country, and yet exempt from reduction ECA funds to be used for foreign peacetime projects such as soil conservation in Algeria?

Many such projects can be named in addition to the one in Algeria. For example, a meat plant in Zanzibar.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will yield I shall be glad to tell him about one more such project.

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield. However, I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. A highway is to be built in British Honduras. The necessity for the highway was brought about by some political differences between Guatemala and the British Empire. I should like to inquire what ECA has to do with the building of that road, and why ECA funds should be used to comply with an agreement entered into between the British Empire and Guatemala.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I agree entirely with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. Similar instances of totally irrelevant projects could be piled up much beyond the time which has been allotted to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert the remainder of my remarks in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I cannot agree to the Senator putting his remarks in the RECORD unless they are labeled as a statement, and do not appear as a speech. We have been edging up on the rule in the Senate for a long time. The Senate has never heretofore adopted the policy of having remarks published in the RECORD as if they were delivered on the floor when they were not delivered on the floor of the Senate. I have no objection to the Senator inserting his statement, but he must label it a statement. Otherwise I shall object.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my prepared remarks be set out in the RECORD labeled in large letters "statement."

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot guarantee the size of the letters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remainder of the Senator's remarks will appear in the RECORD as a statement.

The remainder of Mr. KEM's remarks are as follows:

It is about time that the needs of the American people received consideration at least equal to that accorded peoples of foreign countries.

We can—we must—win the hot war against communism. But victories on the battlefield will be in vain if our American economy is shattered by inflation.

We shall gain nothing by defeating communism only to embrace socialism in the process.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I rise to speak for the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey. I do so with some feeling and with no reservations whatever.

Since the American Government became a member of the United Nations, since it embarked upon the Marshall plan, as it is called, and since it accepted the principle of collective security, I have allowed my thinking to fall entirely into the scope of what all that means. It means international cooperation, and only those things should be done by a nation which can be done through the medium of international agreement.

Mr. President, it is for that reason that I voted against the amendment which probably would add to the strategical welfare of Europe by strengthening Spain. It seemed to me that when the United Nations had made a decision we should stand by that decision. It seemed to me, in regard to the Marshall plan, that when a decision had been made to go forth in cooperation with other nations, and an implied contract had been made that we would stand by what we had done and what we had been planning for so many years, any other action on the part of Congress, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has said, would tend to destroy the morale of nations which we have been trying to get to cooperate with us.

There is, of course, a great fundamental question in the world. Everyone knows that the world is divided into two schools of thought. One school believes in a single will, a judgment to be made by one man and to be followed by all

the others, a dictator notion of ideas. Another school believes in freedom of discussion, freedom of thinking, freedom of ability to work in harmony with one another.

Mr. President, it is the second school with which the United States allies itself. I would not budge from the great advancement which has been made. I was a supporter of the proposal of Briand, the great Prime Minister of France, for a United States of Europe. I have wanted to see Europe saved, and the Marshall plan is a part of the method of saving it, and the United Nations is part of it. If we are to be saved in this world we have to be saved by making friends, by developing the right kind of allies.

Whether my reasons are consistent with those of others or not, I will stand as I have always stood, and as I intend to stand, trying above all to respect any kind of international commitment which we have made, and doing nothing which would in any way destroy such a commitment.

Mr. President, that is my fundamental thinking. That was the thinking in my mind when I voted upon the Spanish amendment a few days ago, and that is the thinking which will control my mind in the vote we are about to take.

I think it wrong for the Congress of the United States to put an impediment in the way of the Government of the United States in its attempt to bring about the preservation of the world by cooperative action.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, in line with the address of the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I now enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which chapter X-B, as amended, was agreed to, and also the vote agreeing to the McCarran amendment as amended. The motion is made in this way because it will be necessary to reconsider the entire chapter in order to get at any specific amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is a motion to lay on the table now in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not at this time. There is other business before the Senate. Entering the motion by the Senator from West Virginia is a privileged matter, but that does not automatically bring the motion before the Senate. The motion is entered, but it is not before the Senate at this moment.

KYRA KITE RIDDLE—REENROLLMENT OF BILL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send forward a concurrent resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 99), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to return to the Senate the enrolled bill (S. 1654) for the relief of Kyra Kite Riddle. If and when

said bill is returned by the President, the action of the presiding officers of the two Houses in signing said bill shall be deemed rescinded; and the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following correction: In line 5 of the Senate engrossed bill strike out "\$1,764.43" and insert "\$1,560.80."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a word of explanation. S. 1654 is a private bill for the relief of Kyra Kite Riddle. At the time it passed the Senate and the House of Representatives it authorized the payment of the sum of \$1,764.43 to Kyra Kite Riddle. By reason of an error in calculation the amount which should have been provided in the bill was \$1,560.80. The enrolled bill is now at the White House. The concurrent resolution which I now send to the desk requests the President of the United States to return the enrolled bill to the Senate and that, upon its return, the action of the presiding officers of the two Houses signing said bill shall be deemed rescinded. It further provides that the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to correct the amount appropriated in said bill by inserting the figures "\$1,560.80" in line 5 of the engrossed bill, in lieu of the figures "\$1,764.43."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Is this a privileged matter, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be considered by unanimous consent only.

Mr. WHERRY. It is all right if it is merely a correction, but if it is to provoke argument, I certainly hope the request will be withdrawn. I think we should proceed to vote on the amendments to the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to take the time of the Senate, but I hope very much that the Senate will support the amendment of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. All Senators know, from the debate and from information generally, what a tremendous influence the ECA has had upon the restoration of business, commerce and industry in Europe, western Europe particularly.

Mr. President, this particular hour in our history is not the time to reduce or to discontinue the ECA appropriation for western Europe. We are calling upon many of the nations of the United Nations to come to our aid in the Korean war, and we cannot afford to send out a message to those nations and to the rest

of the world that we are cutting down our aid under the Marshall plan.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Can the Senator from Texas give us a statement as to how many nations have responded to our call, and what they are furnishing in the Korean war?

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot at the moment. I can get the information, however, for the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Can the Senator mention one single foot soldier that is going to Korea?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, they are on their way. Australia is furnishing some foot soldiers. Great Britain has promised some foot soldiers.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true that the French Army in Indochina is facing precisely the same enemy we are facing in Korea? Is it not true that Joseph Stalin is behind similar moves in both countries?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure that is true.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield very briefly.

Mr. KEM. Is Australia a beneficiary of the Marshall plan?

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. There have been no foot soldiers sent to assist our military force in Korea up to this date. Our soldiers have been there now for more than 30 days.

Mr. CONNALLY. Before they are sent there, the Government must make arrangements to send them. There are objectors in Australia and in New Zealand, just as we sometimes have them in the United States Congress. So objections have to be overcome.

Mr. BYRD. Apparently there are so many objectors that we are not going to receive any assistance; and we will have to do all the fighting.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we want assistance. We are not opposed to receiving assistance. But I know my duty regardless of whether others come to our rescue or not. I am not going to sit down and say, "Well, Australia has not done her part, England has not done her part; therefore, I will not do my part." We have got to go on with this war if there is not a single foot soldier from another land sent to assist us, or if there is not a dollar contributed from any other land. We have laid our hands to the plow. We have got to continue until the victory is ours.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Is it not true that efforts to cut ECA appropriations were oftentimes made by some persons long before there was any incident in Korea? Is it not true that efforts were then made to cut ECA funds? The argument

about the Korean incident does not seem to hold water because of the actions of certain individuals last year and this year.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is very true. Of course, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has never voted for any ECA appropriations. No wonder he is willing to trim it down. He is willing to trim off a little slice here, a little slice there and a little slice elsewhere. When the legislation was originally enacted he was willing to slice off its head and cut off each of its arms and its legs and its ears and its nose. He wanted to kill it all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a letter addressed by Mr. William Foster, Acting Administrator of the ECA to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], together with a letter addressed to me, as well as an article entitled "Marshaling the Marshall Plan," published in the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION

ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D. C., July 27, 1950.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: It is expected that the Senate will vote very soon on the appropriation for the European recovery program. This vote and the amount to be appropriated take on new significance in view of the struggle in which we are now engaged.

I think it vital that certain considerations be emphasized in advance.

Vast new expenditures for military purposes are called for and in light of this circumstance all proposed appropriations must be strictly scrutinized so that resources can be husbanded for the most essential needs. But among such needs high priority must be given to the sums required for maintaining the economic strength of our friends and increasing their military strength as well.

It is important to recollect that early in 1948 the Communist threat to western Europe was a clear and present danger. The Marshall plan has not only so far prevented this threat from being translated into action, but has greatly increased the strength of western Europe to resist the danger. The continued need for world-wide strength to prevent further aggression and to preserve the peace is apparent.

It is this strength which the current vote on ECA will decisively affect. It is this strength which obviously must be made up out of the resources of the whole free world and not the United States alone. And the rest of the free world, particularly the free nations of western Europe, are now, as a result of Marshall aid, in a position to contribute substantially to that end.

What are the political, psychological, and economic changes in the OEEC nations that 2½ years with ERP aid have accomplished and which justify this statement?

Those changes include: a greatly increased industrial and agricultural production; an attainment of reasonable internal financial stability; a political stability allowing for freely chosen democratic governments with constantly declining totals of Communist voters; the sharp reduction of arbitrary restrictions on intra-European trade; the in-

stitution of the European Payments Union with its promise of convertibility within Europe; and a steadily growing belief by the people of Europe in their own future.

Without the assistance furnished by this country through the Foreign Assistance Act, this strong economic base could not have been built. And a strong economy and stable society is the foundation of military strength. In the months ahead, this economic base will have to bear a far heavier load as the free nations of western Europe build up their military strength. It is, therefore, more essential than ever that ECA assistance be continued so that the European economy can carry the load of rearmament, as well as contribute to the maintenance of a decent standard of living.

It is clear that such a continuation of ECA assistance, together with mutual defense assistance, will guarantee more security and a greater increase in military strength for each United States dollar that is spent than we could possibly achieve relying on United States production alone.

This multiplying effect has been demonstrated many times over the past 2 years in the industrial field. For example, electric power capacity in western Europe has vastly increased since April 1948. This increase results mainly from expansion of plants through capital investment, of which about 95 percent was contributed by the European countries themselves, and only 5 percent from ECA dollars. Yet without this 5 percent in dollars the developments could not have been built. Similarly, in military items, though the ratio of total production to dollar investment may not be so dramatic, the effect of each dollar made available to Europe will be multiplied many times.

In this connection and because of our own military effort, question has been raised regarding future use of local currency counterpart funds. While it is clear that in some countries at least a portion of the counterpart could well be directed toward expanding facilities to be used for production of military equipment, there are many instances where present use of counterpart should be maintained best to help attain this new objective. For instance, where the major portion of a nation's counterpart is now being released for such purposes as development of electrical energy supply, improvement of basic transportation facilities, such as roads and railroads, or increasing the facilities of important seaports, these developments can contribute substantially and directly to increasing production for military purposes or to the movement of troops and supplies. It is true, moreover, that wise use of counterpart will further increase the multiplying effect to which I referred and our efforts will be directed to that end.

Up to this point the Marshall plan has been chiefly concerned with building resistance to communism within certain of the participating countries; from now on equal emphasis must also be given to building resistance to aggression from without. But in either case the proved principle of the Marshall plan is applicable: That American aid brings increased returns when coupled with self-help and mutual aid by the participating countries. On the other hand, withdrawal of adequate support by the United States would result in almost immediate economic disruption of the western European nations.

Therefore, I urge in the national interest and in order effectively to wage the peace, that you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of your committee, all of whom are so aware of these dangers, press for a fully adequate amount.

The Marshall plan is firmly identified in the European mind as the symbol of United States partnership in attaining peace and strength. Any sharp curtailment of Marshall aid might well be profoundly misunderstood as indicating a loss of United States interest in the economic stability of Europe.

However, a further endorsement by the Senate will give confidence in the present and hope for the future to the entire free world.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM FOSTER,
Acting Administrator.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: You have inquired about our actions and plans for reorienting the Marshall plan in light of the evident willingness of international communism to use arms in attaining its ends. First, I should like to point out that from the moment Mr. Molotov and representatives of the satellite nations walked out of the initial meetings in Paris on July 2, 1947, our efforts to promote recovery in Europe became this country's prime implement for combatting communism. And when, subsequently, on October 6, 1947, the Cominform was announced, the Marshall plan became the avowed enemy and chief target of the Communists.

Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, repeatedly pointed to the dangers of Communist aggression on all fronts—economic, political, informational, as well as military—with all the energy, sincerity, and urgency at his command. Therefore, when the aggression began in Korea on June 25, the ECA staff was psychologically well-conditioned, and immediately understood the import of the Communist move. At staff meetings held thereafter, gratitude was expressed that in 2 years the Marshall plan had changed western Europe from an economic and military liability into a considerable asset to the strength of the free world.

It was agreed that all efforts to build general economic strength as the absolutely necessary base on which to build military power must be accelerated. It was also agreed that our programs should be restudied at once in order to focus more on those projects which would more directly contribute to early improvement in western European defense.

Although use of counterpart funds for direct defense purposes had been previously discouraged, it was agreed that the new situation warranted sympathetic reception of new proposals submitted by the participating countries to use their counterpart for this purpose. At the same time a review or programs to see whether certain long-range projects might be shelved in favor of those that might be completed more quickly in favor of speedier defense was undertaken.

A complete review of the problems of dollar earnings by the participating countries was also undertaken in the light of the fact that increase in war production would probably cause a decline in consumer-goods production in western Europe.

Little notice of this change in emphasis was given in the press, no doubt largely because of the need to devote so much space to the Korean war, but within a short time questions were posed, and by the end of July it is fair to say that quite broad coverage had been given our new plans and reorienting. I attach a few clippings from leading newspapers to illustrate this fact.

The top staff of ECA was, of course, involved in all these decisions and activities. We had the advantage of frequent telephonic communication with Mr. Hoffman, who is confined to his home recuperating from an operation. On July 28 we held a meeting of all our ECA division chiefs and went over the new development together in as much detail as possible. On July 29, I delivered a letter to Senator CONNALLY setting forth our position. A copy of this is also attached.

In general, I should define our present objectives as being to continue the process

of strengthening resistance to communism from within the participating countries while adding as much, and as quickly as possible, to the powers of the participating countries to resist Communist aggression from without.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM FOSTER,
Acting Administrator.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

MARSHALING THE MARSHALL PLAN—AN
INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON
(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Just as with everything else, the Korean war is having its effect on the Marshall plan.

Heretofore the Marshall plan's contribution to winning the cold war has stemmed from the improved economic conditions it fostered in western Europe, making communism less and less attractive to western Europeans.

But in the month since the North Korean aggression, there has been a visible reorientation of the Marshall plan concept toward winning a hot—as well as a cold—war.

It is no secret in Washington that from now on the Marshall plan purpose will be expanded to include resisting communism from without the participating countries as well as within those countries.

To that end, the Economic Cooperation Administration is taking the following steps:

1. It is giving priority to the flow of materials required in defense production in the participating countries.

2. Present and future recovery projects are being reviewed to discover how quickly or how extensively they can contribute to western Europe's defense. Some will be speeded up and others shelved as a result of this study.

3. A vigorous deliberate effort will be made to build up America's stockpile of strategic materials by developing the source of such materials in cooperation with Marshall-plan countries. New ECA missions to southeast Asiatic countries will be particularly active here.

4. Counterpart funds, wherever possible, will be used to further western Europe's defense efforts while at the same time advancing its economic recovery.

It is fully recognized that with this new emphasis on defense production there will be a certain disruption in Europe's production of consumer goods for export. That means that this reorientation of the Marshall plan can be expected to cut into the anticipated dollar earnings of western Europe from such exports.

However, there will be a more than counterbalancing effect on the dollar-earning position of western Europe, it is believed, from the increase in United States strategic materials buying that is expected. And, as the United States ships raw materials and semifinished goods to Europe for western Europe's new rearmament program, the overall effect, it is felt, will be to temporarily remove the dollar gap as a serious problem.

This reorientation of the Marshall plan concept to take into account the Korean hot war does not alter ECA's basic purpose to bring about western Europe's economic recovery. It only means that while in the past the Marshall plan has confined itself to building resistance to communism within western Europe through recovery, it will now be giving equal emphasis to the building of resistance to communism from without through defense production as well.

ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman has frequently emphasized that in today's conflict between the free world and international communism the battle goes on on four fronts—economic, political, informational, military. Sometimes there is activity on all fronts—as now; sometimes there are pe-

riods of lull on one or more fronts. But the fronts are constantly present and the battle joined on one or all fronts whenever communism decides to attack.

With western Europe being forced to step up its defense production, the economic strength that ECA has built up in western Europe over the past 2 years suddenly becomes military potential for the free world. In the last 2 years, the 24-percent increase in Europe's industrial production, the 52-percent rise in its steel production, the 17-percent increase in hard-coal production, the 21-percent advance in electric power production, not only have resulted in startling economic recovery but have provided a military potential that will contribute greatly to making western Europe secure.

Western Europe may be no match for the heavily armed and constantly arming Soviet Union. But, it is pointed out here, through its own efforts and with ECA help, it has today: a steel capacity of 50,000,000 tons as compared with the Soviet Union's 31,000,000 tons; coal production one and a half times that of eastern Europe and Russia; five times the electric power production of the U. S. S. R.

Western Europe does not have to match the Soviet Union in armaments to have security, for besides its own economic strength it has the industrial power and potential of the United States on its side. However, for the indefinite future, now that communism has shown its willingness to resort to a shooting war to gain its objectives, western Europe will have to adjust itself to less production for export and more for defense. And, as a result, the United States will have to accept a new concept of Marshall plan aid.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, what some Senators seem to be overlooking is the fact that the Appropriations Committee already has cut and sliced the budget submitted by the President to the tune of \$1,395,000,000. In that \$1,395,000,000 is 10 percent of the ECA funds. Now it is proposed, by the Byrd-Bridges amendment, to cut the ECA funds another 10 percent. It is proposed to use the meat axe, without any rhyme or reason, without any sound argument being advanced—so, without the facts upon which a cut should be based.

Mr. President, after the ECA fund has been reduced 10 percent, after the Appropriations Committee has voted by a vote of 17 to 3 to leave the ECA fund as it was originally in the committee, it is false economy to come in with another 10 percent slice. That simply does not make sense. Members of the Appropriations Committee who have put in weeks and months upon the question should know what is most wise and judicious.

Mr. President, it is fine for Senators to be for economy, but in this instance Senators are going to be for economy at the expense, as the able Senator from Arizona has said of the morale of the countries across the sea who are expecting ECA help at this particular time.

Mr. President, as I said previously, never before in the history of this Republic has it been so necessary for America to have friends and allies in the western democracies as it is at this very moment. It is necessary that we have friends and allies by reason of the paralysis which is creeping through the world because communism is spreading its poisonous tentacles everywhere. Two hundred and seventy million people in the western democracies are depending

upon the Marshall plan. Anyone who goes to Europe today and surveys what has happened by way of relieving the people of Europe from the economic burdens, from the squalor and the poverty which existed immediately following the most devastating war in all our history, will truly understand what the Marshall plan has meant to them.

Mr. President, this is not a one-way street. The Marshall plan is for the benefit of, for the safety and security of America as well as the countries across the sea.

Mr. President, I undertake to say that without the Marshall plan—and I believe each of the governments of the western European democracies will corroborate what I now say—that without the Marshall plan many of them would be under the iron heel of Joe Stalin. Were it not for the Marshall plan Italy today would be under the iron heel of communism. Were it not for the Marshall plan France would also be under that despotic power. Norway would be under that iron heel. Probably Sweden, Turkey, and Greece and other small countries would also be under that Kremlin dominion. That would result from infiltration such as occurred in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and other countries of Europe.

Mr. President, the amendment we are considering is an important one. We cannot take \$240,000,000 more from the ECA funds and permit the Administrator to use what is left, without crippling severely the proper administration of the plan. The amendment ought to be overwhelmingly agreed to by the United States Senate in the interest of our own country, in the interest of the countries which are our friends and allies across the sea. I plead with Senators on both sides of the aisle to give this amendment their vote in the interest of America and the world.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I happen to be a Member of the Senate who has supported the ECA program since its inception, but I am going to vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I do not agree that what is proposed is a meat-ax approach to the problem. To the contrary, we have a new set of facts which have come into the picture since the ECA budget was submitted to the Appropriations Committee. That set of facts is that we have naked aggression in Korea. Congress has been requested to appropriate an additional \$10,000,000,000 for our Defense Establishment. We are being asked for an additional \$4,000,000,000 for the arms-implementation program. The President of the United States has already requested \$5,000,000,000 more in new taxes. In my judgment he will have to come to the Congress and request at least an additional \$5,000,000,000. The Senator from Illinois, the majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] talks about a meat-ax approach. We are called upon to approach the American people with a meat ax in order to take new taxes from them.

It seems to me that under all those circumstances, we are justified in applying this reduction to the ECA appropri-

tions, along with the other nondefense appropriations. I do not underestimate the importance of the ECA program; but I do say that, as in Korea, to have the ECA, unless we have sufficient arms with which to defend the free world, will merely be to invite further Communist aggression in Europe and the Far East.

Right now we have to do first things first, and the first thing we have to do is to arm adequately the free world, including ourselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first branch of the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Legislative Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Anderson	Hill	Morse
Brewster	Hoey	Mundt
Bricker	Holland	Murray
Bridges	Humphrey	Myers
Butler	Hunt	Neely
Byrd	Ives	O'Connor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Connally	Kem	Russell
Cordon	Kerr	Saltonstall
Darby	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Donnell	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Leahy	Sparkman
Eastland	Lehman	Stennis
Eaton	Lodge	Taft
Ellender	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McCarthy	Thye
Fulbright	McClellan	Tydings
George	McFarland	Watkins
Gillette	McKellar	Wherry
Graham	McMahon	Wiley
Green	Magnuson	Williams
Gurney	Malone	Young
Hayden	Martin	
Hendrickson	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the first branch of the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey to the Byrd-Bridges amendment. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would each vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—45

Aiken	Hoey	Morse
Anderson	Humphrey	Murray
Chapman	Ives	Myers
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Connally	Kerr	O'Connor
Douglas	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Leahy	Pepper
Flanders	Lehman	Robertson
Fulbright	Lodge	Smith, Maine
George	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Graham	McCarran	Sparkman
Green	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McMahon	Thye
Hill	Magnuson	Tydings

NAYS—40

Brewster	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Holland	Russell
Butler	Hunt	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnson, S. C.	Stennis
Cordon	Kem	Taft
Darby	Knowland	Watkins
Donnell	Langer	Wherry
Dworshak	McCarthy	Wiley
Eastland	McClellan	Williams
Ecton	Malone	Young
Ferguson	Martin	
Gillette	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—11

Benton	Jenner	Tobey
Cain	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Downey	Long	Withers
Frear	Taylor	

So the first branch of Mr. SMITH's amendment to the Byrd-Bridges amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the second branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, which exempts the International Children's Welfare Work from the provisions of the Byrd-Bridges amendment. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" appear to have it.

Several Senators requested a division.

On a division, the second branch of the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question now is on the third branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] exempting the international development from the provisions of the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Chair announce the result again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announced that the second branch of the amendment was rejected on the division vote.

Mr. LUCAS. That it was not agreed to?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request for the yeas and nays comes too late, now that the result has been announced.

Mr. NEELY. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia moves to reconsider the vote by which the second branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the motion be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

Mr. HUMPHREY and other Senators demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] to reconsider the vote by which the second branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was rejected. Senators favoring the motion to lay on the table will vote "yea" when their names are called; those opposed will vote "nay." The yeas and nays having been ordered, the Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is detained on official committee business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "yea."

The result of the vote was—yeas 42, nays 42.

YEAS—42

Brewster	Ferguson	Malone
Bricker	George	Martin
Bridges	Gillette	Millikin
Butler	Hendrickson	Mundt
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Capehart	Hoey	Russell
Chapman	Holland	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Darby	Kem	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Watkins
Eastland	Lodge	Wherry
Ecton	McCarthy	Williams
Ellender	McClellan	Young

NAYS—42

Aiken	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Anderson	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Chavez	Kerr	Neely
Connally	Kilgore	O'Connor
Douglas	Leahy	O'Mahoney
Flanders	Lehman	Pepper
Graham	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Green	McCarran	Sparkman
Gurney	McFarland	Taft
Hayden	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Humphrey	Magnuson	Thye
Hunt	Maybank	Tydings
Ives	Morse	Wiley

NOT VOTING—12

Benton	Fulbright	Taylor
Cain	Jenner	Tobey
Downey	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Frear	Long	Withers

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 42, the nays 42; so the motion to lay on the table fails.

The question now recurs on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to reconsider the vote by which the second branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—43

Aiken	Douglas	Green
Anderson	Flanders	Gurney
Chavez	Fulbright	Hayden
Connally	Graham	Hill

Humphrey	McFarland	Pepper
Hunt	McKellar	Smith, N. J.
Ives	McMahon	Sparkman
Johnson, Tex.	Magnuson	Taft
Johnston, S. C.	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Kerr	Morse	Thomas, Utah
Kilgore	Murray	Thye
Leahy	Myers	Tydings
Lehman	Neely	Wiley
Lucas	O'Connor	
McCarran	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—42

Brewster	Ferguson	Malone
Bricker	George	Martin
Bridges	Gillette	Millikin
Butler	Hendrickson	Mundt
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Capehart	Hoey	Russell
Chapman	Holland	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Darby	Kem	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Watkins
Eastland	Lodge	Wherry
Eaton	McCarthy	Williams
Ellender	McClellan	Young

NOT VOTING—11

Benton	Jenner	Tobey
Cain	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Downey	Long	Withers
Frear	Taylor	

So the motion to reconsider the vote by which the second branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was rejected, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The question is on the second branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Hill	McCarran
Anderson	Humphrey	McFarland
Chavez	Hunt	McKellar
Connally	Ives	McMahon
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Magnuson
Flanders	Johnston, S. C.	Maybank
Fulbright	Kerr	Morse
Graham	Kilgore	Murray
Green	Leahy	Myers
Gurney	Lehman	Neely
Hayden	Lucas	O'Connor

O'Mahoney	Sparkman	Thye
Pepper	Taft	Tydings
Smith, Maine	Thomas, Okla.	Wiley
Smith, N. J.	Thomas, Utah	

NAYS—41

Brewster	Ferguson	Malone
Bricker	George	Martin
Bridges	Gillette	Millikin
Butler	Hendrickson	Mundt
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Capehart	Hoey	Russell
Chapman	Holland	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Darby	Kem	Stennis
Donnell	Knowland	Watkins
Dworshak	Langer	Wherry
Eastland	Lodge	Williams
Eaton	McCarthy	Young
Ellender	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—11

Benton	Jenner	Tobey
Cain	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Downey	Long	Withers
Frear	Taylor	

So the second branch of the amendment of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next question is on agreeing to the branch of the amendment exempting international development. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those who favor the amendment will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those in favor of the amendment will be seated, and those opposed to the amendment will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. KERR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—39

Anderson	Gillette	Humphrey
Chavez	Graham	Ives
Connally	Green	Johnson, Tex.
Ellender	Hayden	Johnston, S. C.
Fulbright	Hill	Kerr

Kilgore	Magnuson	Pepper
Leahy	Maybank	Smith, Maine
Lehman	Morse	Smith, N. J.
Lodge	Murray	Sparkman
Lucas	Myers	Thomas, Okla.
McFarland	Neely	Thomas, Utah
McKellar	O'Connor	Thye
McMahon	O'Mahoney	Tydings

NAYS—46

Aiken	Flanders	Martin
Brewster	George	Millikin
Bricker	Gurney	Mundt
Bridges	Hendrickson	Robertson
Butler	Hickenlooper	Russell
Byrd	Hoey	Saltonstall
Capehart	Holland	Schoeppel
Chapman	Hunt	Stennis
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Darby	Kem	Watkins
Donnell	Knowland	Wherry
Douglas	Langer	Wiley
Dworshak	McCarran	Williams
Eastland	McCarthy	Young
Eaton	McClellan	
Ferguson	Malone	

NOT VOTING—11

Benton	Jenner	Tobey
Cain	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Downey	Long	Withers
Frear	Taylor	

So the third branch of the amendment of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the fourth branch of the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey exempting aid to Palestine refugees.

The fourth branch of the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the amendment, as amended, offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on behalf of himself and other Senators, the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to that amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 10, it is proposed to strike out "10 percent" and insert in lieu thereof "15 percent."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to register my firm opposition and deep regret over the action which has just been taken on the subject of international development. At a stage in world history when we are in desperate need of the point 4 program for economic development of the underdeveloped and underprivileged areas, it seems to me that the action of the Senate in rejecting the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey was a most unfortunate action. I realize there is little or nothing we can do about it at this stage, except to let it be known that there is at least a sizable number in the United States Senate who feel that the war against communism is not merely a war of tanks and guns; that the war against communism is also a relentless war against poverty, misery, and disease. To think that the Senate of the United States would slice off \$2,600,000 from a \$26,000,000 appropriation in the name of economy when the peoples of the world that are going into the Communist camp are the underprivileged people of the underdeveloped areas.

If ever there was a weapon that could be used on the side of freedom and democracy it is the weapon of technological assistance and scientific advance, of which this country has an abundance. Here we are about to appropriate vast sums, billions of dollars, for armament which we desperately need for fighting against the Communist aggressor on the battlefield, and yet we do not seem to possess the good judgment to appropriate a few million dollars to fight against the very forces that take people into the arms and into the camp of the Communist menace. I think that is a tragic mistake, and I think this country will rue the day that the Congress of the United States did not have the foresight to strike a blow in behalf of humanity through striking against disease and disaster by giving to these people in other parts of the world a chance to help themselves.

We just sustained the vote on ECA, and there were projects in ECA which could be questioned. But I say there is not one single proposal in the point-4 program that can be questioned. One cannot question the fight against malaria, one cannot question the need for land reclamation, for irrigation, for electric power, the fight to rid these underprivileged areas of disease. We are proposing to pass millions and millions of dollars of appropriations, but when it comes to a matter of equipping the United States of America and the United Nations with a little money to employ teachers, educators, scientists, technicians, those who can help other people help themselves, what do we do? We say no.

Mr. President, I say now that our action will ring over the Moscow radio into Indochina, and it may not be long before we will have to send troops to Indochina, and when we send those troops the Moscow radio will say, "Yes, they will send their soldiers to kill the Indochinese but they will not send you a public health doctor to help you rid your swamps of disease."

Mr. President, what we have done is a shame and a tragedy. I hope that in conference the conferees will reconsider the action of the Senate and in the name of all that is decent and good, in the name of humanity and progress, will report to the Senate an appropriation for the point 4 program which is worthy of the United States of America. In view of the billions we are spending elsewhere, our action today is not worthy of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to address myself for five minutes to the effect of the Wherry amendment upon the various departments of the Government.

As Senators know, the appropriation for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments and the Judiciary are combined under one head, in one chapter of the bill. The appropriation for

that chapter as reported by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] was \$119,516,000 or 10 percent under the budget estimate. The proposal we now have before us is to cut 15 percent more from the appropriation for those several departments. The result will be that the appropriation for the Department of State will be reduced by \$28,863,000. The appropriation for the Department of Justice will be reduced \$2,248,000. The Judiciary itself is exempt. The appropriation for the Department of Commerce will be reduced by \$37,200,000.

The total reduction, under the budget, by the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska, instead of the \$119,000,000 reduction, as our committee has reported, will be increased to \$188,050,000.

It seems to me the Senate ought to realize what a drastic cut is now proposed to be made by imposing a 15 percent reduction on the 10 percent reduction which the committee, after careful study, has already provided.

Let us now look at the Department of Agriculture. Let us see what would be done there. The chapter of the bill dealing with the Department of Agriculture, as reported by the committee, carries a reduction of \$30,000,000 under the budget estimate. The 15-percent cut would add \$36,000,000 more to that. So the total reduction under the budget would be \$127,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture. But, more than that, it would also cut \$105,000,000 from the ability of the Department of Agriculture to make loans. The 15 percent cut in the money provided for rural electrification and for the farm loan program throughout the United States, would affect those programs to the extent of \$105,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator speaking of a 15 percent reduction or a 10 percent reduction?

Mr. HAYDEN. A 15 percent reduction, which is the proposal made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] as an amendment to the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Bridges-Byrd amendment calls for a 10 percent reduction.

Mr. HAYDEN. The pending amendment, offered by the Senator from Nebraska to the Byrd-Bridges amendment, calls for a 15-percent reduction.

I simply wished to give these illustrations of the effect of agreeing to such a proposal; I did so in order that Senators might know what they were voting for.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall not support the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

I believe it is imperative that we economize. For that reason, I voted against the amendment to exclude the ECA from the provisions of the Bridges-Byrd amendment. I have felt, and I still believe, that it is just as necessary for us to economize in peacetime spending abroad as it is for us to economize in our peacetime domestic spending at home.

I think the action taken by the Senate this afternoon in excluding ECA from any cut, is extremely unfortunate. It

indicates that we have adopted two standards in regard to spending by the United States in time of an emergency. One is that we shall place the yoke upon our own people and make their burden heavier in order to make certain that we do not withhold anything from those abroad.

Let me remind the Senate that every dollar that is spent abroad under the ECA program, however much it may be justified, makes more compelling and necessary retrenchment and curtailment in our expenditures at home for the development of programs in our own interest and welfare. Our action in voting a few minutes ago the extra \$200,000,000-odd for the ECA program, for the building of roads and the carrying on soil-conservation projects, and so forth in Africa and elsewhere, means that every dollar that is spent in such places will have to be taken out of the corresponding programs here in the United States.

Therefore, I shall support, as I originally planned, the Byrd-Bridges amendment calling for a 10-percent reduction; but I shall not support any further reduction.

I regret exceedingly that we are not willing to apply a 10-percent reduction straight across the board, all around the world, in the case of all programs of the same character. There is an inclination on the part of some—and I personally feel the same way, but I will not follow my personal feelings and preference at the moment—that if we are going to spend money abroad for such purposes, then we should not vote to reduce the appropriations for such programs here at home. If reductions are not to be made in the appropriations for foreign assistance, then we should not vote to reduce the appropriations for similar purposes and programs here in the United States.

Mr. President, that is the way I, too, feel about the matter. However, I shall not vote my personal feelings and preference in these trying times. I should like to act that way, but I believe there is a call of duty which is higher than my personal feelings at this moment. Unless we are willing to accomplish, and unless by our actions we actually accomplish, rigid economy in all our programs here in the United States, then, in view of the obligations and burdens we are assuming abroad, we are headed for a national catastrophe.

Yes, Mr. President, every dollar we spend on the ECA, and particularly for certain projects that have been submitted and programed in this appropriation, makes more necessary and more compelling retrenchment and rigid economy in our programs here at home. Unless we are ready and willing to throw all restraint to the winds and spend and spend for everything we want, we must practice rigid economy all the way across the board, Mr. President. If we do not pursue that course, but instead continue as we have proceeded this afternoon, in my judgment we shall soon arrive at a destination of national economic chaos.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on page 2, in line 10, of the Byrd-Bridges amendment, to strike out "10 percent" and insert "15 percent."

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment, offered by the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from New Hampshire, and a number of other Senators.

To that amendment the Senator from Nevada has offered an amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, in line 10 of the Bridges-Byrd amendment, after the parenthesis, it is proposed to insert "or the preservation of law and order."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I had understood that the authors of the Byrd-Bridges amendment would accept this amendment to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada to the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Nevada that the law-enforcement agencies are exempted. I am not certain of the purposes of the amendment he has offered. I do not have the amendment before me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment again.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, in line 10, of the Byrd-Bridges amendment, after the parenthesis, it is proposed to insert "or the preservation of law and order."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in answer to the question of the Senator from Virginia, let me say that a quick examination of the amendment now pending would indicate that practically the entire Department of Justice would be exempted. However, under a stricter interpretation other vital functions and operations of the Department of Justice closely tied into those exempted would suffer a 10-percent reduction in appropriations, thereby directly affecting the activities which would be exempted.

For example, the offices under the appropriation "General administration," such as the Attorney General's Office and other offices which direct and supervise the activities of such exempted groups, would have their appropriations cut, and that would bring about an impossible situation of the tail wagging the dog.

Furthermore; the appropriation for "General legal activities" would be cut 10 percent; and under that heading comes the Criminal Division, whose duties are primarily in connection with the prosecution and investigation of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States, and it falls clearly within the exemption. Therefore, if the 10-percent cut is apportioned to the other divisions but if the Criminal Division is exempted, that division will suffer a comparatively greater reduction. That would mean that the Antitrust Division, the Claims

Division, the Tax Division, the Lands Division, and the Customs Division would be very seriously curtailed and obstructed in their law-enforcement activities.

So, Mr. President, I hope my amendment to the Byrd-Bridges amendment will be accepted.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not follow the explanation by the Senator from Nevada. For example, the Customs Division is exempted. In response to a request a very careful analysis of the amendment has been made in writing by the Bureau of the Budget. The FBI is exempted under section 1003 subsection (i), the Immigration and Naturalization Service is exempted, the district attorneys are exempted, the Bureau of Customs is exempted, the Secret Service is exempted, the Bureau of Internal Revenue is exempted; those who audit the accounts and do police work in connection with the collection of taxes are exempted; the Bureau of Narcotics is exempted; and section (a) of the act—

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the Senator from Virginia that I have been reading from an opinion by the Department of Justice on the pending Bridges-Byrd amendment. It is from the Department itself.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thought the Senator from Nevada had yielded to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. All I can say is we have an interpretation from the Bureau of the Budget, in writing, after a very careful examination of the proposed amendment, and the language itself I think is clear:

The amounts appropriated by this act for the operation of law-enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Customs, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Secret Service are exempt, and so are the funds for the payment of compensation and expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and other officers and agents, whose duties pertain to intelligence operations, including funds transferred pursuant to section 6 (a) of the act of June 20, 1949, or the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States. The exact language may be seen on page 4, subsection (i).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield that I may ask the Senator from Nevada a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I desire to ask the Senator from Nevada whether it is the intention to limit this to the Department of Justice.

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment I have offered to the Bridges-Byrd amendment addresses itself entirely to the Department of Justice.

Mr. FERGUSON. So there cannot be any question about that.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is a clarifying amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. BYRD. I have 5 minutes only, but I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I merely want to say that the information I have from the Bureau of the Budget is that this 10 percent reduction would affect the Department of Justice to the extent of \$1,632,500. So evidently there are some parts of the Department of Justice that are not covered by the language which the Senator has quoted from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BYRD. I think that is correct. There are some expenses of the general administration that are not covered by the exemption. But in the main, it was intended that all the law-enforcement agencies would be exempt.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, have I any time remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can speak again only by unanimous consent, under the agreement entered into.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. McCARRAN. This matter was worked out after many weeks of careful study, investigation and hearings, and the committee cut the appropriation \$7,050,000 under the Budget estimate. The way the Byrd-Bridges amendment is worded, it would affect seriously certain divisions of the Department of Justice wherein both law and order are involved. The amendment that I have offered would exempt them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from Virginia, because he read a rather lengthy list of divisions within the Department of Justice which would be excluded from the amendment which he is sponsoring. I wish the Senator from Virginia would read to the Senate those divisions within the Department of Justice that are embraced in his amendment and that will receive a 10-percent cut if his amendment should prevail.

Mr. BYRD. In answer to the Senator from Pennsylvania, I may say that the fees and expenses of witnesses, \$1,250,000, are exempt.

Mr. MYERS. I was asking for those that are not exempt. Will the Senator read those that are not exempt?

Mr. BYRD. Those that are not exempt include the general administrative expenses, the salaries and expenses of the general administration, the salaries and expenses of the general legal activities, and salaries and expenses of the Antitrust Division. The salaries and expenses of the marshals are exempted.

In most of these departments, as the Senator well knows, there is opportunity for great economy in administrative expenses.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the Tax Court of the United States exempt?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BYRD. All of the judiciary is exempted, but the Tax Court is not included in the judiciary appropriations in this bill. It is not exempt.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is not my question.

Mr. BYRD. The Tax Court is not exempt.

Mr. MYERS. According to the response of the Senator from Virginia to my question, it seems that the attorneys who are in charge of the administration of justice are the ones who will suffer as a result of this amendment. I particularly note that the Antitrust Division is a part of the Department of Justice. Its work will be curtailed if this amendment should prevail. Therefore, although the FBI and a number of the agencies are exempt, it seems to me that all the other divisions indeed will be hindered in their work, and, at such a critical time in the history of our country we certainly should not curtail the work and activities of the Department of Justice. I hope—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MYERS. I have but 5 minutes. However, I will yield as soon as I finish this sentence. I hope, at such a critical time as this, that we will not in the case of one of the most important agencies of the Government undertake to practice a false economy. I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether he thinks it is more appropriate for the Antitrust Division and its personnel to be exempted from this cut than for similar personnel of the Federal Trade Commission, which is enforcing exactly the same laws and performing exactly the same duties, to be exempted.

Mr. MYERS. Perhaps the Senator does not believe in the Federal Trade Commission. Let the Senator offer such an amendment. I am simply saying that the Department of Justice is one of the most important agencies of the Government. It is, in fact, a more important agency than the Federal Trade Commission. I certainly believe it would not be in the best interest of our country or in the best interest of the efficient and proper administration of justice to practice economy on this agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment. [Putting the question.] The amendment to the amendment is rejected.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The Chair has ruled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada was on his feet. But the demand for the yeas and nays is not sufficiently seconded. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to speak very briefly upon this amendment. The question before the Senate this afternoon is simply whether it is going to vote according to a symbol or according to reality. I have every sympathy with the purpose of those who have sponsored this amendment to make a substantial cut in the nondefense, nonessential expenditures of the Federal Government. As a member of one of the subcommittees which handled one of the largest chapters in this bill, I want the Senate to know that the committee in charge of that bill diligently sought to reduce expenditures to a minimum. I know that the same thing was done by other subcommittees. Substantial reductions were made. But it seems to be difficult for Senators to make up their minds that it is impossible to legislate upon the floor of the Senate upon a matter of such great complexity as appropriations. When the predecessor of this amendment was presented in the Appropriations Committee, on the very first day of its consideration, when I first read it, I saw gaping holes in the amendment, through which, in the term so familiar to us all, it would be possible to drive a coach and four. I pointed out that there was no exemption for the Post Office Department, and that it contained a provision for a 10-percent decrease of the amount of money to be expended for the transportation of things. That necessarily meant the portation of mail. The sponsors of the amendment say that it was a valid criticism. It does not appear—

Mr. BYRD. It does not appear in this amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does not appear in this amendment. I raised the question about the application of this cut to strategic and critical materials. It was not in the old amendment. There is an exemption in this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have but 5 minutes. Let me proceed.

So it went, Mr. President. Every criticism which I made very briefly, within scarcely 5 minutes of the meeting of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, was met, but I had not begun to point out the loopholes in the amendment. This amendment, although it has been labored over, still contains loopholes which will injure the defense program if the Senate agrees to it. For example, on page 3, it undertakes to exempt trust funds. It should read "appropriations for trust funds."

In the next paragraph it deals with funds for Government corporations, excluding those made available in the act for administrative expenses. It should say "appropriations for funds."

Then there is an exemption which does not exempt administrative expenses. It deals with the Farm Credit Administration, for example, which receives an appropriation for its administrative proceedings, and which does not operate on a single dollar of public funds, because every penny is repaid. The Farm Credit Administration contributes three or four million dollars annually to the Treasury of the United States. It will be vitally necessary, in case of a great war, to maintain our livestock.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was concerned about the failure to exempt meat inspection. How can we handle our meat program?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am still concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course the Senator is concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. The way I want to handle it is to offer an amendment to the agriculture chapter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will pardon me, but I cannot yield.

These illustrations are indicative of the loopholes in this amendment, Mr. President.

I want to invite attention to the fact that the General Services Administration—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. HUNT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe I have made it clear that I do not like the meat-ax approach to reducing expenditures. That is why I have been trying to cut appropriations item by item so that cuts would be made by Congress itself on those items which should be reduced. After making little headway on 68 individual proposals for reductions, I resorted to a general amendment which although it did not hit individual items, did specify the areas where the cuts were to be made so that Congress would not be completely abdicating its power of appropriating. I did not assert that the amendment was perfect. Any proposal for a general cut has flaws. But the reductions would have been made. However, I could not get the necessary support, even to get a roll call.

It may have appeared that there was competition between my general amendment calling for a reduction of \$1,000,000,000 from selected areas and the Byrd-Bridges amendment calling for a 10-percent cut amounting to an estimated \$525,000,000. It is true that I wanted to vote on my amendment first because I thought it was a better method but, in the final analysis, the important thing is to make the reductions so that we can keep down inflation and release manpower and resources for the defense effort. Therefore, I want to give my wholehearted support to the Byrd-Bridges amendment. While I shall not offer other amendments, this is our last opportunity to make a major reduction and we must not let it pass us by.

The Byrd-Bridges amendment may be a meat ax, but it will make reductions

and since my previous efforts have not been successful, I hope we can pass it. It has an excellent chance. It has a great deal of support whereas my efforts apparently had little. Therefore, I ask those senators who have so graciously supported me to support the Byrd-Bridges amendment as well. If we pool our strength we can get these reductions, and I certainly hope that partisanship will not enter into the drum on this issue.

We all know of the great need for economy in nonessential expenditures. Let us follow this up and show the country that we are aware of this need by passing this amendment reducing these funds by \$525,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it had been my purpose to support this amendment, but since the Senate has seen fit to make fish of one appropriation and fowl of another, I shall vote against it. Having some responsibility as the chairman of the subcommittee which handles the agricultural appropriations, I wish to refer briefly to the effect of this amendment upon agricultural appropriations.

The subcommittee and the full committee reduced the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture approximately \$30,000,000. This amendment would reduce them \$65,000,000.

I have a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, in which he points out that if this 10 percent cut is applied across the board it will mean a reduction of 346 meat inspectors and will seriously curtail the program of meat inspection. He further says that it would ruin the Rural Electrification Administration; that it would restrict the rural telephone program and would make it impossible to give the minimum attention required to safeguard the Government's interest in \$2,200,000,000 worth of loans. It would level a great blow at the operations of the Soil Conservation Service and would deny technical assistance to from 150 to 190 soil conservation districts, as well as reducing technical assistance in 250 other districts.

If the amendment were applied across the board it would reduce the appropriation for the National Forest Service by approximately \$3,000,000. According to the Department of Agriculture, there have been more fires this season than ever before. We all know there is a great need for protection of our forest resources because of the fact that they are shrinking, due to the unparalleled and unprecedented demand made upon them during the past 10 years.

Those are only a few of the items, Mr. President, in the agricultural appropriation bill, which are pointed out by the Secretary, in connection with which very dire consequences would be visited upon our domestic economy.

I am not any expert on the Scriptures, Mr. President, but I remember something is said in the Bible to the effect that he who does not look after his own household is worse than an infidel.

We have now seen fit to eliminate the ECA from any reduction whatever. I cannot go along with the proposition of drastically reducing appropriations which are so important to the national

welfare as are those which I have mentioned, and I could point out others in the bill.

I assert without any fear of successful contradiction that \$1 spent on the national forests of the United States means more to the free peoples of this earth than would \$7 spent for the ECA.

I believe, Mr. President, that the health of the American people, protected through a meat-inspection program, is as important as is the health program in other lands so eloquently outlined by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. We are preserving and protecting our natural resources and carrying on a research program which will be crippled if this 10-percent reduction is agreed to. That program is infinitely important not only to the American people, but to freemen everywhere.

Mr. President, we always help the other nations of the earth, but in the last analysis here in America is the last citadel of freedom. These appropriations deal with the resources of America and our ability to protect and defend ourselves from the forces of aggression which threaten us at this very hour.

Mr. President, for the reason that this so-called economy drive has at least half collapsed, I shall not cast a discriminatory vote to reduce appropriations within the United States when no reduction whatever is being made in the appropriations for the foreign economic administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has done a wonderful work on this sector or chapter of the bill. I hardly know whether to call it a sector or a chapter, under the new method of dividing up appropriations, but whatever it may be called, the committee has done a splendid work. I endorse everything the Senator has said, and I hope the Senate of the United States will not agree to this amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute and speak on it for 5 minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may offer an amendment to the Byrd-Bridges amendment either as an amendment or by way of a substitute for it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to do that at the appropriate time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the Senator gets the floor is the appropriate time to do it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I be recognized now for that purpose?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognized the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] before he asked the Senator to state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment and desire to make what I believe to be some pertinent observations which have not been

brought out in any of the debates I have listened to since the pending measure has been before the Senate.

I do not know why it is necessary to go into the Department of Justice, Department of Agriculture, and Department of Commerce and trim down their personnel. If it is fair to do it in the executive branch of the Government, why is it not fair to do it in the legislative branch? Why do we in the Senate, instead of decreasing our personnel 10 percent, increase the appropriation? Last year the appropriation for the Senate alone was \$12,013,000. This year the figure is \$12,422,000, or an increase of approximately \$410,000 for personnel in the Senate and for things that have to be done in the way of paying for telegrams, telephone calls, and so forth. Yet no one in this economy group, who are so strong for cutting everything in the executive branch of the Government has done a single thing to see to it that something along the same line is done in our own house.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is making rather an extensive statement when he says not a single thing has been done.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall not yield for a speech. The record speaks for itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Last year we appropriated \$12,013,000. This year we intend to appropriate \$12,422,000. For the contingent fund of the Senate we appropriated for the fiscal year 1949 \$2,626,118. For the fiscal year 1950 we appropriated \$2,755,000.04, or an increase of approximately \$125,000. Mr. President, so far this year we have resolutions for investigations alone calling for \$1,200,000. Yet only \$832,000 has been appropriated in the appropriation bill for that kind of work. We shall be forced to have another deficiency bill. The disbursing officer tells me that this year the contingent fund of the Senate alone will require at least \$3,000,000. That is an increase over last year of approximately \$400,000. Apparently we in the Senate are not willing to apply the meat ax on our own people in order to decrease the personnel of the United States Senate, but we are willing to apply it to the executive branch. Of course not very much is involved, but the principle is exactly the same. We ought to do it in the judiciary and the legislative branches if we are to do it in the executive branch. If we are to reduce appropriations in one, we should do it in all. That is the point I am making.

Those who are so strong for economy did not examine the Senate cut and offer to economize. If 10 percent is good for the executive, it should be good for the legislative and judiciary. That is something that someone will have to answer for. Somebody ought to talk about it. I am certain the country would be interested in knowing why the legislative branch was excluded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment in the na-

ture of a substitute and ask that the clerk read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

CHAPTER X-A—AUTHORIZATION TO STUDY AND REPORT ON RESCISSIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 1001. The Senate Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Appropriations, acting jointly, or any duly authorized subcommittee of said committees, are authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of each appropriation, reappropriation, and contract authorization or reauthorization, made by this act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, or made by any other act and available for expenditure or obligation during such fiscal year, to any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government (including funds of Government corporations authorized by this or any other act for administrative expenses), with a view to making such rescissions in nondefense spending as may be possible without impairing effective and efficient operation of the Government.

SEC. 1002. The said committees shall report to the Senate and to the House the results of its study, together with such recommendations as they may deem desirable, not later than August 31, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest to the Senator that the amendment is not in order to X-A. It would be in order to section 1114.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment is offered to chapter XI.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator offering the amendment at the same place as the pending amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To take the place of the language of the Byrd-Bridges amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then it is in order. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this amendment is very plain in its terms. It is a direction to the Committee on Appropriations, which has the responsibility of examining the evidence and the facts, to go over all these appropriations and to report back to the Senate and House by the end of the month recommendations for the rescission of nondefense expenditures. Mr. President, I say that is essential, because by the other amendment, for which this is a substitute, we would seriously injure the defense of the United States.

One of the agencies for which appropriation is made in the bill is the General Services Administration. The agency was established by act of Congress in 1949 for the express purpose of providing the Federal Government with economical, efficient, and effective management of the Government's personal property, real property, and records. The General Services Administration was recommended by the Hoover Commission. I want to call to the attention of Members of the Senate that it has the custody of the 66 reserve plants of the Nation. I have in my hand the list showing the location of these 66 plants, which would

be needed in our national defense. The so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment would impair the ability of the General Services Administration to handle those defense plants. It would cut millions of dollars and hundreds of persons from the necessary operation of providing for this national industrial reserve. This list contains not only 66 industrial plants. It contains 14,000 tons of machine tools.

Then, Mr. President, there is the war-time Civilian Disaster Relief Planning, under which the General Services Administration works with the National Security Resources Board. With the broad-ax method of a flat 10 percent cut we would impair the essential activities of the National Security Resources Board at a time when in a day or two we shall turn around to provide additional appropriations.

Mr. President, are we to march up the hill and then march right down the hill? Let us cut the nonessential, nondefense appropriation, but let us not take the risk of cutting defense appropriations, as it is clear we would be doing. Let us consider the problem of the strategic relocation activity of the Federal Government which is carried on by the National Security Resources Board and the General Services Administration.

Mr. President, as was pointed out in my statement a moment ago, when the Byrd-Bridges proposal was considered in the Senate committee, we pointed out the loopholes and the errors that were being made. The few I mentioned there were corrected. Here I mention others. If there were not a limitation of time, I could go through this amendment line by line and show that the result of the adoption of the amendment would be seriously to impair the capacity of the Government to function at a time when we need its most efficient operation.

Mr. President, I trust that the substitute which I have offered may be accepted by the Senate. Again I say, I have here in my hand the list of the 66 industrial plants which are in the custody of the General Services Administration, the care of which will be seriously impaired unless the substitute is agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not know where the Senator from Wyoming got his figures. As a matter of fact, General Services Administration appropriations totaling \$732,000,000 are exempted in this cut.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I referred to the appropriation for carrying on the Strategic Materials Stockpiling Act.

Mr. BYRD. Six hundred and five million dollars for the strategic materials, and \$175,000,000 in addition to that, are exempted in the particular agency referred to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also true that the buildings to which the Senator from Wyoming referred would be exempted because they come under the \$10,500,000,000 to finance the war effort, and the Administration would have absolute power under that to take over

the buildings for the necessary manufacturing of war materials?

Mr. BYRD. Any building to the extent that prior obligations are made, is exempted. There is a number of buildings. There is the office building in Nashville, Tenn. Some of the funds for that are exempted. There is a partial exemption for the Alaska public works item. There is exemptions for the defense planning for Federal public works, to the extent of \$14,000,000. There are partial exemptions for water-pollution plants, and so forth. When the Senator talks about millions and hundreds of millions, he has overlooked the fact that \$732,000,000 in this particular agency is exempt.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I strongly hope that the Senate will vote down the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, and will then adopt the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment.

First answering the point made by the Senator from Illinois, I call his attention to the fact that the Senate is in excellent position to require that these civilian agencies shall make a reduction of their expenses. The only substantial cut in the appropriation bill which has been made in the weeks of debate on the bill has been the cutting off of the \$10,000,000 appropriation which was designed to start a new Senate office building, very badly needed by Senators and their staffs and the Senate committees.

In the next place, I remind the Senator from Illinois that just as the President's salary and the salaries of his staff and assistants are exempted from the cut because they are a war agency, as well as a peace agency, and their efforts are largely increased in time of war, so in the case of the legislative staffs and the legislative expenses. I do not have to tell every Senator here, because he knows already, that his mail has been greatly increased, that his efforts are greatly spread out, and that war has brought upon him added duties, instead of lessened duties, whereas in the case of the civilian agencies, the opposite is the case.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I can not yield just now, to my regret. I have only five minutes.

Mr. President, this is the acid test. We have not made any real reductions. The House voted over a billion-dollar reduction in time of peace. Shall we, the Senate, be blind to the fact that war has come, that these civilian agencies should make some contribution by way of greater economy, as we face the difficult test, the supreme test, which lies ahead of our Nation?

Mr. President, it seems to me that this is the last chance we are going to have to indicate to the public whether we recognize the fact that this Nation is at war, and that the same philosophy and logic and reasoning which very properly were applied by our able committee, our devoted committee, in drafting the pending bill, should not be applied now. They drew the bill in time of peace. We are passing the bill in time of war.

Mr. President, I think we would make a tragic mistake if we gave rise to a feeling on the part of the people of the country that we think no real effort toward economy should be made. It is not a big effort, cutting out \$525,000,000, but it will show that we do recognize that there is a changed situation which requires a changed approach, and that we propose to attempt to economize as we tighten our belts and face the difficult days ahead.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have a statement with regard to the pending amendment which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, Mr. BUTLER's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I believe it should be made crystal clear that there is nothing in the language of the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment, which I have joined in sponsoring, that requires a reduction in personnel in any specific office, division, or bureau within any one of the departments.

I am particularly concerned about the lay-off notices which have been given to several hundred meat inspectors, apparently in anticipation of a possible reduction in the general appropriations covering the whole Government. There was absolutely no necessity for such a reduction, and, in my judgment, it was ridiculous to single out this small, highly essential service to bear the brunt of the reductions in the Department of Agriculture. I refuse to believe, Mr. President, that there is no other place within the Department of Agriculture where an equivalent saving could be made without hampering any vital service.

The meat-inspection service is essential if packing plants are to continue to process livestock under present law. If the inspector is not there, then the packing plant must close down. I believe it should be fully understood that Congress intended the Secretary of Agriculture to use his discretion, to make adjustments and transfers between such appropriations, so as to protect the really essential functions of the Department.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to take about 5 minutes. I have not used any time on the bill so far.

I intend to vote for an amendment which does not have my unqualified approval. I think this means of forcing economy in the executive branch of the Government is an outright evasion of responsibility on the part of the Congress. I believe that in delegating certain appropriating powers, or the power to vary appropriations to the executive branch, entails a good deal of risk, and is something we should be slow to start. Nevertheless, I am unable to see that there is any other way of forcing the executive branch of the Government to cooperate with the legislative branch in an effort to effect some measure of economy in appropriations which we are making.

There are enough unwarranted appropriations in the pending bill which we are considering to amount to more than the 10 percent which it is proposed to cut from certain departments. I believe that if we had done as we should have done, we would have stricken out the appropriations which are completely unwarranted; but we have not done that.

I do not believe that a cut across the

board, even though it affects only a few departments, is the right way to handle the situation. Nevertheless, I do not see any other way under the sun by which we can require economy within the executive branch of the Government, or certain agencies in it, at this time unless we take some strict measures, whether we like them or not.

Mr. President, in spite of the fact that the head of at least one agency has indicated that if he is required to cut at all, he is going to cut where it hurts most—and I presume that applies to more than one agency head—I think we should vote for the amendment, and then, if it turns out that the Congress has done an injustice to certain departments, if after doing the best they can, they are still unable to operate in an efficient manner, we will still have a chance to make supplementary appropriations at the beginning of the year.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] because I see no other way whereby we can force this matter to a conclusion, and get some showdown on careful spending with the executive branch of the Government.

I was simply amazed when the President, less than 2 weeks ago, sent a special message to the Congress asking for authority to begin several brand new projects, including a dam in Idaho where there had been no dam before, and dams here and there. It looked to me as if it were done for political purposes, and I do not like that at all. I believe some department could well cut out spending for political purposes and propaganda. We cannot expect to spend as much as we would like for peacetime projects while there is a war on. The executive departments should give us full cooperation in reducing appropriations to a feasible minimum. If they are unwilling to do this, we have no other recourse than to force economy in nonessential programs by reducing appropriations.

Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. CORDON rose.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a point of order. I addressed the Chair, and the Senator from Nebraska did not even open his mouth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from Indiana that he is behind the Senator from Nebraska while the Chair is in front of him. The Chair understood the Senator from Nebraska to address the Chair.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a point of order. I addressed the Chair, and the Senator from Nebraska did not. I notice too much of that sort of thing going on, so far as I am personally concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska, whom the Chair had recognized, yield temporarily to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. WHERRY. I will be glad to. I did not know that the Senator from

Indiana was on his feet, but I will agree with everything he said, except that for the first time in my life I did not speak.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I understand the rule of the Senate to be that the Senator who rises and addresses the Chair first is the one who should be recognized. I may be wrong in that, but that is my understanding of the rule. My observation here during the past several months or a couple of years has been that that rule has not been observed so far as I am personally concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to say to the Senator from Indiana that that statement is not true.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I want to say that I do not yield to the Chair; that I do not yield for an observation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has made it just the same.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Chair has made it, but the Chair has made it out of order so far as I am personally concerned, because it has happened to me on any number of occasions, and I want the Senate to know, and I want the Presiding Officer to know that I do not particularly appreciate it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to say to the Senator from Indiana—

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have not yielded to the Chair to make an observation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say to the Senator—and he will extend his time long enough to permit the Chair to do so—that he has never knowingly or intentionally ignored the Senator from Indiana or any other Senator. Frequently it transpires here that a number of Senators rise at the same time and address the Chair, and in that case the Chair certainly has discretion in determining which one he will recognize.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I agree with that, but in this particular instance the Senator from Indiana rose and addressed the Chair, and the able Senator from Nebraska did not address the Chair. I shall be very happy to leave that observation up to anyone who was on the floor.

What I rose for was to say that it seems to me the United States Senate today has two standards. It has a standard for appropriating money for foreign nations, and another standard for appropriating money for its own people. I have observed on the floor of the United States Senate this afternoon that we are against cutting any of the appropriations for foreign nations. I do not know how others feel about it, but I do not think the people of the United States particularly appreciate it.

When we need to reduce expenses in this country, when we need to save money because we are at war, when we are asked to cut all appropriations straight across the board, I can see absolutely no fairness in cutting the appropriations for our own people and increasing the appropriations we make for peoples in other countries. I say that it is a dual standard in the Senate. We

have one standard for foreigners and another standard for Americans.

It is perfectly all right, according to Senators, as shown by their votes, to reduce the expenditures for our own domestic concerns, and yet it is absolutely wrong to do the same thing when it comes to appropriations for foreign nations. That does not make sense to me. We either should economize, or we should not. We either should balance the budget and raise taxes to finance this war, or we should not. By such actions it seems to me we make ourselves look silly not only to our own people, but silly to the peoples in other parts of the world.

Here we are prosecuting a war. We are prosecuting a war. We are getting ready to raise taxes by from \$5,000,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000, which we should do. Yet we set up two standards in the United States Congress. We are told, "You dare not touch an appropriation the money from which is to be used by some other nation," and at the same time we are told that we should cut the appropriations for our own people.

Mr. President, I do not like to cut appropriations for our own people. My inclination is exactly the same as that of the able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I do not like such action. My personal inclination is to say that I shall vote against the pending amendment, but I am not going to do so. I am not going to vote against it. But that is what I should do. I repeat, that is what I should do. I should at least treat every American as well as we are treating every foreign nation. I shall vote for the amendment, but I certainly want the Senate to know that I do not like it, and I am certain the people in the State of Indiana do not like two standards. I am certain they do not, and I am not so sure that that is not true in all the other 47 States.

We have a war on our hands. It is not a police action. We have a war. We have not yet seen published the casualties, the names of the boys who have been lost in battle, the boys who have been wounded, the boys who have been killed. We have a war on our hands, and it is going to take several months even to win this Korean war. We are going to need a great deal of money. We are going to have to tighten our belts. But the United States Congress says to the American people, "We will furnish all the materials, all the money," all the men to fight this war," and then we say to the American people, "Tighten up your belts now. We are going to reduce the amounts for your highways and roads and everything else, but at the same time we are going to increase the appropriations for the peoples in every other country in the world."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator—

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the Senator's last statement—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I certainly want to apologize to the Senator from Indiana if he feels that I saw him on the floor and wanted to gain recognition first.

I did not have an opportunity to speak on the 15-percent-cut amendment, and I feel that the facts have been pretty well presented to the Senate. Of course, now that the foreign-aid part of the bill is not touchable, it makes necessary more of a cut in our own domestic economy. Those who are interested in our own construction projects and in our civil function, which have been reduced 8.6 percent, and the Interior Department appropriation which has been reduced almost a like amount, and in other branches of the Government the appropriations for which have been reduced considerably below the estimates, will find that the cut heretofore made will be increased by 10 percent. I think the Members of the Senate ought to know that.

I agree with the remarks made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I have already expressed myself. The question has been very well presented by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Mr. President, it seems to me we take an untenable position when we say, as I outlined yesterday on the Senate floor, that we will build projects everywhere around the globe, and yet not do the same thing here at home. The Senate, however, has acted on that proposition. The Senate has made its decision. Now what can we do with what is left?

I should like to say briefly that the amount of the appropriation carried in the bill is \$32,504,972,672. Add to that the increase we have made for foreign aid of \$65,000,000, and it makes the figure \$32,569,972,672. If we add to that the Spanish loan of \$100,000,000, if we add to that the contract authority carried in the bill—and to me contract authority is just the same as cash on the barrel head—if we add to that \$2,183,336,000, and then if we add to that the \$10,500,000,000 the military is asking for—and I sat in the Appropriations Committee and know that every Senator wants to back up the military—and if we add to that the \$1,200,000,000 that has already been given to MAP, and then if we add to that the \$4,000,000,000 more which is being asked, we will have a figure of \$50,553,308,000. That does not take into consideration the supplemental appropriation bills and the deficiency bills which will still come before the Senate of the United States.

Think of it, Mr. President—\$50,553,308,000! Yet when there comes before us a proposal to adopt a little bit of an amendment which would now reduce these appropriations, as I figure the proposal, by only \$552,000,000—just think of it; that is the result of the economy drive which was started way back last January to balance the budget—Senators oppose making such a small reduction.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. If I have time to do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator said that additions of \$10,500,000,000 and \$4,000,000,000 have been made, making \$14,500,000,000 of additional requests for appropriations. However, there are additional costs in all of \$16,649,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I totaled the figures rather hurriedly.

So, Mr. President, what the Senator from Massachusetts has just said means we must add practically another billion dollars to the total amount about to which I have referred.

Senators can talk all night about these matters, if they will; and of course, every Senator has a good reason to urge opposition to making a reduction in one item or another. However, the committee worked hours and hours to get a formula by which appropriations could be cut straight across the board, and by which that cut could be made with the least detrimental impact.

To Senators who wish to vote for economy in the right way, I say here is the formula, although all it will save, out of \$51,000,000,000 of appropriations, is the paltry sum of \$552,000,000.

Mr. President, I am going to support that amendment. I shall continue to support a proposal for a 10-percent reduction of appropriations; and if that amendment is not carried, I shall vote for any other amendment providing for reductions in appropriations, as I have done in the past. I certainly think that in the last move we make on this subject, we should deduct at least \$552,000,000 from a grand total of nearly \$51,000,000,000 of appropriations which now confront the people of the United States.

It is said that we are now engaged in only a police action. If that is so, Mr. President, what will our situation be when we have a real four-alarm war? Certainly we must tighten our belts. Much as I respect the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] I hope his substitute amendment will not prevail, and that at least the 10-percent reduction will be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think the Appropriations Committee did a very good piece of work. Although we might like to make further reductions in the appropriations, I, for one, say to the Senator from Nebraska that I am not willing to agree to make reductions in the appropriations for a single American—not a penny's worth of reduction—so long as we do not make reductions in the appropriations for the foreign programs. I did not want to make any reductions in the appropriations for the programs abroad; but neither do I wish to agree to make reductions in the appropriations for a single American at this time. That may be considered treason, but I am still for the Stars and Stripes, rather than the UN.

We might as well face the stern realities, Mr. President. In other words, why should we give money to Europe and to Asia, and then say that the people of the United States, who are paying the bill, must be penalized and must have cuts made in the appropriations for the programs in the United States of America itself, programs which our people need?

So, Mr. President, I hope the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be rejected at this particular time.

Senators who take a different view may think they are correct; Senators may be convinced by reports in the newspapers and on the radio to the effect that it is better to do something for the foreign programs. However, Mr. President, such a view is a mistaken one, for in the final analysis the burden must be borne by the people of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have addressed the Chair perhaps 12 times, but I seem to have difficulty in obtaining recognition even when no other Senator is addressing the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Wyoming as a so-called substitute for the Byrd-Bridges amendment. I may later discuss the Byrd-Bridges amendment itself, for which the O'Mahoney amendment is offered as a substitute, and thereby takes 10 minutes in presenting my views. However, I hope I can state my views in 5 minutes.

The amendment which has been submitted by the Senator from Wyoming as a substitute for the Byrd-Bridges amendment will confer on the Appropriations Committee no authority which that committee does not now possess. The substitute would be utterly idle and futile, were it not for the fact that it directs a reexamination; to that extent, there may be something to be said for the so-called O'Mahoney substitute.

However, Mr. President, what the Appropriations Committee now would be directed to do by the substitute amendment, the committee has just finished doing. There are no changes in the situation so far as the items in this bill are concerned.

Senators say a war has intervened and that we should reexamine, to see whether these items or all of them or the whole of each of them are essential to the war. Mr. President, if there is in this bill a provision for a dollar that is essential to the economy of the United States, to that extent it can be said to be essential to the war effort, to the national security. So, in that respect, we are simply playing with words.

Ninety-five percent of the items in this bill, other than those in the chapter devoted to the national defense, are items which have been recurring over and over and over again, through all the years; and there is not a member of the Appropriations Committee who is not entirely familiar with all of them.

The committee did the best it could. I have previously stated on this floor that I think this is the best bill which has ever come from the Appropriations Committee since I have known it. I repeat that statement.

However, Mr. President, in the time given to this matter by the Appropriations Committee, and available to the committee for that purpose, and in view of the limited staff which can be made

available to the Appropriations Committee, the kind of job the people of the United States have a right to have done on this subject cannot be done, and it will not be done if the substitute amendment is adopted and if the committee is directed to re-do the same thing by the 31st of August. Such a direction would be a direction to do a vain thing, and it would be wasting our time.

Let us go directly to the point, Mr. President. Either we want economy or we do not want it. If we do want economy, here is a method of getting it—namely, the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

I say that in my opinion the mechanics of this bill cannot be improved upon. The mechanics incorporated in this bill represent the best thinking of the Bureau of the Budget and of the General Accounting Office. I do not mean to say that either of those agencies recommends the Byrd-Bridges amendment; of course, I do not know of any executive department or agency which wants any reductions made in its appropriations. But those two agencies did work—and they worked faithfully together, in cooperation with the members of the Appropriations Committee—to evolve a practicable working arrangement.

Of course, we shall hear criticism of the Byrd-Bridges amendment to the effect that if it is adopted discretion must be vested in the President and in the executive agencies to make the necessary transfers, and so forth, and so on. However, the same Senators who will voice that criticism with reference to the Byrd-Bridges amendment will be heard within the next few days on this floor asking the Congress to give to the President unlimited dictatorial authority in every other field under the sun.

Mr. President, let us once in a while try to be logical.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the so-called O'Mahoney substitute to the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to endorse what my distinguished colleague the Senator from Oregon has said. He and I and some of the other members of the Appropriations Committee worked on this bill for months. In the committee we voted for the cuts which have thus far been made by the Senate, and in the committee we also voted for some cuts which the Senate has not seen fit to make. Certainly it would be an absolute futility to send the bill back to the Appropriations Committee. We now have reached the point where the Senate must vote on the question of whether it wishes to impose, according to a formula which we have been assured is workable, an additional 10-percent cut on nondefense items.

Personally, much as I regret to disagree with some of the members of the Appropriations Committee, I hope the substitute will not be approved, and I hope the Byrd-Bridges amendment will be approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the so-called O'Mahoney substitute for the Byrd-Bridges amendment. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I request a division.

Mr. WHERRY. If a division is requested, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably detained on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 60, as follows:

YEAS—25

Anderson	Kerr	Murray
Fulbright	Kilgore	Myers
Graham	Langer	Neely
Hayden	Lehman	O'Mahoney
Hill	Lucas	Pepper
Humphrey	McCarran	Russell
Hunt	McFarland	Sparkman
Johnson, Tex.	McMahon	
Johnston, S. C.	Maybank	

NAYS—60

Aiken	Frear	Martin
Brewster	George	Millikin
Bricker	Gillette	Morse
Bridges	Green	Mundt
Butler	Gurney	O'Connor
Byrd	Hendrickson	Robertson
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Chapman	Hoey	Schoeppel
Chavez	Holland	Smith, Maine
Connally	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Darby	Kem	Taft
Donnell	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Douglas	Leahy	Thye
Dworshak	Lodge	Tydings
Eastland	McCarthy	Watkins
Eaton	McClellan	Wherry
Ellender	McKellar	Wiley
Ferguson	Magnuson	Williams
Flanders	Malone	Young

NOT VOTING—11

Benton	Kefauver	Tobey
Cain	Long	Vandenberg
Downey	Taylor	Withers
Jenner	Thomas, Okla.	

So Mr. O'MAHONEY's amendment to the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the Byrd-Bridges amendment, as amended.

Mr. BRIDGES and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—55

Aiken	George	Martin
Brewster	Gillette	Millikin
Bricker	Gurney	Morse
Bridges	Hendrickson	Mundt
Butler	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Byrd	Hoey	Robertson
Capehart	Holland	Saltonstall
Chapman	Ives	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Darby	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Kem	Taft
Douglas	Knowland	Thye
Dworschak	Lodge	Tydings
Eastland	McCarran	Watkins
Eaton	McCarthy	Wherry
Ferguson	McClellan	Wiley
Flanders	McMahon	Williams
Frear	Magnuson	
Fulbright	Malone	

NAYS—31

Anderson	Kerr	Neely
Chavez	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Connally	Langer	Pepper
Ellender	Leahy	Russell
Graham	Lehman	Sparkman
Green	Lucas	Stennis
Hayden	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Humphrey	Maybank	Young
Hunt	Murray	
Johnston, S. C.	Myers	

NOT VOTING—10

Benton	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Cain	Long	Withers
Downey	Taylor	
Jenner	Tobey	

So the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The amended amendment, as agreed to, is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment on pages 476 and 477, beginning in line 21 (sec. 1114), insert the following:

"CHAPTER X-4—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 1001. Except as hereinafter provided, each appropriation, reappropriation, and contract authorization or reauthorization, made by this act for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1951, to any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government (including funds of Government corporations authorized by this act for administrative expenses), is hereby reduced by 10 percentum.

"SEC. 1002. In order to provide for the most effective use of appropriations and contract authorizations reduced by this chapter, the head of each department and agency in the executive branch of the Government is hereby authorized to make adjustments and transfers between such appropriations, and between such contract authorizations, within his department or agency; but no such appropriation or contract authorization shall be increased under the authority of this section to an amount in excess of that provided in other chapters of this act.

"SEC. 1003. The reductions provided for in this chapter shall not apply to the following:

"(a) Title II of chapter IV; chapter X; so much of title I of chapter X-B as is contained in the paragraphs headed 'Economic Cooperation,' 'International Children's Welfare Work,' and 'Mutual Defense Assistance;' and the amount appropriated to the General Services Administration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946;

"(b) Appropriations in title I of chapter VIII for the Executive Office of the President under the headings 'Compensation of the President,' 'The White House Office,' 'Emergency Fund for the President,' and 'Executive Mansion and Grounds;'

"(c) Appropriations and contract authorizations for the atomic energy program;

"(d) Trust funds;

"(e) Funds of Government corporations excluding those made available in this act (1) for administrative expenses and (2) by appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury;

"(f) Amounts (other than under the Veterans' Administration) for furnishing medical and hospital services and domiciliary care, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, or clinic, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

"(g) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations;

"(h) Appropriations of, or measured by, receipts;

"(i) Amounts appropriated by this act for the operation of law enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Customs, Immigration and Naturalization Services, and the Secret Service; or for the payment of compensation, and expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and such other officers and employees of other agencies whose duties primarily pertain to intelligence operations (including funds transferred pursuant to section 6 (a) of the act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 211) or to the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States;

"(j) Amounts provided for any program of the Veterans' Administration, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, clinic, or facility, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

"(k) Amounts provided for payments to States or political subdivisions thereof;

"(l) Amounts provided to make payment of or contributions toward pensions, retirement and disability annuities and benefits, employees' death or injury benefits, or other items of a similar nature; and

"(m) Appropriations for refunds, awards, and indemnities."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Delaware that there is another committee amendment to be acted on first. Then the Senator's amendment will be in order.

The next section of the bill is section 1114. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 477, after line 22, to insert:

SEC. 1114. During the current fiscal year, no part of any money appropriated in this or any other act shall be used during any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase typewriting machines (except bookkeeping and billing machines) at a price which exceeds 90 percent of the lowest net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the most-favored customer (other than the Government, the American National Red Cross, and the purchasers of typewriting machines for educational purposes only) of the manufacturer of such machines during the 6-month period immediately preceding such quarter.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 478, after line 7, to insert:

SEC. 1115. No payment shall be made from appropriations in this act to any officer on the retired lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service for a period of 2 years after retirement who for himself or for others is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service any supplies or war materials.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We now return to chapter X-A, on page 444 of the bill. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 444, to strike out:

CHAPTER X-A—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Reductions in appropriations and contract authorizations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of \$600,000,000.

Not more than the following sums may be obligated by any agency or department provided for in this act, viz:

(1) For civilian personnel, not more than an amount 10 percent below the amount proposed in the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951, except that in the Department of Defense where no more than the amount of the President's budget estimate minus 2 percent shall be obligated. This paragraph shall not apply to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration.

(2) For travel, not more than a total for all departments and agencies of \$319,000,000, and not more than 5 percent less than the estimates provided for military personnel travel and not more than 20 percent less than the amount provided for civilian personnel travel, then the estimates therefor contained in the President's budget message for the fiscal year 1951.

(3) For transportation of things, for all departments and agencies, not more than

\$720,000,000: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the amount obligated exceed a figure 10 percent below the estimate submitted by the President in his budget message for 1951 for each item for all agencies except the Department of Defense, and for the Department of Defense not more than 5 percent less than the estimates of the President, transmitted in said budget message.

(4) For communications services, not more than \$59,000,000, and not more for any department other than the Department of Defense than the amount of the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent, and for the Department of Defense not more than a figure 5 percent below the President's budget estimates for 1951.

(5) For rents and utilities, not more than \$205,000,000, and for all establishments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951 minus 10 percent.

(6) For printing and reproduction, not more than \$52,000,000, and not more in any case than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

(7) For other contractual services, not more than \$1,301,000,000, and for all departments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

(8) For supplies and materials, not more than \$3,888,000,000, and for all departments of the Government except the Department of Defense and the Veterans' hospitals not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

(9) For equipment, not more than \$3,577,000,000, and for all departments other than the Department of Defense, not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

(10) For lands and structures, for all departments of the Government, except the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 5 percent.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk state the amendment which I sent forward to the desk on behalf of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 478, between lines 18 and 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. . No funds or contract authorizations made available by this act shall be used for the construction of any structure, work, or other project unless (1) such construction is certified by the Secretary of Defense to be essential to national security, or (2) the construction of such structure work, or other project has been commenced prior to the enactment of this act, and substantial detriment to the interests of the United States will result if the proposed further construction is not carried out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this amendment will place into effect the same rule which applied to Government projects during World War II, only that in this instance, as we pass the appropriation bill we in Congress will be assuming our own responsibility. The President of the United States during the past 2 weeks has called for a survey by the different departments of the Government of all projects which, in their opinion, could be suspended.

The President's recommendation can apply only to those projects for which

appropriations have been made. This amendment applies to the projects which are referred to in the appropriation bill which is now before us and holds up those projects until such time as they are certified to be essential to our national defense. In cases where a project has been started, and if the suspension of work would result in an unnecessary loss, it is exempt.

I urge that the Senate accept the amendment. I do not know what the amount of savings will be, as I have no way of knowing how many of the projects will be determined to be nonessential, however we do know that it will reduce expenditures by several hundred millions of dollars.

With a critical shortage of many strategic materials developing in this country it is essential that all public works programs be suspended unless their construction is needed as part of our defense program.

A vote on this amendment is the equivalent of a vote on the percentage of tax increase that will be needed later to pay for these programs. I urge that Congress accept its own responsibility and not pass the decision onto the President.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment proposes legislation in an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have filed with the clerk a motion to suspend the rule of the Senate, and I ask for a vote on the motion to suspend the rule in order that the Senate may vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has filed such a notice. A two-thirds affirmative vote is required to suspend the rule. The question is on the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is unavoidably detained on official business, and if present would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and

voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is detained on official business.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 34, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—34

Brewster	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bridges	Ives	Schoeppel
Butler	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Knowland	Stennis
Capehart	Langer	Thye
Donnell	Lehman	Tydings
Douglas	Lodge	Wherry
Eastland	McCarthy	Wiley
Eaton	McMahon	Williams
Ferguson	Martin	
Frear	O'Connor	

NAYS—49

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Chapman	Holland	Murray
Chavez	Humphrey	Myers
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Darby	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Dworshak	Kerr	Russell
Ellender	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Leahy	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lucas	Taft
George	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Gillette	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Graham	McFarland	Watkins
Green	McKellar	Young
Gurney	Magnuson	
Hayden	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—13

Benton	Kefauver	Tobey
Cain	Long	Vandenberg
Downey	Malone	Withers
Hunt	Maybank	
Jenner	Taylor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fewer than two-thirds of the Members of the Senate having voted in the affirmative, the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is rejected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a clerical error was made in the bill through inadvertence. Two words were left in the agricultural section of the bill which should not have been there, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that on page 171, line 14, the two words "farm structures" be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have some amendments to offer which I think will take but a few minutes to consider. The Department of the Army has sent two or three amendments, and I will ask to have them reported. I do not think there will be any opposition to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 472, line 16, following the word "involving", it is proposed to insert "the national security"; on page 473, line 13, following the word "operations" and before the word "receipts", to insert "any appropriation as to which the President determines such an exemption to be necessary in emergencies affecting the national security"; on page 473, line 20, following "confidential nature", to insert "or, in an emergency, any item determined by him to be necessary for the national security"; on page 473, line 24, to insert "(6) any item determined by the Presi-

dent, in an emergency, to be necessary for the national security."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to any of these amendments?

Mr. BRIDGES. I certainly do object.

Mr. McKELLAR. I submitted the amendments to the Senator from New Hampshire, and I believe he had a substitute for them.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have been so busy that I have not been able to take the matter up with the Department. I am perfectly willing to accept the substitute the Senator has drawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will send forward the substitute.

Mr. BRIDGES. I send the substitute to the desk.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will give us an opportunity to take the matter up in conference, and we will work it out there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 443, after line 12, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 630. Appropriations and contract authority contained in this chapter shall not be subject to the provisions of subsections (c) to (i) inclusive of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1111 of this act during the existence of an emergency affecting the national security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is this the amendment about which the Senator from Massachusetts spoke to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 443, between lines 12 and 13, it is proposed to insert:

Sec. 630. No part of the appropriations made in title IV of this chapter shall be available for contracts with any person, firm, or corporation to make or cause to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any employee within the Navy; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in title IV of this chapter be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no moneys appropriated in title IV of this chapter for the Naval Establishment or made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government naval shipyards or

arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, except when the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, would, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy, be advantageous to the national defense.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I raise a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont withhold his point of order until I can make a brief statement?

Mr. FLANDERS. I withhold it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This is an amendment which was a part of the law with regard to the Navy Department from 1915 to 2 years ago. It is in two parts. The first part is the so-called stop-watch amendment, which has applied in all navy yards, as I have stated, from 1915 to 2 years ago. The second part of the amendment would require work to be done in a naval establishment except when, in the opinion of the Secretary, it would be advantageous to the national defense to have it done by a private contractor. That has also been in the law of the land, as a part of appropriation acts, for about 25 years, except for the past 2 years.

I have received permission of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations to offer the amendment, and to ask that the rule be suspended so that it may be agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I raise the point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the amendment is subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair withheld a ruling until the Senator from Massachusetts could speak on the amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. I raise the point of order again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read and immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 180, before the period in line 9, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to reduce or to authorize any reduction in this appropriation or in the number of meat inspectors authorized to be paid from this appropriation."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendment is probably very trivial to be considered along with a \$52,000,000,000 appropriation bill. I think it involves 256 meat inspectors and provides that they shall not be laid off, as a measure of protecting the health of the country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, was it the intention of the Senator to cut the reduction applicable to the Department of Agriculture, or simply provide that this part of the activities of the Department of Agriculture should not be affected in the adjustment of the cut by the Secretary of Agriculture between

various divisions, bureaus, and offices in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. WHERRY. The latter part of the Senator's statement is what I intended. The Bridges amendment permits the Secretary to transfer employees to different departments. My amendment would permit the retention of these inspectors without a cut, notwithstanding the Bridges amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. And it would not reduce the amount of the reduction accomplished under the Bridges amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is no question about the importance of meat inspection, but there are other items in the agricultural chapter of the appropriation bill which are just as important. Some Senator remarked to me a few minutes ago that no sooner would this amendment be agreed to than Senators would be marching down the hill with amendments on other items.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think the Forest Service employees are just as important as meat inspectors, and if this amendment shall be agreed to, it is my purpose to suggest an amendment providing that the Forest Service employees be exempted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think we should approach this matter in this way. We have provided a 10-percent cut in the Department, and left it up to the Secretary of Agriculture to make the cut. The Secretary of Agriculture knows the relative values of the various offices. If he cuts meat inspectors unduly, we can deal with it in the same deficiency bill in which we deal with other items for which it will be necessary for us to make deficiency appropriations.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say that I voted to reduce appropriations for the Marshall plan. That is now not included in the reduction which has been made. Other departments were cut, including the Department of Agriculture, which will have to take most of the cut. I voted against that cut. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Georgia that we should not start exempting sections of the Agricultural Department appropriations. I voted against cutting the appropriations for the agencies of the Government, but voted to cut the appropriations for the foreign activities.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it would be necessary to offer a number of amendments to other items to exempt them, and if we start on such a practice, Senators will have been able to go on record as voting for a 10-percent cut, and then proceed to vote for amendments which will eliminate any possibility of reducing the appropriation one dollar. After we have just voted for a 10-percent cut, we should not start to make exemptions. If that is kept up and similar action is taken on all items all of us would like to exempt, we will have made a great play of publicity in cutting

appropriations, and then forestalling the cuts by amendments.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Is it not a fact that under the provisions of the amendment just agreed to the authority rests with the head of the department to make any transfers which may be needed, or advisable, or desirable, to increase the efficiency and protect the essential services of his department?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CORDON. And we do not need any such provision as that now proposed, do we?

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, now that I have that statement from the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and from the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and before any Senator proposes to modify the amendment or take exception to it, I should like also to ask the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], if he agrees with the statement made by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Oregon that the Secretary has power to transfer these funds.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska withdraws his amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in the section relating to the price-support operations I think there has been an error in the language. The language tries to exempt price-support operations. I call up the amendment which I have sent to the desk, lettered "A" of July 17, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 472, line 1, it is proposed to strike out all after the word "States", down to and including the word "programs", in line 3, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "No funds (other than funds for administrative expenses) available for price support, surplus removal, and related operations, with respect to agricultural commodities shall be subject to apportionment pursuant to this section."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the committee attempted to exempt price-support operations from apportionment under the provisions of the bill. The Department has other activities than price-support operations. They have certain activities under section 32. My amendment merely makes it possible for the Department to proceed in an orderly fashion without attempting to apportion the operations between any particular months or any 6 months' period. I have discussed the amendment with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and I am sure he knows that is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can see no possible objection to the amendment, because the section 32 funds cannot be handled on such a basis as has been proposed. Unless the amendment is adopted, the effectiveness of the section 32 program, as well as the price-support program, would be destroyed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have cut the Marshall plan funds, and we have made other cuts. How much of a cut does the Senator's amendment represent. I realize, of course, that the cut will not apply to section 32 funds, but there may be a reduction in employees.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, Mr. President; the amendment has nothing to do with reduction. The amendment simply means that, if a price-support program is begun on cotton, for example, cotton cannot be supported for 6 months, and then an attempt be made to divide the money on a year's basis, and apply half of it to one period and half to the other.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment does not provide for any reduction at all?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. RUSSELL. It merely deals with antideficiency provisions of the bill. It has nothing to do with reduction or increase in appropriation.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Georgia is entirely correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may we have the amendment explained again by the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I shall be glad to explain it. Under the language adopted by the committee attempt was made to exempt price-support operations from the provisions of the bill. The Department does other things in addition to carrying on price-support operations. It has certain activities under section 32, which is not really a price-support operation. The language I suggest in my amendment merely makes it possible for the Department to proceed in an orderly fashion, without attempting to apportion the operation between any particular months or any 6 months' period. I am sure there is nothing wrong with the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does it increase the amount of money available?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not in the slightest.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, not in the slightest.

Mr. BRIDGES. What is the advantage of it, if there is not an increase?

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Department of Agriculture had to apportion its section 32 funds, 6 months in one period and 6 months in another period, it might throw the entire program out of balance. Mr. President, has the amendment been agreed to?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, was the amendment read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, the amendment has been read. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to what I think is ade-

quate language on page 472 of the bill which would make his amendment unnecessary.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that it is because the language on page 472 is not adequate, that the amendment has been offered.

Mr. CORDON. I am not going to object to the amendment, but I should like to read into the RECORD at this time the provision which appears on page 472, paragraph (d) (2):

Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with the initiation, operation, and administration of agricultural price-support programs.

I have made some little study of this subject over a period of years. I know that it is not contemplated under the language of the bill itself that there be apportionment in connection with funds which are used in seasonal or emergency operations. The amendment in itself, so far as I can see, can do no harm. Perhaps it might satisfy someone who has a doubt as to the effect of the language of the bill without it. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and myself, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 124, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$370,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the expenses of moving empty railroad cars, except where consistent with prevailing commercial practices, and no officer or agency of the United States shall have authority to obligate the Post Office Department, or to cause the Post Office Department to become in any way obligated, for the payment of any such expenses."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment. The amendment is not in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment while I make a brief statement concerning the amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the 5 minutes that have been allotted to me, I wish to explain the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have only 5 minutes, and I should like to make my statement, which is very brief.

The purpose of the amendment is to curtail expenditures for transportation of mails from \$400,000,000 to \$370,000,000, which would amount to a saving of \$30,000,000.

I had the privilege to be the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee which held

extensive hearings last year on the whole problem of transportation of our mails by railroad. I am convinced as a result of those hearings that our Government is today overpaying the railroads in what amounts to a subsidy of at least \$30,000,000—an amount, Mr. President, which is conservative in the light of reports in my possession from the General Accounting Office and the Post Office Department.

The appropriation bill appropriates \$400,000,000 for the transportation of the mails. More than half of this sum—nearly \$250,000,000—is allocated to the transportation of mail by railroad. Postmaster General Donaldson, in hearings before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service last year, stated that the Post Office Department “used about half of the space we paid for.” The General Accounting Office checked some of the mail runs, and found that our Government was paying as much as 84 percent additional for unused space and deadhead cars. It found that 22 percent of the money the railroads received from the Post Office Department was received for no services rendered. The Post Office Department has estimated that in 1949 it paid more than \$30,000,000 to the railroads for space it did not use. The General Accounting Office, therefore, recommended that the Post Office Department should not pay for empty cars and unused space.

Our amendment, Mr. President, once and for all, would correct this gross inequity and would be a significant step in placing the Post Office Department on a businesslike basis.

I was much amused to notice an advertisement in the July 1950 issue of *Ties*, the Southern Railway System magazine. The advertisement, which appeared regularly in the newspapers of towns and cities served by the Southern Railway System, was signed by Mr. Ernest E. Norris, president. I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement be incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S STOP CALLING IT AN “AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT”

Plain talk is urgently needed today on a matter that affects the pocketbooks of all taxpayers—subsidies to commercial intercity transportation agencies that long ago outgrew the infant industry stage.

The yearly expenditures of the Federal Government alone for aid to forms of transportation other than the railroads now approach one and one-half billion dollars. These are your tax dollars—and ours. They help provide the highways used by huge commercial trucks, the airports, and other facilities used by commercial airlines, and the waterways used by waterway carriers.

In contrast, the railroads do not receive, and do not want, one single penny of subsidy. They are self-supporting. They pay more than \$1,000,000,000 a year in taxes. And their charges reflect their true costs of doing business.

We think it's time to call a spade a spade—time to point out that these subsidized carriers can destroy but not supplant the self-reliant railroads—time to urge that simple justice be done for the good of all America and all taxpayers.

ERNEST E. NORRIS,
President, Southern Railway System.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I simply want to point out with great satisfaction Mr. Norris' statement that “the railroads do not receive and do not want one single penny of subsidy.” With this statement, Mr. President, I am sure the railroad industry, therefore, will undoubtedly support the amendment I propose.

I also would like to place in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in *Aviation Week* for May 22, 1950, called *The Great Train Robbery, or Our Self-Supporting Railroads*, which comments on the advertisement of the Southern Railway System and which deals with the subject matter of our amendment.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY, OR OUR SELF-SUPPORTING RAILROADS

We have before us the Southern Railway System's new advertisement in *Business Week* for May 6. The rails have been pretty noisy for a long time about subsidies and how they don't have any. This ad is typical.

It says that of all the forms of intercity commercial transportation, only the railroads are self-supporting. “They don't leave it to George,” says the Southern.

George is you, Mr. Taxpayer.

“The railroads pay their own way * * * . It isn't easy, especially when we have to compete for business with subsidized carriers. But it's easier on you and your pocketbook, George.”

Frankly, to the contrary, it does look pretty easy to us, but if what we read in the stuffy CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is true, it definitely isn't easy on us taxpaying Georges.

For we started reading the fine print in the Appendix of the RECORD and after we got through some of the complaints of a certain Indiana Congressman we could practically feel you railroads snatching our wallets.

It certainly smashed a lot of illusions we Georges had built up in our minds from reading all these ads and press releases about how only you in the transportation world got none of those juicy subsidies.

Because Representative JOHN R. WALSH contends that ever since the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916 was passed you railroads have pocketed millions and millions of our dollars which the Post Office Department allows you for carrying empty mail cars all over the biggest railway system in the world.

One big reason, it seems, that you railroads can be so self-supporting is that we Georges paid you in 1946, for example, for carrying 529,462,152,219 cubic-foot-miles on nonlocal surface mails, and yet you really carried only 323,677,344,195 cubic-foot-miles. That means that in 1946, 44.24 percent of the space we tax-paying Georges paid for was not used. Even now, Mr. Walsh says, the government (meaning us Georges) pays about \$250,000,000 annually to you railroads for transporting mail, but we receive only half this service we pay for. This is because—as you fellows knew all along, you jokesters—the 1916 act requires the same rate for the return of a mail-storage car as was paid for its full outbound movement, provided the car is not used by the railroad for other traffic on the return run.

In dramatic fashion, Mr. Walsh introduces testimony in Postmaster General Donaldson's own words before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

“Yes * * * there is a difference in pay to railroads. * * * I think what you are talking about is space purchased by full cars or storage cars or what-not. That is different from the regular RPO lines, the lines in which railway postal clerks operate. Now

with reference to the space for transporting mails by full carlots or by 15 or 30 feet or 45 feet or what-not, I think that our investigation indicated that we used about half of the space that we paid for. Under the law, if we transport a carload of mail from New York City to San Francisco we pay for that so much per foot per mile, so to speak, and then we pay for the return movement of the car, whether we use it or not. There is far more mail moving west than there is mail moving back.”

After reading this, the rest of you Georges may like to know what the General Accounting Office told the Senate Post Office Committee about this particular manner in which the railroads self-support themselves out of our pockets. After its own study of the so-called round-trip provision of the act, it told the Senators:

“The study has indicated that cars carrying full-pay loads out do not return promptly, but are often directed to other use for the carrier's convenience and substitute cars are returned, making it possible for the railroads to realize a greater income. The propriety of this practice is a possible question since the act does not appear to anticipate such substitution. * * * Many substitute cars are returned in freight trains and the trip is paid for at passenger rates.

“The operation of the round-trip provisions has resulted in numerous complex agreements, which assure the railroads full payment for all returned deadhead cars and empty space. In some instances the return movement is in advance of the outbound loaded movement.”

This last idea is ingenious. This wrinkle extracts our money to buy empty space on the return portion of a round trip that hasn't started yet. How self-supporting can you be?

And C. B. Allen, a very capable news hawk, finds interest in the GAO's comment: “In practically all instances, the carrier is paid more by the Post Office for the return of a car empty than if the car was carrying a payload of a private shipper. Returning a car empty is to the railroad's advantage.” (Especially if it can get paid for the return trip before it starts out.)

Two years ago, Mr. Allen reported in the New York Herald Tribune, the railroad post-office practice reached the proportions of a minor wartime scandal when it was charged in Government circles that the railroads had been operating empty cars back and forth across the country, despite an acute “shortage” of shipping space, to collect the higher mail-pay rate.

Mr. WALSH, in a final word, says “The Post Office Department has permitted the railroads to abuse this provision of law in such a way as to increase greatly the amount of empty space paid for. While some empty returns must, under the law, be paid for, this has been turned into a racket by the railroads with Post Office Department approval.”

So ends today's lesson on how America's self-supporting railroads are the only form of inter-city commercial transportation who don't still rely on help from the people's tax dollars. That's how the railroads are “easier on you and your pocketbook.”

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most inexcusable practices in government today is the practice by which the Post Office Department pays our railroads at full rates for the movement of mail in both directions even though mail may actually be transported in only one direction. The Post Office Department as the customer of the railroads is required to assume an obligation which no private shipper or no other governmental agency assumes. I emphasize the words “which no private shipper or no other governmental agency assumes.”

I submit that this is a waste of Government funds, Mr. President. In view of the overt evidence of waste of Government funds and in view of the emphasis which has been placed again and again in the Senate on economy, there is no excuse for appropriating an additional \$30,000,000 of funds which the General Accounting Office by its own survey has said is unwarranted.

Therefore, I offer my amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I rise to the point of order that the amendment is legislation offered to an appropriation bill.

I wish to say to the minority leader, to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and to members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that this matter was not called to our attention. If the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], or other members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service wish to report such a proposal from their committee, that should be done—although of course I am not familiar with the details of this matter.

However, I do not think it is proper to include post office legislation in an appropriation bill. Therefore, I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 476, it is proposed to strike out the language in section 1113, beginning in line 5, through line 20.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am satisfied that if the Senate will hear me through on this amendment—and I expect to take less than 5 minutes—the Senate will agree with me that this section should be stricken from the bill.

My first point is that if this language had been proposed by the Senate committee as an amendment to the bill, it would have been subject to a point of order, because clearly it would have been legislation proposed to an appropriation bill. However, the Parliamentarian advises me that because the section was inserted by the House of Representatives, it is not subject to our Senate point of order rule.

My second point is that there is now pending a bill on security risks in Government employment known as the Tydings bill. Those of us who are members of the Armed Services Committee have been working hard on the Tydings bill in trying to iron out some differences in regard to appeal procedure. I say we should handle all measures on this subject of security risks in one bill, because if we proceed on that subject by piecemeal operations, we shall find that there will be considerable differences in procedures between the departments in respect to the handling of security risks.

My next point is that in its present form this section of the bill is highly arbitrary. It does not provide a check or any review or any appeal at all from

the decisions of the dismissing officers. Of course we wish to get the security risks out of Government employment, but we also wish to see that we are fair to the innocent. We owe it to our sense of fair play and justice to provide some appeals procedure and checks on the discretionary action of dismissing officers. However, on the basis of section 1113 of the bill which my motion seeks to strike, we might just as well repeal the entire civil service appeal system now.

Mr. President, because I think this matter should be handled in a separate bill; because I think the procedure should be uniform; because section 1113 of the bill is legislation on an appropriation bill, although not subject to our Senate point of order, I say we should strike this section from the bill, and then should proceed to cover the same subject by means of the Tydings bill, which will be before the Senate in a very few days.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, some arguments in regard to this matter which have been submitted to me by some scientists. I do not speak for the scientists, but their arguments speak for themselves.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROONEY RIDER TO THE APPROPRIATION BILL, H. R. 7786

The Scientists' Committee on Loyalty Problems wishes to call the attention of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to a section of the omnibus appropriation bill which has come to be known as the Rooney rider. This rider merits much more consideration than would be indicated by its brevity. It has been attached to the appropriation of the Department of Commerce (sec. 113 of ch. XI, H. R. 7786, p. 429) and states that:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests of the United States."

Since this tersely worded rider grants to the head of a civilian agency sweeping powers, the rider must be subjected to a careful and sober appraisal. What are its objectives? What are its implications? What will be its effects?

PURPOSE OF THE RIDER

The power of summary dismissal which is contained in the rider is intended to expedite the removal of poor security risks and is similar to the power which is now held by the military departments and the Department of State. It is indisputable that in these times the security of classified information must be carefully protected and therefore, when reasonable suspicion falls on a worker in a sensitive position, some steps must be taken promptly. However, we must consider whether the rider, as worded, in attempting to mend small holes in our cloak of security, may not tear apart the whole fabric of our carefully and tediously knit procedures of civil service.

In the following analysis of the rider, it will be shown that the rider as stated is vague and indefinite, that it circumvents and abrogates established Civil Service procedures, and that it will hurt the morale of

the employees. Before beginning this analysis, it is instructive to look into the legislative background of this rider.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND OF THE RIDER

The rider was proposed by Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY (Democrat), of New York. Its wording is identical with that of the McCarran rider to the appropriation bill of the Department of State. Apparently such authority was requested by the Department of Commerce, as shown by the following quotation from the hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, page 2344:

"Mr. ROONEY (speaking to Mr. Gladieux). Are you familiar with the so-called McCarran rider which is a part of the appropriation bill for the Department of State? * * * What is your reaction to the suggestion to have a similar rider for the appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce?"

"Mr. GLADIEUX. We have requested legislation—we have prepared legislation giving us the same authority and submitted it to the Bureau of the Budget for clearance, about 3 months ago.

"Mr. ROONEY. Do you feel that such a provision should apply generally to the Department of Commerce or only to certain of the bureaus of the Department, such as the Bureau of Standards, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the CAA, and so forth?"

"Mr. GLADIEUX. Our requested legislation makes no distinction. We requested authority for the entire Department of Commerce. * * * We have not yet received clearance from the Bureau of the Budget. * * * There are a number of kinds of cases where we find ourselves seriously handicapped in coping with them on a dismissal basis, because under Civil Service regulations we must file specific charges, hold hearings, and otherwise follow a standard procedure. Frequently these kinds of charges are just not subject to handling in the normal civil-service way."

In April, Representative MARCANTONIO raised points of order against both the McCarran rider and the Rooney rider. The points of order were sustained and the provisions stricken from the bill. On May 9, however, the House passed a resolution waiving further points of order against chapter XI of the bill and specifically points of order against these two amendments, which were then reinserted as part of chapter XI—General Provisions. There has been no opportunity for public hearings at any stage.

The McCarran rider is the legal basis for the security safeguards of the State Department. This is temporary authority, renewed each year. (Section 104 of the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1949.) The sweeping provisions have rarely been used. Permanent legislation granting summary suspension of poor security risks has been introduced in two identical bills: H. R. 7439 (the Murray bill) and S. 3104 (the Tydings bill). These bills provide some safeguards for the employees. They now appear to be sidetracked. The Commerce Department was not included in these bills, although the President was given the authority to extend the provisions to other departments and agencies.

LACK OF JUSTIFICATION OR NEED FOR THE ROONEY RIDER

The rider as worded is vague and indefinite. What are the types of offenses such that termination of employment is "necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States"? The broader implications of the rider will be considered later, but for the purposes of the present discussion, it will be assumed that the rider is directed against employees who are either poor security risks or disloyal.

The situation of the loyalty program in the Department of Commerce will be discussed first. It will be shown that it is in a satisfactory condition and need not be supplemented with an act such as the Rooney rider. All new employees entering the Government service are screened for loyalty and thus there is a very small likelihood that any of these will later be found disloyal. Virtually all of the present employees of the Department have been checked for loyalty under the President's Loyalty Order (Executive Order 9835, March 21, 1947). Out of a total of 46,000 employees, only 369 loyalty cases have been found since 1947, a period of 3 years. Of these employees, 273 were acquitted and 71 were separated. Only 25 cases are now pending adjudication (p. 2336, Hearings on the Department of Commerce Appropriations for 1951). This indicates the high degree of loyalty existing in the Department. Since both old and new employees of the Department have been passed on loyalty and since the existing loyalty procedures are adequate to handle the small number of new cases which may arise each year, there is no reason for invoking summary dismissal, such as is contained in the Rooney rider.

We will now consider whether such sweeping powers are necessary to protect the classified information handled in the Department of Commerce. The proportion of employees engaged in classified work in the Department is relatively small. Most of the classified work is done at the National Bureau of Standards, where there are not over 1,000 employees in sensitive positions. If this constitutes about 80 percent to 90 percent of the sensitive positions in the Department of Commerce (statement of Mr. Gladioux, hearings, p. 2339), then there are probably not more than 1,200 employees, or about 2½ percent, doing classified work out of a total employment of 46,000. The number of security cases which have been handled by the Department is also rather small. Out of the 273 cases of acquittal (over a period of 3 years) which were mentioned above only 26 were security cases. It is possible that a small proportion of the 71 separations constituted security cases.

Security matters are adequately protected in the Department. The bulk of the classified work in the Department is done for the military agencies and for the Atomic Energy Commission, and the employees doing this work are cleared by these agencies. Classified material and programs are handled according to the strict regulations prescribed by these agencies. Thus it would appear that adequate security measures already exist in the Department of Commerce.

Since only a small proportion of the employees of the Department of Commerce are engaged in classified work, the application of the Rooney rider as a security measure to the Department as a whole seems meaningless. How can the rider apply to the majority of employees who are not in sensitive positions, unless the definition of what constitutes security is to be greatly broadened? This brings us to the first conclusion of this discussion, namely, that laws which embody procedures and penalties for dealing with poor security risks should not apply to any agency as a whole, but only to employees who are in contact with classified matter.

DANGERS INVOLVED IN THE ROONEY RIDER

1. Abrogation of civil-service procedures: Grave dangers are involved in granting the power of summary dismissal to a predominantly civilian agency. In the first place, such a law abrogates the civil-service procedures which have served to protect Government workers from arbitrary action. The Rooney rider specifically sets aside the civil-service safeguards of the employee which are embodied in section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, when it states, "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the

act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law." The protection of civil service was well recognized in the appropriation hearings:

"Mr. GLADIEUX (p. 2344). There are a number of kinds of cases where we find ourselves seriously handicapped in coping with them on a dismissal basis, because under civil-service regulations we must file specific charges, hold hearings, and otherwise follow a standard procedure. * * * (p. 2359). To discharge them we would have to file civil-service charges on them, and we have no basis for doing it. That is why I say that what we are doing is admittedly quite tenuous. * * * I admit it is pretty tough on some of these people; * * * (p. 2345). Assuming they (pending cases) are cleared, then the whole file comes back to the Department, and we make a subsequent determination as to whether they should be classified as security risks. That is where I say we are probably on shaky grounds, because once a person is cleared, some people would argue that he is cleared and no further action should be taken. We do not accept that. Even where the Loyalty Review Board has said this man is all right we have said, 'We will make our own determination as to whether he is a security risk.' * * * I am never sure that we can sustain our position if it is seriously challenged before the Commission or before the courts, because we have no legal basis for doing what we are doing in designating these people as security risks, in taking away their promotion rights, and transferring them from desirable jobs to less desirable jobs where they do not handle security information. We have been sharply criticized for what we have done."

It is apparent from these quotations that the Government employee derives some protection from existing civil-service procedures. The granting of the power of summary dismissal to the Secretary would remove this safeguard of the employees.

2. Broadening of basis of dismissal of employees: Considerable danger resides in the interpretation of the vague phrase of the Rooney rider, "in the interests of the United States." In the previous discussion we have interpreted this to mean the maintenance of adequate security measures, but this is not definitely stated. May it not be in the interests of the United States to summarily dismiss employees for other reasons? The temper of the Appropriations Committee is indicated by the following quotations which show that Mr. Rooney would root out all the homosexuals from the Department of Commerce. The Scientists Committee on Loyalty Problems takes no position in this matter. It is simply cited as illustrative of the broadening of the meaning of the rider. Quoting from page 2338 to page 2341:

"Mr. ROONEY (to Mr. Gladioux). What is the policy of the Department of Commerce with regard to homosexuals? Has anybody ever sent out a directive addressed to the heads of the various bureaus, all the way down the line, calling for the names of any people suspected of being homosexuals? Have any (employees) been dismissed in the past 3 years, let us say, because it was discovered that they were homosexuals? Not one? In the whole Department? That is incredible, in an organization of 46,000 people. Do you think that a directive such as I have suggested should be issued immediately to the classified areas, at least? Are you not in control of your organization to the extent where you can get the word around that you wanted turned up any people who were so inclined? Now, when the Department of State can come in here and point out that they have separated so many people for this reason, and so many for the other reason—and one of the reasons is homosexuality—and you are not able to point to the separation of one out of 46,000, it seems that something may be wrong."

These quotations show that the interests of the United States may be variously interpreted. Furthermore, when certain employees become the target of congressional displeasure, may it not be interpreted as in the interests of the United States to dismiss these employees?

A further danger exists in the power of summary dismissal that it may be used at lower administrative levels to eliminate employees because of some personal bias or prejudice of the supervisor against them.

It may be argued that the power of summary dismissal has been little used by the agencies which have previously possessed it. However, this is more of an argument for its elimination from the law that its retention, since if it is little used, it must be unnecessary. While the law exists, however, the danger still exists for the employee. He is sitting on a powder keg, and even though the fuse has never been lit, he is still uneasy.

3. Lack of safeguards for the employee: The rider does not provide the employee with any safeguards. It is ironic that in the military agencies, where security is of most importance, employees should have been given some protection, such as hearings, whereas no recourse is provided in the rider intended for a civilian agency. Public law 808, which carries the security provisions for the military agencies, provides for hearings and for appeals of employees who are suspected of being poor security risks. The Tydings and Murray bills previously referred to also provide for similar safeguards and for restitution of back salary for employees who are cleared. Certainly similar provisions should be included for the Department of Commerce. The present attitude of some persons is that it would be worth sacrificing 10 people to get one who is guilty. This "would be burning down the house of the American way of life in order to get at the rats in it." We have already seen that only 71 dismissals were made in the Department out of 369 suspected cases. Under the Rooney rider, the 369 could have been summarily dismissed without any recourse of the employee whatever.

The reason for providing the employee with safeguards is not based merely on the concept of fairness to the employee, but because it is good administration. The employee has no vested interest right in his job; however, it is in the interest of the United States to have good personnel management. The Department of Commerce has among its employees a considerable number of scientists. Nothing can destroy the morale of scientists, lower their efficiency, and deter the superior worker from entering the service more than an unfavorable atmosphere created by the use of arbitrary powers.

In conclusion, we wish to stress again the grave dangers to an efficient Government service inherent in the granting of the power of summary dismissal, particularly to a civilian agency. If security measures beyond existing ones are required, they should be introduced as separate legislation and incorporate suitable safeguards for the employees.

APPENDIX

SECURITY AND LOYALTY

The differences between security and loyalty cases are not easy to define. Quoting from a report by the Scientists' Committee on Loyalty Problems (published in Science, March 3, 1950, volume III, pages 220-225:

"CRITERIA FOR CLEARANCE

"Determination of the actual criteria to be applied in determining eligibility for security clearance is apparently extremely difficult. Very recently the Atomic Energy Commission, the Air Force, and the Industrial Employment Review Board have formulated such criteria. The formulation

was so difficult that at one point the AEC despaired of ever spelling it out in specific terms. However, the committee believes that similar codifications should be made by all agencies concerned.

"The AEC and Air Force recognize two types of security risk. For example:

"Category (A) includes those classes of derogatory information which establish a presumption of security risk * * * that is, disloyalty (in the sense of the President's loyalty clearance order, felonious conduct, insanity, violation or disregard of security regulations, etc. In these cases, refusal of clearance is mandatory (subject to appeal in Washington).

"Category (B) includes those classes of derogatory information where the extent of activities, the attitudes or convictions of the individual must be weighed * * * or (those of) his spouse." In these cases, clearance can be granted or denied, or referred to Washington. Much has been written elsewhere on these types of guilt. The committee, however, has confined itself to opposing any unwarranted increase in the area where these criteria must be applied."

With regard to category A: felonious conduct, insanity, and disregard of security regulations are objective acts or conditions which can be readily determined. It would be good personnel management to eliminate such employees regardless what type of position they held, and their cases should be capable of being disposed of by ordinary personnel procedures.

The main type of security case which seems to be in the majority and which causes most concern is that in which the determinations are based on subjective or circumstantial evidence, such as attitudes or beliefs. That is to say, a security case is similar to a loyalty case except that the evidence necessary to bolster the suspicions is lacking. This is brought out in the appropriation hearing where an effort was made to spell out exactly what was a security risk. Apparently each case must rest on its own merits. This example is quoted from the hearings (p. 2361) as illustrating the tenuous nature of the charges.

"Mr. GLADIEUX. I think this is another typical kind of a case. Here is a person who, while in high school, wrote a letter to a schoolmate advocating communism. Since then, on other occasions he seems to have evidenced an interest in communism, but there is no evidence of Communist Party membership and he disclaims any sympathy for communism.

"Mr. STEFAN. Are those the kind of cases that you have there, of this man who is considered a security risk because once when he was a youngster in high school he evidenced an interest in communism? I can't comprehend reason for that.

"Mr. GLADIEUX. Well, I am trying to give you the typical ones (cases). We put a security block on that person, but these I am giving can be repeated many times.

"Mr. STEFAN. That is unreasonable, unfair, and unjust. You are not giving us typical poor security risk cases, are you?

"Mr. GLADIEUX. These are all security risk cases."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me ask a question: What is the amendment, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read again.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 476, it is proposed to strike out section 1113, beginning in line 5, through line 20.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this provision has done more toward eliminating subversives from the State Department than has any other provision which has been placed in any bill in re-

cent years. It is the one thing which has accomplished a result toward the protection of the Government from those who would bore from within, in the State Department. The State Department has been under fire here for months now. The only way by which the State Department was able to rid itself of a number of borers from within was by and through this section of the bill, which has been in existence for years. To eliminate this section at this time, when the State Department has been under fire, and when by dint of this provision the State Department has been able to clear itself of some of those who were in it, would be a blow to the advancement we have made toward security in this country. To eliminate this language, Mr. President, would be a backward step in respect to our national defense and our national security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, is each Senator limited to 5 minutes on a motion to strike out?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, may I be heard?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON. I simply wish to submit that if the distinguished Senator from Oregon makes a motion to strike, I do not believe he will be limited to 5 minutes.

In that connection, I should like to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the unanimous-consent agreement, as it is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, applies to motions; but there was nothing in the request of the distinguished majority leader which applies to motions.

The distinguished minority leader suggested that motions be included; but if Senators will refer to page 11779 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday, in the second column on that page, they will see the following:

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator modify his request to that extent? Let the Chair understand whether the request is that each Senator has the right to speak 5 minutes on each amendment, or whether there shall be a limitation of 10 minutes on each amendment, to be equally divided.

Mr. LUCAS. Each Senator is to have 5 minutes on each amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Each Senator will have 5 minutes on each amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. ELLENDER. All amendments must be germane.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to inquire, if the appropriation bill is passed tomorrow night, whether the Senator from Illinois contemplates a Friday session?

Mr. LUCAS. A Friday session is contemplated for the purpose of calling the calendar.

Mr. ELLENDER. All amendments must be germane.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator include in his request the elimination of amendments that are not germane?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

However, Mr. President, nowhere did the Senator from Illinois include in his request a provision that motions which might be made would be subject to the 5-minute limitation.

I raise this question at this time because a motion by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has been entered, and I would hate to have debate on it limited to 5 minutes by each Senator.

I invite the attention of the Presiding Officer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the point to which I have referred. If the Chair will examine the RECORD at that point, he will find that nowhere did the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who submitted the unanimous-consent request, ask that it apply to anything other than amendments; he did not request that it apply to motions.

I hope there will not be a ruling that the agreement limits the debate on motions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to be governed by the Journal, and the Journal shows that motions are included.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is shown in what was subsequently inserted into the Journal; but the language used in the debate at that point is plain, and it is obvious that no request was made that motions be included.

I hope there cannot be modifications at a later date in connection with such matters. Some of our distinguished Members from the southern States are quite interested in opposing attempts to limit debate. I hope we shall not be foreclosed at this point simply because something was included in the Journal, although not agreed to on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator concluded his remarks?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from California asked me whether I would yield. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico whether under his theory a mere motion to reconsider could be made on any amendment that had been adopted, and that then there would be no restriction whatever on debate. In that case it would entirely invalidate the understanding arrived at by the Senate. It would be possible to go on for 4 days to discuss a motion to reconsider. I submit to the able Senator from New Mexico that that was neither the intent nor the understanding reached on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Chair whether the junior Senator from

Oregon has any of his 5 minutes left, in which to answer the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon be permitted 5 minutes—

Mr. MORSE. I want 2 minutes. That is all I want.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the Senator may have whatever time he requires to answer this statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. The inquiry is whether the first item of the proceedings of the Senate today was that of dispensing with the reading of the Journal and the approval of the Journal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the Journal was dispensed with, but it was approved.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was the Journal approved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was, on the motion of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under that situation, is any Senator now permitted to challenge the recitations of the Journal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Journal cannot be challenged. The Senate will be governed by the Journal.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a part of the colloquy appearing on page 11778 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which very clearly includes the request of the minority leader that the usual provisions be inserted in the unanimous-consent request, namely, that any motion or amendment then pending or which might be offered would be included in the agreement, giving 5 minutes to each Senator, and so forth. I think it was generally understood by every Senator.

I am a little disappointed in my good friend that he would raise the point, now that it has been thoroughly discussed and is in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the majority leader will agree, I am sure it would be satisfactory to all the Members on this side of the aisle to carry out the proposal of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee. In fact, I should not be averse, in order to have a unanimous-consent amendment tonight, to meet at 11:30 tomorrow morning and make these two amendments the pending business, and, at 2 o'clock, start voting on all pending amendments and motions, with 5 minutes for each Senator on each amendment or motion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. After 2 o'clock?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I make that suggestion to the distinguished majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the request include motions and points of order?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hope it does not happen again. If there is any doubt about it, it certainly should be written in blue pencil from now on. I hope the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will accept that, and from now on not question the unanimous-consent agreements.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I tried to point out that I had seen the statement of the Senator from Nebraska. He brought it up twice, and I am sure there is ample authority for it. I find that the Vice President said, "Is that accepted?" and there was no answer to that question. I hope we shall be more careful in the future.

Mr. WHERRY. We shall be more careful in the future; and that is the reason why I thought the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] should have ample time on his amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to assure the Senator from Nevada that there is no one in this body who wants to make more certain that subversives will be eliminated from Government than does the junior Senator from Oregon. Under the Tydings bill we are trying, however, to work out a procedure that will protect something which is pretty precious and fundamental in America. That is, that after a man has been dismissed from any of these so-called security-risk departments his case can be reviewed by an appeal officer. I want him to stay dismissed as far as the department that dismissed him is concerned. In other words, I do not want Louis Johnson in Defense, or McGrath in the Department of Justice, or anyone else at the head of any other department to be required to take back a man in whom he does not have confidence during the period of this great crisis with which we are confronted. But, Mr. President, mistakes in judgment can be made. People can and do dismiss loyal and fine employees because they have a grudge against them. Damage can be done and too frequently is done to innocent people. There is one principle in America that we must preserve: It is the principle that the exercise of discretion in determining the guilt of people shall be subject to review.

Let us not get to the point in this land of ours where people can be ruined for life by the exercise of judgment on the part of someone over them as to their guilt, when in fact a review of that decision would show them to be innocent.

The right of review from decisions as to one's guilt is basic to our American conception of fair play and fair trial. It is essential to just treatment. I cannot support the continuation of a procedure under which the Secretary of State can condemn a man as being subversive, if in fact the record will not support the judgment of the Secretary of State. I want his record cleared if he in fact is innocent. I do not want him sent back to the State Department if the Secretary of State does not have confidence in him. I think we should

resolve doubts in favor of the public interest in these matters, and I do not think such a man should have a right to go back to the State Department and work. But I do think the judgment of the Secretary of State should be reviewed. That is basic to American justice as I know it, and that is all I am pleading for. I think that a check upon the decision of mere men in our Government as to the loyalty of employees of Government should be subject to review. The purpose of having section 1113 stricken out of this bill is so we can consider this subject in one bill applicable to all the departments. We should discuss the issue in a separate bill and fight it out here on the floor of the Senate in full debate as to the substance of the matter. We should not try to ram this section through here on the basis of House language that would be subject to a point of order if it were Senate language.

That is my position, and I shall stand on it no matter what misinterpretations are made as to the purposes of the junior Senator from Oregon in regard to this matter. The right to review the decisions of men in this country as to the guilt of people is pretty precious to all of us under the spirit and intent of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I rise to oppose this amendment to strike out the so-called McCarran rider. I happened to be a member of the Appropriations Committee when the Senator from Nevada and other members of the committee had Mr. Byrnes, the then Secretary of State, before them, when this question was discussed initially and when this amendment was first placed in an appropriations bill. I am sure that if the Senate could have heard the former Justice of the Supreme Court they would understand that he, too, wants to protect all the rights of the citizens of the United States. But he also recognized and he spoke for something that was vital. He stated the fundamental proposition that employment by the United States Government is a privilege, and not an absolute right.

Mr. Byrnes further recognized that if the head of a department such as the State Department or the Commerce Department were to protect the security of the United States in such a vital spot, vital to the people of America, it would be necessary to give the Secretary of such department the right to discharge without trial. Without such authority it would be impossible for those department heads to operate their departments efficiently and for the safety and security of the United States.

It was an established fact that without such authority it would have been impossible for the Secretary of State to have discharged Mr. Carl Marzani. That individual had had a trial before the Civil Service Commission, but as it developed he could not be discharged except by virtue of the McCarran rider. I hope the Senate will not undo the splendid work which was done by the senior Senator from Nevada when, in response to the representations of Secre-

tary Byrnes, he had this amendment included in the bill by the Appropriations Committee.

The Senate has affirmed it on various occasions, and the House likewise has seen fit to do so. In placing this provision in the bill the House showed its understanding of the Remington case. The House knew that William Remington was placed back in the Department of Commerce when there were the most serious questions against his loyalty. He has since been removed in the face of an indictment for perjury because he had stated he was not a Communist, but if the Secretary of Commerce had not had the authority for dismissal contained in this provision he would today be working in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. DONNELL and Mr. MUNDT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, and I do so on this basis. I am not quarreling with him at all as to the right of a man to have a trial and to have a review. But as I see it there is nothing in the language in this bill which would at all preclude the further enactment of such a bill as was referred to by the Senator as the Tydings bill. I understood the distinguished Senator from Oregon to say in substance that he has no objection to a provision which would not require the head of a department to reinstate an employee. In other words, he is perfectly agreeable to this right of the Secretary of State, as I understand, or of the Secretary of Commerce, and if in the judgment of those respective officials an employee should be discharged, the Senator is perfectly agreeable that those officials should not be required to reinstate him. After all, as I see it, that is all that this particular provision in section 1113 does. It simply provides:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 * * * or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce—

Like the Secretary of State—
may, in his absolute discretion * * * terminate the employment of any officer or employee * * * whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. President, that simply means that the heads of those departments, the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Commerce, may discharge a man when he deems it to the best interest of the United States to do so. There is nothing in this provision, so far as I see, that would preclude Congress in the slightest, even inferentially, from passing an act which gives a man a right of review as to the merits of a case.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. There is no doubt that we could subsequently pass legislation, and I hope we shall, if my amendment is not adopted. I hope we shall anyway.

But the Senator, I respectfully submit, is in error if he thinks that with the passage of the bill with this language in it the employee then has any right of appeal. I think he will find, because we have gone into it pretty carefully in the Armed Services Committee, that that is the end of it, and he cannot get his record cleared. All I want is to give him an opportunity to have someone review the record to determine whether he was in fact subversive.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, have I any further time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I do not at all wish to state that this section of the appropriation bill gives, in itself, the right of review. I am very heartily in favor of the general principle expressed by the Senator from Oregon in believing that there should be some legislation passed which entitles a man to the right of review. But as I see it, this provision is very wholesome and is demanded by the best interests of our country, entitling the head of the State Department, the Secretary of State, and the head of the Department of Commerce, the Secretary of Commerce, to discharge an employee if he deems it proper so to do. I do not think the discharge in itself in any sense convicts a man of any wrong doing. It is simply the exercise of the discretion of the official, in thinking that in the best interests of the Government the man should be no longer in the Department. Such a provision has been on the statute books of the United States for a number of years, and I do not think it would in any sense amount to a deprivation of the right of review, even though it does not affirmatively confirm that right. So, Mr. President, I oppose the amendment of my distinguished and good friend, the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the viewpoint expressed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] in opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

In the first place, Mr. President, the McCarran rider has been extremely useful to the country and to the Congress of the United States. Considerably more than 200 State Department employees have been separated from the public payroll because of the existence of the McCarran rider. I use the figures supplied by Mr. John Peurifoy, a young man who is Assistant Secretary of State in charge of security, a young man who is generally admired and respected by the Members of Congress, and who in a letter over his own signature made that information available to the Congress of the United States. Certainly, Mr. President, until we provide some other way to assure security in the State Department and in other departments of the Government, we should not sabotage the only tool we have.

I join the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in the hope that there will be a Tydings bill to tighten up security. I hope such a bill will be approved by

the committee and that it will be reported. I hope it will not be bottled up and pigeonholed by the Democratic policy committee. I think it would be a wonderful thing if the Mundt-Ferguson bill dealing with Communists generally could be added to it on the floor of the Senate. We have been trying for many weeks to get a vote on a measure—S. 2311—to protect the security of this country against Communists while we are fighting them in Korea. So we should not rely on the remote hope that the Tydings bill will be approved by the Democratic policy committee and reported so that we can vote on it; we are learning the hard way, namely, that in this body we must legislate the matter of communism as we can, when we can, and how we can. One way in which we can do it is to defeat the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, fine as is its purpose and thus retain at least such legislation as we have to help safeguard our security.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry. There are a number of amendments on the desk which have not been acted upon. I presume there will be some amendments which will probably not be presented. I am wondering if I might make a preliminary survey to ascertain what Senators have amendments which they desire to offer. I do so for the purpose of ascertaining eventually whether we should remain in session and vote on all the amendments to the bill, or take a recess.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I think will not take more than 2 minutes to discuss.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have two amendments which will take a very few minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have two amendments which are not printed, and which I do not think will take very long.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, under those circumstances, I think we should move along, and perhaps we can finish in an hour. I hope so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 478 it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 1116. No part of the appropriations under this act shall be used to pay transportation of any employee of the United States Government on a foreign-flag ship or aircraft, if and when such transportation is available by ship or air by American-flag transportation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the only purpose of the amendment is to require that employees of the Government, when they travel, shall give a little preference to American-flag ships and aircraft. I think it is only fair to the American taxpayer who subsidizes

our aircraft and the merchant marine. Some Government employees, in traveling to Europe, choose the Isle de France, the Queen Elizabeth, or the Queen Mary. We find that 95 out of 100 such employees travel on foreign vessels, both coming and going. The least they can do is to travel on ships flying our own flag. If an Englishman were to travel to the United States and use an American ship instead of an English ship he would be recalled before he arrived. It is not always possible to use American-flag ships, but I think the time has come when we should serve notice on our Government employees in this respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I raise a point of order against the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I call up my motion to reconsider the vote by which the so-called Spanish-aid amendment was adopted. I move the immediate consideration of the motion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is that the Spanish-aid amendment which was agreed to?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I object.

Mr. KILGORE. I move the immediate consideration of the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] to reconsider the vote by which the so-called Spanish aid amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the motion of the Senator from West Virginia be laid on the table.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I have not yielded. I have the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator withhold his motion to lay on the table?

Mr. KILGORE. I have not yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator had made his motion. The Chair then recognized the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KILGORE. I have not discussed the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is not the Senator from West Virginia entitled to the floor? A day or two ago the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] made a motion to reconsider, and another Senator moved to lay the motion of the Senator from Missouri on the table. The Senator from Missouri insisted on having the floor, and the Vice President recognized the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] as a matter of right. The Senator from West Virginia has made a motion to reconsider, and I believe he likewise has a right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Vice President

recognized the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] as a matter of courtesy.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I ask that the same courtesy be extended to the Senator from West Virginia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would have been glad to extend the same courtesy to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], but the Chair did not see the Senator on his feet, and recognized the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who has now made a motion to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from West Virginia. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. ANDERSON and several other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. May we have the question stated by the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] to reconsider the vote by which the so-called Spanish aid amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—65

Aiken	Connally	Ferguson
Brewster	Cordon	Fulbright
Bricker	Darby	George
Bridges	Donnell	Gillette
Butler	Dworshak	Gurney
Capehart	Eastland	Hayden
Chapman	Eaton	Hendrickson
Chavez	Ellender	Hickenlooper

Hoey	McClellan
Holland	McFarland
Ives	McKellar
Johnson, Colo.	McMahon
Johnson, Tex.	Magnuson
Kern	Martin
Kerr	Maybank
Knowland	Millikin
Langer	Mundt
Leahy	Myers
Lodge	O'Connor
Lucas	O'Mahoney
McCarran	Pepper
McCarthy	Robertson

NAYS—15

Anderson	Hill	Morse
Byrd	Humphrey	Murray
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Frear	Kilgore	Russell
Graham	Lehman	Williams

NOT VOTING—16

Benton	Jenner	Thomas, Utah
Cain	Kefauver	Tobey
Downey	Long	Vandenberg
Flanders	Malone	Withers
Green	Taylor	
Hunt	Thomas, Okla.	

So Mr. McCARRAN's motion to lay Mr. KILGORE's motion on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, in the drafting of Chapter II of the bill I believe an error was made. In that part which provided an appropriation for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to carry on an audit and investigation of air mail rates, in our air mail carrier service, these words were used, "for making a survey of certificated interstate and overseas air carrier operations." I myself understood that the word "overseas" covered the operation of all our planes flying abroad, overseas. I have interviewed numerous members of the committee, and other Senators, and all were of the same opinion. But it seems that the Civil Aeronautics Act divided our planes into three classes, instead of two. There were our interstate planes. Overseas planes were defined as those which flew overseas to our island possessions. The other category was those which flew to other countries, which were classified as "foreign." Therefore the situation arises, if the provision remains as it is, that if a plane flies, for instance, to Japan by way of Hawaii, carrying mail, the audit could be made only as far as Hawaii, and no figures could be gotten beyond Hawaii into Japan. For planes flying to Europe there would be no figures, but figures only as to those flying to our island possessions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from West Virginia will suspend for a moment, the Chair will call his attention to the fact that no amendment is pending before the Senate, and that under the unanimous consent agreement an amendment must be pending, and that the address of the Senator, and of each Senator upon the amendment, would be confined to 5 minutes.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I was laying the foundation to make a motion. I expect to make a motion. I was giving the reason for it, because it could not be understood otherwise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair feels that he should, then, advise

the Senator from West Virginia that in that situation the Chair would charge up the Senator's preliminary remarks to the 5 minutes limitation.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask the Presiding Officer if he is charging his own remarks up to my time, too?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, the Chair will not do that.

Mr. KILGORE. I expect to make no remarks after I make my motion.

I think it would be a mistake to start this investigation. Since this matter came to my attention too late to make a motion to reconsider the vote within 2 days, it is therefore necessary for me to make a motion to suspend the rule in order to make a motion to reconsider and to insert an amendment, adding the words "and foreign" after the word "overseas," in order that a complete investigation may be made. Otherwise the investigators will be stopped at our island possessions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make his motion?

Mr. KILGORE. I make the motion now to suspend the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that that motion will have to lie over a day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am completely in accord with the remarks the Senator from West Virginia has made. An error was made, and my inquiry is, Can unanimous consent be given to insert the two words which the Senator has suggested?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the motion can be made. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent?

Mr. KILGORE. I am asking unanimous consent.

Mr. TAFT. What is the amendment to be offered?

Mr. KILGORE. To strike out the words "and overseas"—

Mr. TAFT. On what page?

Mr. KILGORE. On page 6, lines 14 and 15, to strike out the words "and overseas" and insert a comma and the words "overseas, and foreign", which would then make it read, "a survey of certificated interstate, overseas, and foreign air carrier operations," and so forth. It would include all our planes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, when the committee passed on this matter it was the intention of the committee to cover all investigations of mail transportation. Therefore, so far as the chairman of the subcommittee would have authority, I would be willing to accept the amendment. I think it is proper, and I think the Senate should give unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to taking up the amendment at this time?

Mr. McKELLAR. We will take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and the ques-

tion is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE.]

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I wish to propose on behalf of myself and a group of Senators, and I ask that it be stated, and that the names of the proponents of the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The amendment proposed by Mr. MURRAY, for himself, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. NEELY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. KERR, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HILL, and Mr. PEPPER, was, on page 141, line 7, to strike out the figure "\$19,977,760" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$23,435,000."

Mr. MURRAY obtained the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amendment has reference to chapter V, having to do with the Federal Security appropriation, has it not?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct; it has reference to vocational training.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have consulted many members of the subcommittee, including the chairman of the full committee, who also is a member of the subcommittee, and we feel that this amendment has so much merit that we can take it to conference, and we will accept the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, other Senators are here besides the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, yes; I always know the Senator from Illinois is here.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico is taking an amendment to conference without any Senator discussing it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the Senator from Montana that I am the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, and I have not been consulted about this amendment. I personally do not approve of this method of amending an appropriation bill on the floor of the Senate, and making a very substantial increase, particularly, when the minority has not been consulted, as in this case, so far as I know.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope the Senator from California will maintain that position.

Mr. MURRAY. This is not a substantial increase. It merely increases the amount that is provided for vocational training by \$3,457,240, bringing it up to the budget estimate. It is a very important provision because it is essential at this time in the war-production program which is about to be inaugurated. A similar program performed a great service in the last war. Without it we would have great difficulty in finding trained

employees for the different war production programs that will be put into operation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able Senator that while in a bill which carries some \$40,000,000,000, more or less, the difference between \$19,977,760 and \$23,435,000 may not seem very much, it is still some \$4,000,000.

Mr. MURRAY. No; it is not.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And I do not think it should be treated lightly on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MURRAY. It actually is \$3,457,240, as I stated a moment ago, but it is an essential program without which we would find ourselves in a difficult position in the war production program which is about to be inaugurated. It seems to me the Senate should realize that this program performed a very valuable service at the commencement of the First World War. The program was fathered by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. He was the sponsor of the original George-Barden Act, which set up this training program. While in operation it performed a very valuable service to the country. Without it now we would find ourselves in a very difficult position.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think no one of us is unmindful of the importance of this type of work, and certainly my own State of California is enthusiastically for it. But if this does tie into the war effort, as I believe it does, and since we have supplemental bills which will come before the Congress, I submit to the able Senator from Montana it is an orderly procedure to go to the Bureau of the Budget, secure a budget recommendation on the situation, and come in on a supplemental bill with the provision, rather than upping the present bill by some \$3,400,000.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I may say that the proposed increase brings the total up only to the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. LUCAS. We have been trying to cut that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the amendment is something which can and will reach into every rural high school in America which has the benefit of this program. It not only ties into any war program, but it also ties into the present rural youth-training program. This is the vocational-training program. This is what is called the Smith-Hughes program. It is known in another form as "Future Farmers of America" and "Future Homemakers of America." Its outstanding record of more than a quarter of a century has contributed greatly to the economic life of every rural community in the Nation which has the benefit of this splendid work.

I emphasize the tremendous advantage of this work in the rural areas of

the South, for our Negro boys and girls. The response from the Negro boys and girls has been remarkable. It is very interesting to see the program which has been outlined for them now.

The amount involved is relatively small, when applied to a program which is carried on throughout 48 States. It already has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. The proposed increase will bring the amount up to the sum the Bureau of the Budget has already approved.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask for what purpose this additional fund would be used to perform that would not be performed without it? Is it to be used for more teachers, more facilities, for opening more schools, or for what is it to be used.

Mr. STENNIS. It is to be used for furnishing more teachers. The fund can be used, as I understand, for facilities, but when so used is used only in a small way. The purpose is to provide more teachers, to extend this vocational training program into more high schools.

Mr. AIKEN. Does it apply to the agricultural program only?

Mr. STENNIS. No. It include mechanical training and other training that goes with vocational training. Such training is included.

Mr. AIKEN. Would this increase make it possible for more high schools to carry on courses in vocational training?

Mr. STENNIS. Absolutely. That is one of the main purposes of the increase in the fund. The plan is a definite one. It has been worked out over the years. It is not something which has been brought up recently. The increase will merely supply more funds to carry out the program.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The program is a good program. No one denies that. But I think the Senate would be interested to know that in 1942 the appropriation of \$13,500,000—

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, with all deference to the Senator, I will say that I yielded for a question. I ask the Senator if he will speak in his own time, please.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wanted to say that there has been a gradual increase in the amount over a period of years.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. That gradual increase is consistent with a planned program, which will now be seriously interfered with unless this small additional amount is given.

I want to make one further point with reference to this program. From personal observation I know it is a tremendous factor in training the young while they are on the land to have an interest in the land, to learn that they have a future on the land, and that they may safely cast their future on the land. This program, along with the 4-H Club work, is one of the most powerful factors in building up the rural communities,

in building a young citizenship which is willing to cast its future with the land.

I have no statistics, Mr. President, but I know that the State of Iowa needs 10,000 incoming farmers each year to replace those leaving the farms for one reason or another. At the present time only 6,800 boys are enrolled in vocational agricultural courses, with approximately 1,500 graduating each year. The same is true with respect to the situation of many States. The program really does tie the youth in with the land. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire if it does not also apply to industry which will be engaged in war production. That to my mind is the important feature of it.

Mr. STENNIS. The fund does apply to industry as well.

Mr. MURRAY. Already these industries are on a 24-hour basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is amazing to me how Senators can move from one side to the other, depending on how a matter under consideration affects their section of the country, their State, or their cities. We have under consideration an increase of \$4,000,000. Earlier this afternoon we discussed for a considerable period of time a proposed decrease of \$1,500,000,000. I am against the amendment. I hope it will be voted down, in view of what has happened here this afternoon. We are trying to economize. This is no time to add \$4,000,000 to the bill, regardless of what the program is.

What I really rose to speak about is the Spanish amendment. I shall speak on that subject for 3 or 4 minutes. Much has been said about what happened on the floor on Tuesday last with respect to the adoption of an amendment for aid to Spain. Mr. President, I am a realist. I undertake to say that I knew exactly what I was doing when that compromise was made. I undertake to say that I knew that the Senator from Nevada had the votes to put the Spanish amendment through the Senate of the United States, thereby taking \$100,000,000 from the ECA fund. There cannot be any question about that. Senators who have been so excited about the Spanish situation would have wound up in the same position they are now in. The only exception is that we would have been \$100,000,000 short in the ECA fund.

The Senator from Illinois has been more interested in trying to keep the ECA fund intact, trying to do something, as I see it, not to cripple the Marshall plan or the European recovery program.

There is no doubt that if a point of order had been made against the Spanish amendment it would have been sustained, and an appeal from that point of order would have been overruled. There were enough votes on the floor of the Senate to overrule the decision of the Chair, and it would have been done. I think the fact of the matter is there were enough votes even to sustain the Senator from Nevada if he had made a motion

to suspend the rule, which requires a two-thirds majority. With that realization, with the full knowledge that we were going to take \$100,000,000 out of the ECA fund, I had no hesitancy whatsoever in making the proposition I did through the Democratic policy committee. I think it was a "good deal," and I care not how any other Senator or anyone else may feel about it. The State Department would have had the Spanish amendment with \$100,000,000 less for ECA funds if we had not followed the procedure we adopted. Of course, it was a compromise; and the Senator from Nevada was willing to go with us in that direction, in regard to that matter. Every member of the Democratic policy committee agreed that we did not have the votes to defeat the proposal. When we do not have the votes, Senators can talk all they will, but if they are worse off than they were before, it does very little good to complain.

Yesterday I did not have an opportunity to explain my position, so I am explaining it now.

Senators who contend that they were cut off and did not have an opportunity to discuss that question should stop and realize that on Tuesday for approximately three-quarters of an hour the Senate was virtually in a state of recess, because there was no Senator present to discuss either side of the Spanish amendment question. Senators could have discussed it in that period of three-quarters of an hour; that time was available. However, no Senator spoke on that question at that time.

Mr. President, I wish to make my position clear. I do not hesitate to admit when I am licked. I repeat that I am a realist. I honestly believe that we worked out an arrangement which was better than the arrangement would have been if we had gone ahead and ultimately had permitted the point of order against the amendment of the Senator from Nevada to prevail in the Senate, because we saw what happened on the last vote on this question, when there were votes in opposition by 15 Senators. That is an indication of what would have happened.

I rose for the purpose of telling the Senate and the country what we have accomplished in that connection. That move by us saved the ECA \$100,000,000. I do not care what the officials of the ECA or what those in any of the departments say about the matter, for the fact is that by that move the Senate saved the ECA \$100,000,000. If we had not made that move, but if we had followed the other procedure, the ECA would have been in the same position that it is in now, but it also would have had \$100,000,000 less than it now has available.

That is all I care to say, Mr. President.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me say that I appreciate what has been said by the Senator from Illinois, and I can understand his feeling in the matter, in view of his tremendous responsibilities as leader of the majority and also as head member of the Democratic policy committee.

Mr. President, personally I can see no reason whatsoever why the United States Senate should apologize to the State Department or to the ECA for any action the Senate has taken. I still have the greatest respect for the integrity and sincerity of purpose of this body. In view of the fact that the Secretary of State was wrong about Mr. Hiss, it is obvious that the Secretary of State makes mistakes. I say he is mistaken now in thinking that 65 Senators made the wrong decision in regard to the Spanish matter.

I think the Senate even has the right to be wrong, although I do not think the Senate was wrong; I think we took the correct action.

I believe that the procedure we adopted will help ECA in Europe, if we mean what we say about ECA and if our philosophy regarding ECA is what we brag about. In that case, there is no reason to feel that the Senate was not justified in voting day before yesterday as it did and in taking the position it took then and in taking the position it took today. I think the action taken was moral and sincere.

Mr. President, I say bluntly that the only reason why heretofore we have not taken action of this kind is, not because we did not want to help ECA, but because we were a little timid about communistic influences in Europe. Of course, we may say that such things do not help any. However, in the case of France it is true that although internationally the French Parliament may agree with us, nevertheless when it comes to enacting legislation in the French Parliament, all the members of that Parliament vote, including the 180 members of the Communist Party. Would they have any influence in regard to whether or not that government would invite Spain to participate, no matter how worthy that proposition might be?

Similarly, would the Communists whom the Senator from Mississippi and I and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] heard in the Italian Parliament, have any influence in regard to that matter?

The best thing the United States Senate has done for ECA has been to take the action referred to, because now we shall be united. I say this notwithstanding that possibly I am the one Member of the Senate who does not agree with everything the head man in Spain is doing. I do not agree with all he is doing, but that is not the question. There are many things about which I do not agree; and there are many things about which those on the other side of the water do not agree, so far as concerns what is going on in this country. However, does that fact justify our taking a position inconsistent with the philosophy of a law we have enacted?

Mr. President, I think we did a favor to ECA and to the State Department and to the Nation.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I rise simply to make a very brief statement. I regret very much that this very meritorious amendment has become mixed up in a controversy which is somewhat

foreign to it. However, the controversy itself is worthy of note.

Having voted for the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, I myself think that it is the one piece of realism which I have seen in the Senate for a long time, in connection with our dealing with international affairs. Certainly if we mean to do anything for western Europe, but more particularly if we mean to do anything under the North Atlantic Pact for the defense of western Europe, Spain is an indispensable factor in that problem.

Not only is that true, Mr. President, but if we are not realistic enough to know that there should be built at once—in fact, it should have been built many months ago—a strong ground army in western Germany and in Japan, we have not enough realism left in the Senate or in the Congress to be able to run the world; and we might as well understand that now, I think.

Tragic as this war is—and it is tragic beyond description—it still will serve us and the other free people of the world well, in the future, if it has the effect of returning America to a sense of realism. The one thing most sadly lacking in this Nation, in dealing with international affairs, is a definite sense of reality.

Mr. President, as to the pending amendment, let me say that I have been identified with agricultural and vocational education ever since I first came to the Senate, 28 years ago. I have done my best for that cause.

The authorized appropriation for agricultural training and vocational training, which embraces the mechanical arts, as well as other subjects, is almost \$30,000,000; it is \$29,000,000 and a fractional amount which I do not now remember.

The appropriation has never reached the full amount of the authorization, first, because there were in the Government at an earlier time persons who wanted to run the educational institutions of this country, regardless of congressional judgment and congressional decision; second, the Second World War made teachers and instructors in vocational training and education in agriculture and the mechanical arts, and so forth, extremely scarce. Therefore, we were always compelled to accept a smaller appropriation than the full amount of the authorization.

Mr. President, the budget now has authorized the amount specified in this amendment. I have already voted to apply a 10-percent reduction to this appropriation, along with others. Under that 10-percent reduction provision the total and the increased amount requested in this appropriation, if the amendment is adopted by the Senate, of course will be subject to the 10-percent reduction.

Those interested in vocational education tell me—and they have repeatedly told me for a year—that they are prepared to go forward with their program, that they already have available instructors, and could use even the full amount authorized for this particular purpose. But this amendment does not offer to do that. It offers merely to bring the appropriation up to the

amount recommended by the budget. The total of it, as I have already said, will be subject to the 10 percent reduction provided in the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me add, Mr. President, if I may, that in World War II, because of this program, nearly 11,000,000 people who had had some training under one branch of it or other, found themselves in the service of the country.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am very anxious to have a vote. Really, I am not going to make a speech. I am not in favor of this amendment, and I hope it will be voted down. But I ask my fellow Senators to let us vote on it. I now resume my seat.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I certainly do not wish to keep the Senate here any longer than necessary. Since the question of the Spanish amendment has again been raised, I cannot allow some of the things which have been said in the last few moments to go unchallenged.

I do not question the right of the distinguished majority leader and the right of the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee to have such views on this subject as may seem proper to them. But I want to say again, as I have said heretofore, and I want to repeat it with all the force at my command, that I believe the Senate of the United States made a serious mistake in taking the action which it took on Tuesday in connection with the McCarran amendment.

The Senator from Georgia referred to the importance of being realistic. I fully agree with the distinguished Senator. But I say that we are not realistic when we break our ties, or threaten to break our ties, with tried and true allies, men with whom we fought, men who in concert with us have made great sacrifices. We are a part of the United Nations. We depend on the United Nations. I still believe that the United Nations is our greatest hope, and I have said so time and time again. I think the developments of the last few days have proved that. Yet we, by unilateral action, are virtually throwing away and repudiating action which has been taken by the United Nations in connection with Spain.

Furthermore, we are saying to our allies and friends who are in the ECA program abroad, "You have got to play along with Spain, even though you have time and time again publicly stated that you did not want to have any relationship with her." We are saying to our people that we disregard what has been done in our own defense by these democratic nations, and we are saying to the world that we are willing to support Fascist nations, nations which have disregarded and repudiated all their obligations to humanity. We are playing into the hands of Russia and the satellite states, giving them propaganda, machinery and weapons, which I fear will

be of great help to them and do great harm to us.

Mr. President, I tell you we cannot win this war, whether it be cold or hot, on the battlefields of Korea, alone. The field of battle is far wider than Korea. It is a battle for men's minds. It is a battle for men's faith in us and in democracy. I tell you, Mr. President, and I say it sadly, that I think we have risked losing the faith and the confidence of many of the freedom-loving countries of the world. So I say again that I believe the Senate of the United States has made a serious blunder.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think I can follow the philosophy of the Senator from New York correctly, and I largely agree with him. The only thing I am concerned about is that we should be consistent, that we should help those who help us, and that we should not help those who are not trying to further our purposes and ideas. I should like to ask the Senator how many American boys lost their lives on account of Spain? Will the Senator say that we lost one American boy on account of Spain?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have not the slightest idea as to how many men we have lost on account of Spain.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. That great nation, which helped us so much—

Mr. LEHMAN. Which great nation?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I mean a nation that is now a participant of ECA. How many American boys did we lose in north Africa how many did we lose in Sicily, how many did we lose in Anzio, on account of Italy?

Mr. LEHMAN. We lost a great many.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But we are helping Italy.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not defending Italy, but Italy is today a part of the defense line which this country has set up. If the Senator does not believe in the defense line that has been set up through ECA, why did he vote for an appropriation for ECA?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I want to add a word to what the Senator from Georgia and other distinguished Senators have said. I am only sorry I could not have voted to take the \$100,000,000, if necessary, from ECA, rather than to have to borrow the money from the Export-Import Bank. For years and years we have been trying to help the Spanish people—not the Spanish coal company. As chairman of the committee, I wrote Mr. Gaston of the Export-Import Bank a letter yesterday, about the Spanish matter, and I have been in conference with many of the Senators regarding it. The sooner we follow up our action, the better off we will be.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]

concluded his speech. When will the debate on amendments be finished so that debate will be unlimited?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not until after the bill is passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I invite the Presiding Officer's attention to the fact that there was no agreement to limit debate on the bill. The limitation applied only to amendments. When will the opportunity for unlimited debate arise? There was no quorum-call prior to the submission of the unanimous-consent agreement, and there was no final agreement. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The limitation of 5 minutes for each Senator applies only to amendments and not to the final passage of the bill.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], for himself and other Senators. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is it in order to ask for the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has already announced the result.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator make his motion in time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was not a record vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Chair know how the mover of the motion voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It makes no difference. That question does not apply, as the Chair understands, except upon a record vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, did I correctly understand that the Senator from Georgia suggested the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does not that take precedence?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I am perfectly willing to go on record on this vote.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I insist on a roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hoey	Millikin
Anderson	Holland	Morse
Bricker	Humphrey	Mundt
Bridges	Ives	Murray
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Chavez	Kem	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kerr	Pepper
Darby	Kilgore	Robertson
Donnell	Knowland	Russell
Douglas	Langer	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Leahy	Schoeppel
Eastland	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Ecton	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Lucas	Sparkman
Ferguson	McCarran	Stennis
Frear	McCarthy	Taft
Fulbright	McClellan	Thye
George	McFarland	Tydings
Graham	McKellar	Watkins
Gurney	McMahon	Wherry
Hayden	Magnuson	Wiley
Hendrickson	Malone	Williams
Hickenlooper	Martin	Young
Hill	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Montana and other Senators was adopted.

Mr. AIKEN and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we have the question stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to change my vote to "nay."

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Do I understand correctly that the amendment which was agreed to was the amendment with reference to vocational, agricultural, and mechanical training?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Then a motion was made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Then the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] made a motion to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Is that the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The motion is not debatable.

and the yea-and-nay vote is now in progress.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. In view of the fact that many Senators have entered the Chamber since the beginning of the vote, the Senator from Mississippi asks that the Chair state the parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has stated it on three different occasions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. STENNIS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it correct to say that if a Senator wishes to vote in favor of the amendment—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call is in progress. The Senator's inquiry is out of order.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. MORSE (when his name was called). Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is in doubt as to the parliamentary situation at the present time. Will the Chair state it so that the Senator from Oregon may vote in accordance with the explanation of the Chair?

Mr. LUCAS. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has stated the question on three separate occasions for the information of the Senate. On a similar request of another Senator the Chair has already ruled that the Chair feels he should not restate the question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Under the rules of the Senate does not a Member of the Senate have the right, prior to his answering on a roll-call vote, to make inquiry as to what the vote is being taken on? I have been called off the floor several times during this discussion and I am in doubt as to the exact wording of the issue we are voting upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to make such inquiry.

Mr. MORSE. That is what the Senator from Oregon has sought to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is confusing two rights. One is his own right to make inquiry, and the other is the right of the Presiding Officer to exercise some discretion in the matter of making reply. The Chair has already replied three times to the same question. He declines to reply further.

Mr. MORSE. I merely sought to find out what my rights were. I think the Chair is making a great mistake when he refuses to advise any Senator upon inquiry made in good faith what the issue before the Senate is.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be in order. Senators will resume their seats. The clerk will resume the calling of the roll.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I misunderstood the question. I wish to change my vote to "yea."

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to inform the Senator from Oregon what the vote is being taken on.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. MORSE. A point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that the point of order raised by the Senator from Oregon cannot be raised while the result is being tabulated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order raised by the Senator from Illinois is sustained. The point of order raised by the Senator from Oregon cannot be considered at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I claim my rights under rule XII, and ask to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Chair to rule XII, which reads as follows:

When the yeas and nays are ordered, the names of Senators shall be called alphabetically; and each Senator shall, without debate, declare his assent or dissent to the question, unless excused by the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I make the point of order that until the result of the roll call is announced by the Chair, debate is not in order.

Mr. MORSE. I make the point that I must make this point as to my rights before the result is announced, according to the provisions of rule XII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of the Senator from Tennessee is not well taken. The rule itself requires that any further discussion, when a Senator has declined to vote, shall precede the announcement of the result of the roll call. The Senator from Oregon will proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I continue to read the rule where I stopped reading:

And no Senator shall be permitted to vote after the decision shall have been announced by the Presiding Officer, but may for sufficient reasons, with unanimous consent, change or withdraw his vote. * * *

When a Senator declines to vote on call of his name, he shall be required to assign his reasons therefor, and having assigned them, the Presiding Officer shall submit the question to the Senate: "Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?" which shall be decided without debate; and these proceedings shall be had after the roll call and before the result is announced; and any further proceedings in reference thereto shall be after such announcement.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I regret very much that I did not understand

the Chair's ruling as to what we were voting on. The noise and confusion in the Senate at the time left several of us in doubt as to the Chair's ruling. I was not alone. The Senator from Vermont has already announced that he was confused. Several other Senators have told me they are in doubt. It is a complex parliamentary situation and should be explained by the Chair. When my name was called, I rose and asked, as I think I had a right to ask, for a statement by the Chair of the issue before the Senate. I thought I understood it but I wanted to make absolutely sure. If the Chair would tell me now, so that I would know for a certainty whether I was voting for or against the amendment if I vote for the pending motion I would then be prepared to vote. But I submit, Mr. President, that under rule XII a Senator, acting in good faith, ought to be allowed to have the parliamentary situation explained to him by the Chair before he is called upon to vote. That is the only request I have made of the Chair. I think I am entitled to a statement as to what the parliamentary situation here in the Senate is. I have declined so far to vote only because of my doubt as to the form of the motion. I think that if I desire to vote ultimately for the amendment, I should vote "yea" on this motion. I want to vote ultimately for the amendment, but I want the Chair to tell me whether or not in casting a "yea" vote on this motion I am casting a vote which will amount to supporting the amendment. I am not clear as to the wording of the motion that this vote is on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would decline to answer the question of the Senator. The Senator has declined to vote for the reasons stated to the Senate. Under the rule, the Chair is required to submit to the Senate the question: "Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?" That question is required to be decided without debate. Those who favor accepting the excuse of the Senator from Oregon for not voting will indicate it by saying "aye."

Mr. McCARRAN and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (putting the question). The "noes" appear to have it. The "noes" have it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for a division.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the question before the Senate at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call has been terminated, and the result will now be announced.

Mr. MORSE. A parliamentary inquiry, on the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Do I understand correctly that the vote of the majority of my colleagues in the Senate is that my reasons for declining to vote have been rejected?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands. The Chair has announced that a majority of Senators voted in the negative on the question

required by the rule to be submitted to the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I now ask for the right to vote. A colleague has just explained the parliamentary situation to me which I did not hear the Chair explain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has no right to vote at this time unless the Senate will, by unanimous consent, give him a right which he has forfeited.

Mr. MORSE. I appeal from that decision of the Chair. Rule XII requires that I vote and the Chair cannot deny that right to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that, the result not having been announced, the Senator's name can again be called, if he by this time has sufficient information upon which to cast his vote.

Mr. MORSE. On the basis of the hurried explanation I have just had from a colleague I am going to guess that a yea vote is for the amendment. However, I think I should have had an official ruling from the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's name will be called.

The name of Mr. MORSE was again called, and he voted in the affirmative.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—38

Alken	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Chapman	Kerr	Myers
Darby	Kilgore	Neely
Eastland	Langer	Pepper
Fulbright	Leahy	Russell
George	Lehman	Sparkman
Graham	McClellan	Stennis
Gurney	McFarland	Thye
Hill	Magnuson	Watkins
Hoey	Maybank	Wiley
Humphrey	Millikin	Young
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	

NAYS—39

Anderson	Hayden	Malone
Bricker	Hendrickson	Martin
Bridges	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Capehart	Holland	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Ives	Robertson
Cordon	Kem	Saltonstall
Donnell	Knowland	Schoeppel
Douglas	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Eaton	McCarran	Taft
Ellender	McCarthy	Tydings
Ferguson	McKellar	Wherry
Frear	McMahon	Williams

NOT VOTING—19

Benton	Gillette	Thomas, Okla.
Brewster	Green	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Hunt	Tobey
Cain	Jenner	Vandenberg
Connally	Kefauver	Withers
Downey	Long	
Flanders	Taylor	

So the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is upon the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and other Senators.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I understood the Chair to say that the motion before the Senate at this time is the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to reconsider the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana and other Senators was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that to be correct, and is advised by the Parliamentarian that the 5-minute rule applies.

Mr. STENNIS. The question is debatable, is it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is debatable.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this amendment pertains to vocational, agricultural, and mechanical training. The popular name of the organization it would affect is "Future Farmers of America" and "Future Homemakers of America." This program has been in progress for more than 25 years, and its accomplishments, particularly with reference to rural youth, have been phenomenal.

Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. I expect to be brief, but there are some Senators now in the Chamber who were not here when the matter was discussed before.

The amendment raises the appropriation only \$3,457,240, which brings the appropriation up to the budget level. We have already adopted the amendment on a division vote, and we have adopted this afternoon an amendment which will subject the appropriation carried in this amendment, along with the other funds for this purpose, presumably, to a 10-percent cut.

Members of the Senate, I am speaking only partly from personal knowledge, but I can assure the Senate that this is a very finely handled and very effective program. What it has done for the

economic development of the rural youth of our country has been outstanding. It and 4-H Club work, represent one of the main factors in the last quarter of a century in improving economic life in the rural areas. There can be no question about that. I have seen young boys and girls who have received this training, who are content to continue living on the same land on which they have heretofore lived, or in the same community. It represents a bulwark of strength for rural communities.

One of the great trends in America is the trend away from the rural areas to the cities. I think we all realize that to be an unhealthy trend. I find that in the Southern States where this work is carried on in the Negro schools and advancement and development are remarkable. The program trains the boys and girls in the mechanical arts. It trains them in homemaking. It trains them in tilling the soil. It is outstanding training.

Mr. President, I say that if the amendment is not adopted it will be necessary to curtail a very sound, progressive program which has been moving along under the George-Barden Act for several years. In view of the military program ahead of us, the mechanical training given under this program is almost indispensable. It is popular now to say that this or that ties in with the war effort. But the mechanical side of the training does tie in particularly with war training.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator please explain the connection of the program with the Future Farmers of America?

Mr. STENNIS. This is the agricultural side of the training program of the Future Farmers of America. There is also training in the mechanical arts. I am not so familiar with that as I am with the agricultural training. But it is very definitely a part of their training. Most of the money, as I understand, will be used for employing additional teachers in additional schools which do not now have the benefit of this training.

I have before me a statement from the director of this work in Mississippi. He says a total of 42 schools in Mississippi are applying for this training. The State puts up half the money. The other half comes from the funds in question. Of the 42 schools 16 are for whites and 26 schools are for colored children. Those schools are now applying for this work in my home State. Many of the schools throughout the United States are applying for the work. The program has been slowly but gradually extended from one school to another, and progressively it has covered the Nation. A portion of the relatively small appropriation asked for by this amendment is used for this purpose.

Mr. LANCER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. What States are affected by the program?

Mr. STENNIS. It can apply to all States. I assume it does. I think it applies to all States. I have listed here Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, West Virginia, Colorado, Florida, Kentucky, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Washington. My time is running out, but I see from the document I have before me that these expanded programs are listed for these States. I am sure the program applies to the Senator's State, to entire areas of the South, and throughout New England, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that the amendment as drawn carries out the Budget recommendation of \$23,435,000, which is an increase of \$3,458,240 over the amount reported by the committee. We must bear in mind, however, that when we make the 10 percent reduction provided by the amendment adopted today the increase will be only \$1,113,740.

As I have looked into the way the program has operated in a great many of the States I am thoroughly convinced that the amount proposed under the amendment will be money well spent. It will be found that the program has resulted in increasing the earning ability of those who have taken this vocational training by probably twice as much as they were able to earn in the past. Many of those whose earning capacity has increased, and will be increased by taking the training, are colored people in the South who have not been able to take advantage of vocational education in the past. Thus the amendment will help in building up our American economy. I believe the amount of \$1,113,740, which is the increase over the amount reported by the committee, after deducting 10 percent, will be repaid in the greater earning capacity of those who take the training.

I am thoroughly convinced that the amendment should be adopted, in order to give boys and girls throughout the Nation an opportunity to take advantage of this particular program. The program does not apply only to the South or to South Carolina. It applies to most of the agricultural States. It is of great benefit in the States where the training is being provided.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that these vocational training facilities are the facilities that we use today for the vocational training of our GI's under our GI educational program?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. GI's will be found taking the training in every county in my State. I think that will be found to be true in most of the States of the Union at the present time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from South Carolina made the statement that already a 10-percent cut is provided for this program. I should like the Senator to know that the money provided for this vocational training is a grant, and is therefore exempted from the 10-percent cut.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I did not know that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, I should like to say that I would be willing to recommend to the minority side of the aisle—and I have discussed it with the chairman of the subcommittee—that we take the sum of \$21,000,000 to conference, which is an increase over the amount of the bill of \$1,022,240, in the interest of moving on with the bill, in which our national defense and everything else is tied up. It would seem to me that that would be a reasonable compromise of the situation, and one which will facilitate the final passage of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will answer the Senator from California by saying that I believe every dollar that is asked for under the amendment is necessary in order to carry on a proper program throughout the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wish to ask a question. Is it agreed that this amount would not be subject to a further reduction of 10 percent under the Byrd-Bridges amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; grants made to States such as those for vocational aid are not subject to the 10-percent cut.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read from the bill: (k) Amounts provided for payments to States or political subdivisions thereof.

Mr. President, I believe I am as much in favor of the program under discussion as is any other Senator, but I am opposed to adopting an amendment which comes before us at the last moment. It was not presented to the committee. The committee has been in session since the 25th of January. No Senator came before us with this amendment. Not a word was said about it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is infringing upon the limited time of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My time is about up. In order to conserve time, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement bearing on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Caro-

lina was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is with a view toward the education of young Americans that I cosponsor an amendment to increase the appropriation for vocational education.

The Vocational Education Act of 1946 has proven itself a fine program and has been of great benefit to the Nation. The vocational education program in the State of South Carolina has been of great importance in the furthering of educational advantages and it is of prime importance to the welfare of this Nation that my children and your children have access to the very best educational standards and well trained teachers.

The money spent on this program has never been regretted for it has already returned every penny in the form of a better educated America.

This amendment increases the appropriation for this program approximately \$3,500,000 and I cannot think of a better way to spend this money than to improve the educational facilities in our schools. The last analysis of this program showed that the great majority of these funds goes for teachers salaries, and in my State like most other States, the teachers are grossly underpaid for their valuable services.

If it were not for this program, agriculture programs in rural schools would hardly be possible and nothing is more important to a rural school than its agriculture program. This money is used to pay the teachers and in the past there was no money available.

Also, many veterans are attending public schools and are taking advantages of this program.

I urge the Members of this body to increase this appropriation to be sent into the public and especially rural schools of America. The teachers are there and are presently receiving very poor salaries and it is up to the people of this Nation to see that the teachers of our schools are paid a decent salary. Many of them are already leaving the teaching field for better jobs and if they continue to leave, what is to become of our schools?

We can keep these good teachers by paying them a livable salary and they will receive a better salary under the vocational educational program.

It is our duty to enact this legislation with the proposed amendment which will provide better educational opportunities for the American school children, and especially those children living in the rural school districts.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I beg and plead with Senators that they vote for the amendment. We need the money provided by it. We need it badly in order to continue the teaching in connection with vocational training. It is necessary to retain the teachers. We cannot do so unless we pay them, and we cannot pay them in many instances, unless we receive the additional amount provided for by the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from California what figure he used a moment ago? Was it \$21,000,000?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield. By the way, I am perfectly agreeable to the Senator's proposal. I will say, however, that I believe the committee was treated badly because Senators favoring the proposal did not appear before the committee. There is no reason why they could not have appeared before the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the reasons I have stated, that is, in order to expedite passage of this large bill which contains many items of importance to the country, I am willing to recommend that we take the sum of \$21,000,000 to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Having done that, I hope we can stop talking now, and can vote on this bill. This is the fifth week the bill has been before the Senate, and I certainly hope we can vote on the bill now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana modify his amendment?

Mr. MURRAY. No, Mr. President. I think the amount proposed to be appropriated by the amendment is absolutely necessary if this program is to be carried out. The program applies not only to farm boys but also to the training of men in the industries where, in the war effort, it will be necessary to have additional trained men.

Mr. McKELLAR. The appropriation for fiscal year 1950 was exactly the same as the amount recommended by the committee for fiscal year 1951.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, is it in order for me to speak at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair addressed an inquiry to the Senator from Montana, and he has replied to it.

If the Senator from Montana wishes to speak now, he is entitled to proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as I have said, this amendment applies not only to the training of farm boys, but also to the training of men who are engaged in the trades and the industries.

Just before the Second World War began, this program was of tremendous service to the United States. Without it, we could not have had available sufficient trained workers for the war industries of the United States.

So it seems to me that it would be a great mistake to reduce this amount, which is the amount allowed by the Budget, and no more; and of course this amount is subject to a 10 percent reduction, under the provisions of the Byrd-Bridges amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is not true that, in this connection, men are also being trained for radio and radar work, for the making of repairs to tractors and automobiles, as carpenters, and in other trades? In short, is not the program providing the trained, skilled workers we need so badly in the United States at this particular time?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct; and already some of the industries in the United States have gone on a 24-hour production basis, and have requested assistance from vocational schools, in connection with the training of workers who are needed in those industries.

It seems to me that the Senate would be acting very unwisely at this time, when we are just preparing to engage in a program of rearmament, to reduce the amount of this appropriation and to make it insufficient for the carrying out of an effective program.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that there are approximately 24,000 public secondary schools throughout the 48 States, but that today this program is being carried on in only approximately 8,000 of those schools—in other words, in only one-third of them?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. That is absolutely true.

Mr. HILL. What the Senator from Montana seeks by the amendment is to make it possible to extend this program into some of the other schools, which so much need the program. Is not that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator from Montana recall that the dispatches coming back to us from Korea have emphasized the fact that so many of our men over there have not had sufficient schooling, have not had the very training which today we are seeking to provide by means of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator has stated the situation absolutely correctly.

Mr. President, it has been stated that we did not appear before the committee in connection with this matter. However, the amendment was proposed by me because we began to receive telegrams from all over the country urging the necessity of this program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana. My amendment to his amendment would strike out the figure "\$23,435,000," appearing in line 2 of the amendment, and would substitute in lieu thereof the figure "\$21,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from California that the pending question is the motion to reconsider. Therefore, it is not now in order to propose such an amendment, other than by unanimous consent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. MURRAY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the motion to reconsider. I do not believe the Federal Government spends any money for which it receives a larger return, and I believe that it spends little money for which it receives as much return, as it receives for the money it spends for assistance and encouragement to vocational and agricultural training.

Let me remind the Senate that this program pertains not only to the Future

Farmers of America, but also to the 4-H Club boys and girls of the Nation.

I also remind the Senate that millions of our young people and others who need the benefit of this program are now participating in it.

In Oklahoma there are approximately 75,000 young people engaged in this program at all times; and I believe that in every other State of the Union proportionate numbers of young people are engaged in the program.

For 4 years I was a member of the board of pardon and parole of the State of Oklahoma, and for 4 years I was Governor of Oklahoma. During that period of 8 years, there was never an application for clemency coming to me in either capacity from a man or a woman in a penal institution who, when he or she was young, had had the advantage of this training.

I believe that this program costs the Federal Government less than \$10 a year for each young person who participates in it.

The amount here requested will permit the program to be offered to more and more of the young people of the Nation.

There never was a time when such a program was needed more, both in regard to training the youth of the country, giving them an opportunity for better economic advantages and to advance themselves, and giving them an opportunity to produce the food, feed, and fiber needed by the United States. Certainly it would be penny wise and pound foolish for us to reconsider the action by which we already have agreed to the amendment increasing the amount for these valid programs.

I cannot imagine that Senators now would vote to reconsider the action whereby we already have approved the amendment which will make reasonably adequate provision for expanding this amazingly wonderful, beneficial, educational program for American youth.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the very pointed and direct remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and of the other Senators who have expressed themselves in behalf of the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

I am very familiar with the vocational-education program, for at one time it was my privilege to direct a program of some substantial size in this field in the State of Minnesota.

My friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], spoke eloquently and to the point when he addressed himself to the agricultural aspects of this program; and I should like to say that not only do we enjoy the benefits of agricultural education, as outlined in the George-Barden Act, to which the amendment applies, but we also have, as a result, a splendid program of vocational training, dealing with the mechanical and industrial arts. Certainly this program has paid terrific dividends.

One other point that needs to be emphasized is that the States are working on a system of matching funds with the Federal funds, and year after year States

have increased the amount of their funds in proportion to the amount of the Federal grant. In other words, the States have been doing their job—plus. In the coming fiscal year the States are prepared to move ahead on a broader program of vocational education and are asking of the Federal Government to hold the appropriation to a moderate degree, not to the full amount. A matching of funds has already been established as a basis of operations on the part of State legislatures. In other words, many State legislatures look forward to the Congress appropriating funds that will match the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget. Now if we should go below that, we would literally be letting down the States that have projected programs throughout their respective local school districts and areas.

As has been said, this program has value in terms of youth, in terms of occupation, in terms of rehabilitation. It surely has value in terms of economic productivity. There can be no doubt that the value of vocational education can be measured in dollars. It is productive in the dollar sense, but, more than that, as the Senator from Montana has pointed out, it is needed in the defense effort. Only recently General Hershey, of the Selective Service, said that the need of the Army now is for artisans, craftsmen, skilled mechanics, and semiskilled mechanics. One cannot even die for his country unless he knows something about vocational education. They want him to be equipped mentally and occupationally to be a semiskilled or skilled person; and this program will do more to equip the American armies and to equip American industry and to equip American agriculture to perform their jobs than possibly any other single educational program that can be mentioned.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think it is inconceivable that for the sake of \$3,000,000 we should turn back a major defense project—which is exactly what this amounts to. If we are to produce shells, if we are to produce munitions and tanks, we had better have skilled craftsmen to do it. At least the young men who are going to use these munitions and tanks have to be trained in terms of their mechanical abilities, as has been asserted by the heads of the Selective Service at the present time.

So I appeal to the Senate, since there can be no doubt as to what the issue is, and since no one can be in doubt as to what the program before us is, that we sustain the vote that was taken on a division, reject the motion to reconsider and go ahead and act on this amendment, not only as part of an educational program, but as a fundamental, basic part of the American national defense, at home and abroad.

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to call the Senate's attention to the fact that in 1947 the amount allotted under this provision was \$14,200,000. If the

motion of the Senator from Tennessee carries, and the matter is reconsidered, I have already announced that I shall offer an amendment increasing the amount to \$21,000,000. If the amendment is adopted, it will mean that there will be a 50-percent increase in this work in the period since 1947.

Furthermore, this is a matter of matching funds. There is nothing in the way that will prevent the States, who recognize the importance of this work, from increasing their contributions toward it; and I submit that most of the States of the Union are far more solvent than the Federal Government is today.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the budget estimate be made the amendment, that it be adopted and that it go to conference, and that those who are interested in it come before the conferees. First, we shall have to agree to the motion. But it is very late. I am very tired, and I know all Senators are very tired. I therefore suggest as a sort of compromise arrangement that we let the full amount of the budget estimate go to the conference committee, where it must go, anyway.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think it is well that we know just what the House had in mind in relation to this particular amendment. This is a grant-in-aid. There is no question that under the Bridges-Byrd amendment it is exempt, and therefore the 10 percent does not apply. I read from the House report:

Grants-in-aid: The committee has disallowed the budget increase of \$3,457,240 sought to be added to the \$19,842,760 available in 1950 for vocational education grants under the George-Barden Act. A fundamental purpose of these grants is not only to provide direct assistance to the States and communities but also to stimulate State and local expenditures for these purposes. State and local expenditures have been increasing progressively in the last few years without any corresponding increase on the Federal side. In 1948, \$2.96 of State and local funds were expended for each Federal dollar for this purpose, and in 1949 that ratio jumped to \$3.52 for each Federal dollar. In terms of totals, approximately \$93,000,000 was expended from State and local sources in 1949 as against \$77,500,000 in 1948 and \$62,160,000 in 1947. These statistics demonstrate that the Federal grants are serving admirably the stimulating purpose which they were set up to do.

Mr. President, I think we should have that in mind. We should have in mind that this was a matter rather of stimulating the States into action on this program. They have gone into the program. We have been supplying the money. The States are better off today than the Federal Government is, and when the 10 percent does not apply, the offer of \$21,000,000 would be certainly a sufficient sum under the circumstances.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator not know that the programs under this pro-

vision are projected and mapped out, in view of the very funds that we appropriate? Will the Senator let me read him a quotation from the Department with reference to this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Tennessee, that the Budget figure be taken to conference, is it not true that if the Senator will withdraw his motion to reconsider, it will achieve that purpose, and that we can then go forward?

Mr. McKELLAR. With the understanding that the unanimous-consent request would be agreed to, I should be willing to do that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I say if the Senator withdraws his motion, would it not achieve that purpose?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will withdraw my motion, if I may. I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw it, because there are Senators present at this time who have stood very steadily by this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is very important that this bill become a law. I very earnestly ask Senators on both sides to let the bill pass and not to carry it over further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is unanimous consent given to the request of the Senator from Tennessee that he be allowed to withdraw his motion?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am sorry, but I shall have to object.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is unanimous consent necessary for the withdrawal of a motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is advised that such is the case. Leave of the Senate is required.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the consent of the Senate required to withdraw one's own motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is necessary, in order to withdraw a motion to reconsider. The Chair reads to the Senate Rule XXI:

2. Any motion or resolution may be withdrawn or modified by the mover at any time before a decision, amendment, or ordering of the yeas and nays, except a motion to reconsider, which shall not be withdrawn without leave.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Montana and other Senators was adopted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not wish to speak at length. I merely wish first to ask the Senate not to reconsider this amendment, and to associate myself with the remarks that have been made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, and other Senators. The experience of my own State

has been identical to that which has been described. The hour is too late for me to reiterate the statements which have already been made.

There is just one other thought I should like to suggest to Senators who are opposing this particular amendment, in addition to those that I believe have already been made. That is the great importance of this program to the education of the colored people of the country. I have previously observed that there are some persons who are very much interested in their improvement in certain other ways, such as industrial employment, but they overlook sometimes the great importance of education to the colored people. I think some of the opponents of this amendment ought to consider it from that angle. It is probably the most important single program we can find for the improvement of the lot of the colored youth as well as of the white youth. I know that is true in my State, and I think it is true in all Southern States.

I hope Senators will make an exception in the case of this amendment and will adopt it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate adopted the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and other Senators.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Arkansas would be willing, in keeping with his fine statement, to incorporate in his motion the FEPC bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I would say to the Senator that I would not. I think that is a completely erroneous approach to the whole problem. I am unable to understand how those persons who seem to be so interested in forcing a system of employment on the Nation have no interest whatever in trying to raise the level of education and the standards of health of the colored people.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is not the opportunity for employment equal to the opportunity for education?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This program involves none of the elements involved in the program of FEPC. There are distasteful and wholly unworkable elements in that program.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would it be possible at this time to incorporate the FEPC bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the unanimous-consent agreement requires that no amendment which is not germane shall be in order. Therefore the Senator's proposed amendment would not be in order at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. I realize that the Senator who is now presiding would, of course, be inclined to rule in that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is sorry to have to say to the Senator from Nevada that the Senator who is now presiding tries to pass upon questions on the basis of the rules, and he is

advised by the Parliamentarian as he has stated and as he has ruled.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now move that the FEPC bill be incorporated in the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator is out of order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thought we could finish this bill tonight, and I so stated to the distinguished minority leader about 2 hours ago. I thought we could then take a recess until Monday. My distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, seems very tired, and I think, in deference to the Senator from Tennessee—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am not so tired as I am lame; especially so, after all the attacks which have been made upon the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Our of consideration for the distinguished Senator who has been extremely faithful in staying almost daily at his post for the past 4 weeks in connection with this bill, and since it is now almost 9 o'clock, I should like to ask the Senate to take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Many Senators took the Senator from Illinois at his word, that we would finish the bill tonight. Many Senators canceled engagements in order to remain here with the understanding that the bill would be finished in the next hour.

Mr. LUCAS. It is now 9 o'clock, and we have been here since 11 a. m. I make my suggestion only out of deference to the Senator from Tennessee, who is really very tired. I think we should do that for the distinguished Senator, who has been in the Senate longer than has any other living man. He has been a faithful soldier here. We may be here for two more hours. I think if we should take a recess until tomorrow, to meet at 12 o'clock, we can finish the bill in a couple of hours.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished majority leader for yielding. I contacted the members of the minority and they agreed to remain here tonight to finish this bill. I was sure that it would be possible, by remaining here tonight, to recess until Monday. I went around and contacted practically all the Members on this side of the aisle, and they agreed to remain. Out of respect for the distinguished Senator from Tennessee I want to cooperate. But I believe we could go right on and vote and get through with the bill within an hour. I actually think so, and I should like to do that if the majority leader will permit it. But I am not going to hold out against the wishes of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee or the wishes of the majority members of that committee if they would like to take a recess until tomorrow.

I think we might agree to limit debate to 5 minutes on each amendment. If we cannot do it tonight, I think we should try to limit ourselves tomorrow. If we

can do it tonight, I should be glad if the majority leader would agree to a limitation of 5 minutes on each amendment—not for each Senator—and vote the amendments up or down and vote the bill up or down and finish it tonight. I think we can do that. I appeal to the majority leader to try it, and then if it cannot be done, we can recess until tomorrow.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator withhold his request until the Senate votes on the pending motion?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to suggest that 5 minutes, a long time ago, would have sufficed, but the distinguished Senator from West Virginia was cut off and could not speak and other Senators could not speak. I do not think that 5 minutes on each amendment is sufficient. We have been waiting for the period to arrive when we shall have unlimited debate. I want only 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. I think I understand the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I want to cooperate in every way. I have a great deal of respect and consideration for the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, but I should like to have the Senator modify the unanimous-consent agreement under which we are operating to limit debate to 5 minutes on each amendment. If that cannot be done, I think the only thing to do is to take a recess.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I understood from what the Senator from New Mexico said a moment ago that probably there would be an objection made to that course. If we can vote on the motion now, I shall make that kind of a request.

Mr. MURRAY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Chair please state what we are about to vote on, so that every Senator will know?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has moved that the Senate reconsider the vote by which it adopted the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for himself and other Senators. The question now is on agreeing to that motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island

[Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—24

Bricker	Frear	Martin
Bridges	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Kem	Saltonstall
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Eaton	Lucas	Taft
Ellender	McKellar	Wherry
Ferguson	McMahon	Williams

NAYS—53

Aiken	Humphrey	Morse
Anderson	Ives	Mundt
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Darby	Kerr	O'Connor
Donnell	Kilgore	Pepper
Dworshak	Langer	Russell
Eastland	Leahy	Schoeppel
Fulbright	Lehman	Sparkman
George	McCarran	Stennis
Graham	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	McClellan	Thye
Hayden	McFarland	Tydings
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Watkins
Hill	Malone	Wiley
Hoey	Maybank	Young
Holland	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—19

Benton	Gillette	Taylor
Brewster	Green	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Hunt	Tobey
Cain	Jenner	Vandenberg
Connally	Kefauver	Withers
Downey	Long	
Flanders	Robertson	

So Mr. McKELLAR's motion to reconsider was rejected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall make one further request. If the request is not granted I shall make a motion to recess. It seems to me that we have debated the principal amendments and the bill itself a sufficient length of time to be able to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement which would limit debate on any amendment to 5 minutes, as well as on the bill itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify the present unanimous-consent agreement by providing that all amendments which have not been heretofore disposed of shall be debated only for 5 minutes on each side, that is, 5 minutes for the proponents and 5 minutes for the opponents, to include also the bill itself, and that the other usual orders which are entered into, such as

germaneness of amendments, motions, and so forth, shall be included in the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it intended to include motions?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; motions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator intend the agreement to be operative after convening tomorrow?

Mr. LUCAS. No; from now on. I mean from this moment on. I believe we should try to finish consideration of the measure this evening. If we can enter into the kind of unanimous-consent agreement which has been suggested I believe we can finish consideration of the measure this evening within perhaps an hour.

Mr. WHERRY. Less than that.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps less than that. If it is not possible to enter into such a unanimous-consent agreement, I propose to make a motion to recess.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think we should dispose of the bill tonight. I think we can dispose of the bill in a very short period of time. I think we can dispose of it without any unanimous-consent agreement which prohibits any Member of the Senate for a reasonable length of time to express his point of view on any one amendment he may wish to discuss. I realize that after we have had a hard day such as this and tension has developed within the Senate, there is a great tendency of course to put the pressure on for a quick vote, and overlook sometimes the right of individual Members of the Senate who in good faith may wish to present an argument for or against an amendment, and I believe we must constantly be on guard in protecting the rights of individual Members of this body to have adequate time for debate on an amendment. I submit, if a Member of this body wishes to present an amendment and discuss it or oppose an amendment, that 5 minutes simply is not adequate time within which to discuss it. We may as well have no debate at all. Therefore, again risking misunderstanding as to his motives, the junior Senator from Oregon shall stand guard on what he thinks is a very important right in the Senate, namely, the right to reasonable debate on the floor of the Senate, and he objects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. TAFT. I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. I thought I had the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio—

Mr. TAFT. I have two rather noncontroversial amendments.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator think they are noncontroversial?

Mr. TAFT. I hope they are. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. I have not seen any amendments which are very noncontroversial, and I think perhaps we ought to take a recess. But if the Senator desires to try out one of these noncontroversial amendments, I am willing.

Mr. TAFT. There will be no trouble about one of them, anyway. I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield the floor?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio proposes an amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 338, line 4, it is proposed to strike out the colon and insert in lieu thereof a period, and, beginning with the word "Provided" in line 4, to strike out down to and including line 22, on page 341, as follows:

That no part of this appropriation for education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, shall be expended for tuition, fees, or other charges, or for subsistence allowance, for any course elected or commenced by a veteran on or subsequent to July 1, 1948, and which is determined by the Administrator to be avocational or recreational in character. For the purposes of this proviso, education or training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly or related aviation courses in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation shall not, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, be considered avocational or recreational when a certificate in the form of an affidavit supported by corroborating affidavits by two competent disinterested persons, has been furnished by a physically qualified veteran stating that such education or training will be useful to him in connection with earning a livelihood: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation for education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, shall be expended subsequent to the effective date of this chapter for subsistence allowance or for tuition, fees, or other charges in any of the following situations:

(1) For any veteran for a course in an institution which has been in operation for a period of less than 1 year immediately prior to the date of enrollment in such course unless such enrollment was prior to August 24, 1949;

(2) For any course of education or training for which the educational or training institution involved has no customary cost of tuition, until a fair and reasonable rate of payment for tuition, fees, or other charges for such course has been determined. In any case in which one or more contracts providing a rate or rates of tuition have been executed for two successive years, the rate established by the most recent contract shall be considered to be the customary cost of tuition notwithstanding the definition of "customary cost of tuition" as hereinafter set forth. If the Administrator finds that any institution has no customary cost of tuition, he shall forthwith fix and pay or cause to be paid a fair and reasonable rate of payment for tuition, fees, and other charges for the courses offered by such institution. Any educational or training institution which is dissatisfied with a determination of a rate of payment for tuition, fees, or other charges under the foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall be entitled, upon application therefor, to a review of such determination (including the determination with respect to whether there is a customary cost of tuition) by a board to be known as the Veterans' Tuition Appeals Board, consisting of three members, appointed by the Administrator for such purpose. Such board shall be subject, in respect to appointment, hearings, appeals, and all other actions and qualifications, to the provisions of sections 5 to 11, inclusive, of the Administrative Procedure Act, approved June 11, 1946, as amended. The de-

cision of such board with respect to all matters shall constitute the final administrative determination. In no event shall the board fix a rate of payment in excess of the maximum amount allowable under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended. The term "customary cost of tuition" as employed herein and in paragraph 5, part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is regarded as that charge which an educational or training institution requires a nonveteran enrollee similarly circumstanced to pay as and for tuition for a course, except that the institution (other than a non-profit institution of higher learning) is not regarded as having a "customary cost of tuition" for the course or courses in question in the following circumstances:

(a) Where the majority of the enrollment of the educational and training institution in the course in question consists of veterans in training under Public Laws 16 and 34, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended; and

(b) One of the following conditions prevails:

1. The institution has been established subsequent to June 22, 1944.

2. The institution, although established prior to June 22, 1944, has not been in continuous operation since that date.

3. The institution, although established prior to June 22, 1944, has subsequently increased its total tuition charges for the course to all students more than 25 percent.

4. The course (or a course of substantially the same length and character) was not provided for nonveteran students by the institution prior to June 22, 1944, although the institution itself was established before June 22, 1944: *Provided further*, That nothing in the foregoing proviso shall be construed to affect adversely any legal rights which have accrued prior to the date of enactment of this chapter, or to affect payments to educational or training institutions under contracts in effect on such date.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this amendment at least saves some money by striking out four pages of printing in the bill.

Last year we dealt with the problem of vocational schools by amending an appropriation bill in a purely legislative way. I did not think that was the proper way to legislate. That amendment was carried over into this year's bill, but since that time the whole subject has been dealt with by legislation in a bill approved by the President on July 13 this year. So that it seems to me obvious that this language should now be eliminated from the appropriation bill. The wording is a little different from that of the legislation enacted, and we will only create confusion if we leave this language in the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio is quite correct in his statement. The language he proposes to strike out was written into the independent offices appropriation bill last year while that measure was being considered on the floor of the Senate. It deals with the fees and regulations of veterans' training and education.

Since the provision was written into the independent offices bill last year the Senate has considered an amendment of the entire act, and my understanding therefore is that the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is merely to strike out the language of last year's appropriation bill, which in effect was legislation, and therefore brings into operation a law which has just been en-

acted at this session. That being the case, I certainly hope that there will be no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk and ask to have it reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 367, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

Flood control, Roseville, Ohio: For the construction of local flood protection works at Roseville, Ohio, heretofore authorized by law (Public Law 761, 75th Cong., as amended and supplemented), \$540,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on June 30 I wrote the following letter to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

MY DEAR SENATOR McKELLAR: On June 16-17 of this year a disastrous flood inundated the town of Roseville, Ohio, inflicting extensive damage, as evidenced by the attached photographs.

I have the photographs here, which show the entire town under water, the town being damaged to the extent of several million dollars, altogether. The letter continues:

A flood defense project has been authorized at Roseville, since the Flood Control Act of 1938 (Public Law 761, 75th Cong.), but only preliminary planning has been embarked on.

I therefore request since the Army Civil Functions Subcommittee has already completed hearings and marked up that section of the 1951 general appropriation bill that the attached amendment to the bill be considered by the full committee before final action is taken on the bill.

The full committee felt that they should not take any new action which had not been considered by the subcommittee, and it was suggested that I submit the amendment on the floor of the Senate.

The damage was about three or four times the entire cost of the project, if the project had been started and completed. I think there is no question that if the matter had come before the committee, the amendment would have been included in the bill. It is in the nature of an emergency provision, and I think it is reasonable, and I ask the Senator from Tennessee if he will not take the amendment to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio spoke to me about the matter before. I have looked into it, and I am sure the situation in Roseville is bad, and should be dealt with at once. So far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I call up an amendment on page 472, line 4, which I hope will not be controversial. It is important, however.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 472, line 4, after the word "apply", it is proposed to insert the words "to appropriations for the transportation of mail or."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to make it possible for the mail to be carried, and for whatever contracts are necessary to have the mail carried to be entered into. No one can tell what the mail situation is going to be. No one knows.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, did the Senator say the amendment comes on page 472, line 4?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. The language there reads, "The provisions of this section shall not apply to any corporation" and so forth. Will the Senator please tell where his amendment goes in?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It follows after the word "apply", to insert the words "to appropriations for the transportation of mail or."

As I have said, no one can tell how much mail there will be. No one can tell in advance, no one can prophesy, what it will amount to. The acting chairman of the CAB has written me and insisted and urged that this amendment be agreed to. I ask the chairman of the committee if it can be taken to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was the amendment submitted to the committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It was not submitted to the committee. It is a matter which came up after the bill reached the floor of the Senate. The necessity for the amendment was not noticed until the bill came out on the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that the subcommittee did not receive the information which the Senator from Colorado now presents, because the bill had been written up, and we were dealing with an over-all appropriation bill, rather than separate bills, which has been the customary way of making appropriations heretofore. I told the Senator from Colorado that if the amendment did not meet with opposition from the chairman of the committee, I would carry the amendment to conference, as the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to have the amendment taken to conference because it might save a great deal of trouble. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does this amendment mean that all appropriations for carrying the mails would be exempted from the antideficiency provision?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I presume that is what it would mean. That would be the effect of the amendment, I suppose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That would mean that all the Post Office Department would be eliminated from the antideficiency provision.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, no; it does not mean that at all. It applies only to the transportation of mail. It is limited to the transportation of mail.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, what is the cost of the transportation of the mail?

Mr. MAYBANK. Four hundred million dollars.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think this amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the amendment cover delivery of mail?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It covers transportation of mail, contracts for the carriage of mail.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would not apply to the mail deliveries from door to door, would it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; it has nothing to do with that. It applies to the transportation of mail.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, do I understand that railroad transportation, air-mail transportation, ocean transportation is included?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; ocean, air, and all kinds of transportation of mail.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the only reason it cannot be separated in this amendment so as to make it apply only to air mail is because the present bill lumps the transportation of mail in one item for which I think \$400,000,000 is provided. The amendment is meant to apply only to contracts for carrying air mail.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to make a statement. The \$400,000,000 is divided principally into railroad and messenger service, \$227,000,000; amounts due, \$29,000,000; foreign air mail service, \$60,000,000; domestic air mail service, \$68,000,000. I wish the Senator from North Dakota to know, because he is the ranking minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, that there are going to be deficiencies. The matter might be carried to conference and worked out there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr.

LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 3979. A bill to fix the responsibilities of the Disbursing Officer and of the Auditor of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2238).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 883. A bill to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2241).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1140. A bill to authorize credits to certain public agencies of the United States for costs of construction and operation and maintenance of flood protective levee systems along or adjacent to the lower Colorado River in Arizona, California, and Lower California, Mexico; with amendments (Rept. No. 2240).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 10. A bill to facilitate the deportation of aliens from the United States, to provide for the supervision and detention pending eventual deportation of aliens whose deportation cannot be readily effectuated because of reasons beyond the control of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2239).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 9074. A bill to amend chapter 61 (relating to lotteries) of title 18, United States Code, to make clear that such chapter does not apply to nonprofit contests wherein prizes are awarded for the specie, size, weight, or quality of fish caught by the contestant; without amendment (Rept. No. 2242).

By Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 3889. A bill to increase permanently the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 2243).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 3, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 4. An act authorizing the advanced training in aeronautics of technical personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; S. 2655. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn M. Hryniak;

S. 3380. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1939, to redefine the term "contraband article" with respect to narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; and

S. 3520. An act to strengthen the common defense by providing for continuation and expansion of Western Hemisphere production of abaca by the United States.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 4008. A bill for the relief of Paura Fumie Suzuki and her minor son, Raymond Takashi Swenson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah also introduced Senate bill 4009, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to promote the development and adoption of plans and programs for the improvement of the skills of the Nation's work force, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and

Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 4010. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker, of El Paso, Tex., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the operation and use by the United States Army of certain lands in Dona Ana County, N. Mex., as an antiaircraft artillery practice firing range; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 4011. A bill for the relief of Capt. Merton Jesse Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 4012. A bill for the relief of Walter R. Cupp, Captain, United States Army, E. O. retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 4013. A bill for the relief of Emiko Mori; and

S. 4014. A bill conferring authority on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to regulate admission to the bar of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IMPROVEMENT OF SKILLS OF NATION'S WORK FORCE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to promote the development and adoption of plans and programs for the improvement of the skills of the Nation's work force, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Utah will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4009) to authorize the Secretary of Labor to promote the development and adoption of plans and programs for the improvement of the skills of the Nation's work force, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. THOMAS of Utah is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

Mr. President, as we all know, this Nation is embarked on a program to build up its economic and military strength to the point where it can effectively cooperate with the United Nations in its efforts to perform its clear responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security and to resist aggression which threatens that international peace and security. One of the most important aspects of this responsibility must be the development of a program for the effective mobilization of the manpower of this Nation. The executive branch of the Government is devoting much time and thought to the development of this effort and to the working out of sound procedures to carry it out.

In such a program, it is not only important that we see to it that industries which are called upon to make a contribution to the defense effort have the necessary labor to do the job; it is also necessary that each worker be enabled to do the job in the most efficient and skilled manner possible.

In 1937 the Congress authorized the Secretary of Labor "to formulate and promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN AGENCIES
OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT FOR
SERVICES PERFORMED FOR OTHER
GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2018) to authorize advancements to and the reimbursement of certain agencies of the Treasury Department for services performed for other Government agencies, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 5, to strike out "Disbursement," and insert "Disbursement or"; on page 1, lines 6 and 7, to strike out "or the Bureau of Engraving and Printing"; on page 1, line 9, to strike out "Division, Office, or Bureau" and insert "Division or Office"; on page 2, lines 2 and 3, to strike out "Division, Office, or Bureau" and insert "Division or Office"; on page 2, line 7, to strike out all after "(a)" down to and including "Treasury," in line 11; on page 2, lines 12 and 13, to strike out "Division, Office, or Bureau" and insert "Division or Office"; on page 2, line 14, to strike out "section" and insert "act"; on page 2, to strike out all of line 16 and down to and including "(B)" in line 17; on page 2, line 20, to strike out "(C)"; on page 3, line 1, after "accounts," to insert "and"; and on page 3, line 2, to strike out all after "accounts" down to and including "repealed" in line 14.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to Senate bill 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Arkansas give a brief explanation of these amendments?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The bill authorizes advancements to and reimbursement of certain agencies of the Treasury Department for services performed for other Government agencies, and for other purposes. The amendments are clerical in nature and do not go to the heart of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They have been approved, of course, by the Senator?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado on page 472, in line 4.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, last night when I called up this amendment, I used the 5 minutes which were allotted to me. I now ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes to discuss

the amendment. Probably I shall not need that much time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado for an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator please repeat the request? I did not hear it clearly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am requesting unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes to discuss the amendment. Last night I used all the time which then was allotted to me.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to make it very clear to the Senate that I have no personal interest whatsoever in this amendment. The Civil Aeronautics Board tells me that it is very necessary that the amendment be taken to conference and considered carefully; and that is all I am requesting.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a justification of the amendment, in the form of a statement by myself and a letter and other papers from Mr. Oswald Ryan, who is Acting Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement, letter, and papers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

Mr. President, my amendment, if adopted by the Senate, will except the appropriation for transportation of mails in the sum of \$400,000,000 from the antideficiency provision—section 1111—which requires that appropriations and expenditures be apportioned on a quarterly or monthly basis so as to prevent the creating of a deficiency. In prior years deficiencies have been made by the Congress where justification showed the increased costs for movement of mail were attributed to higher rates granted by the CAB or there existed an increase in volume of mail, over which the Postmaster General has no control, and which the Bureau of the Budget sanctioned in approving apportionments of funds made available in the regular appropriation act.

For 1951 this privilege is not granted; instead, the Postmaster General is required to apportion funds provided in chapter IV so that no deficiency whatever will be created.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, July 26, 1950.

The Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: We are writing in order to give our wholehearted support to an amendment, printed on July 14, 1950, which is intended to be proposed by the Honorable EDWIN C. JOHNSON (Colorado) to the omnibus appropriation bill (H. R. 7786). This amendment will modify section 1111 of that bill, which, if enacted without such amendment, may have a drastic, and it is believed unintended, effect on the Board's powers to fix rates of compensation for the

transportation of mail by air carriers under the Civil Aeronautics Act.

The Board is in full accord with the basic principles of the Antideficiency Act, and insofar as the appropriations for its own use are concerned has no objection to the section. However, for the reasons set forth in the attached memorandum, we believe that section 1111 of the appropriation bill as it now stands may impose an unintended restriction on the statutory provisions respecting air-mail compensation contained in the Civil Aeronautics Act. In our opinion, not only would the Board be handicapped in carrying out its mail-rate duties under the Civil Aeronautics Act, but our air carriers—particularly those flying international routes—might also be deprived by this section of substantial revenues, and their continued operations thereby jeopardized. The attached memorandum explains these difficulties in more detail.

Sincerely,

OSWALD RYAN,
Acting Chairman.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD MEMORANDUM,
JULY 21, 1950

SUBJECT: SECTION 1111 OF THE GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL AS IT MAY AFFECT THE MAIL-RATE POWERS OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Section 1111 of the general appropriation bill (H. R. 7786) revises section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (antideficiency law) to read, in part, as follows:

"SEC. 3679. (a) No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available therein; nor shall any such officer or employee involve the Government in any contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law."

It appears that the revised section—and particularly the new language regarding the creation or authorization of an obligation under any appropriation in excess of the amount available therein—would probably be construed to limit the powers of the Board under the Civil Aeronautics Act to fix rates of compensation for the transportation of air mail. Under section 406 of the Civil Aeronautics Act (49 U. S. C. 486), the Board is empowered and directed to fix and determine the fair and reasonable rates of compensation for the transportation of mail by aircraft. It is further provided that "the rates so fixed and determined shall be paid by the Postmaster General from appropriations for the transportation of mail by aircraft." Under section 405 (g) of the Civil Aeronautics Act (49 U. S. C. 485), the Postmaster General is required to tender mail to the holder of a certificate authorizing the transportation of mail by aircraft to the extent required by the postal service.

In fixing and determining mail rates under section 406 of the Civil Aeronautics Act, the Board regularly does so with respect to two distinct situations in each mail-rate proceeding. The first involves the fixing of a rate to be paid the air carrier for the transportation of mail for the period between the date on which the petition for an increase in mail rates was filed and the date of the Board's mail-rate order. In that situation the service has already been rendered, and it remains only for the Board to fix the final rate. If, as is frequently the case, the final rate is higher than the rate under which the carrier has been paid, upon the issuance of the order fixing such rate the carrier immediately becomes entitled to payment in accordance with such rate and the Postmaster General is directed to pay the amount of the appropriation for the transportation of air mail. This action by the Board, therefore,

may well be deemed either to create or authorize an obligation under the appropriation for the transportation of mail by air within the meaning of the terms as used in the antideficiency law. The Board would, therefore, be prevented from fixing the rate required by the standards of the Civil Aeronautics Act if there were any prospect that as a result thereof the appropriation would be exceeded.

While there has not been an opportunity to explore the matter fully, it seems likely that the Interstate Commerce Commission, in fixing rates for the carriage of mail by the railroads, might be confronted with the same problem. The matter is made all the more complicated by the fact that under the appropriation bill a single sum is provided for all transportation of mail.

The second situation for which the Board fixes mail rates concerns the period in the future beginning with the issuance of the mail-rate order. The rate for such a period may be fixed on either a plane-mile basis or a ton-mile basis. In the case of rates fixed on a plane-mile basis, the amount of compensation bears no direct relationship to the amount of mail transported. In the case of the ton-mile rate, the amount of compensation will vary in accordance with a formula set forth in the order and does bear a direct relationship to the amount of mail transported. It is conceivable that the Postmaster General might, in the case of air carriers on a ton-mile rate, so adjust the amount of mail thereafter tendered to them that he could prevent the total rate of compensation payable to all carriers from surpassing a rate which, on a fiscal-year basis, would exceed the amount of the appropriation. With respect to air carriers on a plane-mile basis, this would be almost impossible for him to do. In either event, he would be ignoring the mandate of section 405 (g) of the Civil Aeronautics Act which requires him to tender mail to the holder of certificates to the extent required by the Postal Service, and he would be defaulting in his obligation to the public to carry mail by air in cases where the public has paid for that service.

Accordingly, it is evident that the Board and probably the Postmaster General will not be able to carry out their duties under the Civil Aeronautics Act in regard to the fixing of rates, and the tendering of mail without the possibility of violating the antideficiency act as amended by section 1111 of the appropriation bill. We understand that the bill makes suitable exceptions for other situations where obligations, directed by law to be incurred, cannot be predicted accurately. Examples of such other situations are the payment of fees for Government witnesses in court proceedings and the judgments of the Court of Claims. In order to avoid the limitation upon the statutory powers and duties of the Board and the Postmaster General which might well flow from this section, and to be certain that there is no ambiguity with regard to the intention of Congress, it is recommended that there be inserted after the word "apply" where it appears in line 4 on page 472 of the bill the phrase: "to appropriations for the transportation of mail or."

ADDENDUM

Despite the opinion contained in the foregoing memorandum relative to the effect of the amendment to the antideficiency law on the Board's mail rate making powers, it has been asserted in some quarters that the amendment would not change in substance the existing law. This unfortunately is believed fallacious. In order fully to understand the question involved, it is necessary to consider the relevant portions of the existing law and the proposed amendment there-together. These are as follows:

Existing law

"No executive department or other Government establishment of the United States shall expend, in any one fiscal year, any sum in excess of appropriations made by Congress for that fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract or other obligation for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriations unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law."

Amendment

"No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available therein; nor shall any such officer or employee involve the Government in any contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law."

It will be noted that each of the foregoing provisions is divisible into two separate parts. In the case of the existing law, the first clause prohibits actual expenditures in excess of appropriations; the second clause prohibits involving the Government in a contract or other obligation in excess of such appropriation. To the latter clause there is an exception if the contract or obligation is authorized by law.

Under the present law the Board does not experience any difficulty in complying with the present Antideficiency Act since it does not expend the appropriations for the carriage of the mail and since although it "involves the Government in" mail pay obligations, it comes within the exception of the second clause.

The argument advanced by those who say the amendment will not seriously affect the Board is based on the assertion that the amendment parallels the existing law, contains a similar exception where the contract or obligation is authorized by law, and therefore exempts the Board from this prohibition. The difficulty with this argument will be seen on an examination of the proposed amendment. It will be noted that both parts of the existing law have been combined in the first clause of the amendment, and that the second clause of the amendment relates not to incurring obligations in excess of appropriations but "in advance of appropriations"; as in the case of the existing law the exception contained in the proposed amendment applies only to the second clause.

Thus the effect of the proposed amendment as it affects the Board is to eliminate the exemption "unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law" from the existing law.

One of the four appropriations for the Post Office Department is "transportation of mails," which carries an appropriation of \$400,000,000 for the fiscal year 1951. Said appropriation is shown on page 124 of the bill. This appropriation carries funds for domestic air-mail service, foreign air-mail service, foreign mail transportation, star-route service, powerboat service, and Detroit River service.

Under present procedure the Postmaster General is required to apportion, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, funds provided by this and other appropriations and, under section 1111, the so-called antideficiency provision, the Postmaster General is required to make such apportionment so as to prevent a deficiency (see p. 468, subsec. (c)). The only exceptions to the apportionment provision are found in subsection (e) (1) (p. 472, line 8). One of these exceptions relates to emergencies involving "the protection of property," and, in this instance, the question would arise as to whether the movement of mail and the payment of costs in

connection therewith would constitute an emergency and would enable the Postmaster General, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to create a deficiency attributable to increased volume of mail or increases in rates to be paid carriers, or the result of new additional mail service to be instituted. By law, the Post Office Department is required to move the mail.

Subsection (h) (p. 474, line 23) and subsection (i) (p. 475, line 3) prohibits the creating of an obligation or the making of an expenditure in excess of the amount apportioned or permitted by regulation and provides a penalty for the violation thereof by any officer or employee of the United States.

If it is construed that the Postmaster General, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, cannot create a deficiency on account of an emergency involving "the protection of property" (mails), then the alternative plan would be to amend subsection by adopting the Johnson amendment. Page 472, line 4, insert after the word "apply" the words "to appropriations for the transportation of mail or."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. As ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Appropriations, of the Appropriations Committee, and as one who has given at least some slight study to the Antideficiency Act which is proposed to be amended by this amendment, I would say to my colleagues who now are on the floor of the Senate that I hope the amendment will be adopted and will be taken to conference.

I say in all frankness to the Senator from Colorado that I think the air transportation lines are unduly alarmed. I am gravely doubtful whether adoption of the amendment is necessary. However, if it is necessary, we should be in a position to handle it in conference; and unless it is adopted and placed in the bill at this time, there will be no opportunity to correct any error with respect to this subject when the bill is in the hands of the conferees, whereas if the amendment is in the bill when it goes to conference, there will then be an opportunity to study the matter and, if necessary, to make any correction which may be justified, and thus to do substantial justice to the Post Office Department itself in connection with the handling of the mail, as well as to do justice to those with whom the Post Office Department must make contracts in that connection.

Therefore, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Oregon, because he has stated my position exactly.

Let me say that I do not know whether the demand for the adoption of this amendment is a false alarm or whether adoption of the amendment is extremely important to the transportation of mail. However, the Civil Aeronautics Board, which has been given the tremendous responsibility of contracting for the transportation of mail by the air lines, says this matter is important. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be adopted and taken to conference, where it may be considered by the conferees; and if they do not want the amendment to remain in the bill, they can remove it.

On the other hand, if the conferees decide that the amendment should be included in the bill, perhaps they will see fit to change the language of the amendment or the part of the bill to which it will apply, or otherwise will see fit to modify the application of the amendment in some way, so that the difficulty, if there be one, may be corrected.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I should like to ask the Senator whether I correctly understand the situation. It is my understanding that the amendment is directed primarily to the transportation of mail by the airlines.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I am sorry that I cannot agree with the Senator as to that. The amendment is meant to apply to the transportation of mail by airlines, but it cannot be confined to that, because the appropriation item in respect to the transportation of mail is written as only one item, applying to all forms of transportation. So the amendment would apply to all forms of transportation, including the transportation of mail by airline, because of that technical situation.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Let me ask the Senator another question, then, if he will yield further.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I understand that the Senator from Colorado hopes to get around that phase of the matter, if the amendment is adopted, by taking it to conference and, primarily, eliminating some of the difficulties which have developed in respect to the transportation of mail by airline. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Colorado knows that time and time again the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has requested the Post Office Department to justify these subsidies. Two years ago the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'Connor] submitted a resolution calling on the Post Office Department to justify the subsidies, and providing for a hearing on the rates for the transportation of mail by steamship and railroad. The hearing was held. A little later my resolution calling for an investigation of the rates for the transportation of mail by railroad came up, and a hearing was held on that resolution.

The Post Office Department's representatives said they had experts who would come before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and would produce the figures and would help us make a thorough study of these rates.

In my opinion, the rates paid for the transportation of mail have been scandalous, especially those paid for the transportation of mail by railroad. As a matter of fact, the rates for the transportation of mail by steamship and by airplane have not been much better, so far as that is concerned.

As I understand this amendment, there will be virtually no limit; practically all restrictions will be removed, and the Post Office Department will be allowed an almost unlimited amount of money for this purpose. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I certainly wish to register my objection to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if I felt as the Senator from North Dakota does—namely, that the amendment would do the things he thinks it will do—I would be everlastingly opposed to the amendment. However, I do not think it will have that effect at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Let me say that I do not think this amendment will have the effect the Senator from North Dakota has stated; that is not the way I interpret the amendment.

I think adoption of the amendment at this time is necessary in order to provide some leeway in connection with this matter; and I do not think the amendment will cost an appreciable dollar, so far as funds are concerned. I believe that is the opinion of the Senator from Colorado, too; is it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is my opinion, except I realize that if it becomes necessary to extend the carriage of mail, by virtue of an increase in the volume of mail, of course the cost will be greater. However, such greater cost will not develop because of the adoption of this amendment, but because there will then be a bigger job to be done.

Mr. CORDON and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Colorado whether it is not a fact that there are certain imponderables in connection with the obligation of the Post Office Department to handle the mails, certain factors which are wholly without the control of the Department, and which make impracticable apportionment under the Antideficiency Act, notably, the amount of mail to be carried? It can be estimated. If the estimate is high, we have some money left; if it is low, we must make up the difference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must advise the Senator from Colorado that his time has expired.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I shall present the matter in my own right. I am still making inquiry of the Senator from Colorado. In connection with the handling of the mails, there are unknown factors wholly without the control of the handling agency, the Post Office Department. The volume of mail varies. It must be handled, whether it be less than the amount estimated or much greater. The cost, of course, varies with the volume.

Then, in connection with air mail, the costs are wholly without the control of the Post Office Department. The National Aeronautics Act provides that, once there has been a designation of an air carrier as a carrier of air mail, there shall then be paid to such carrier on account of its carriage of mail such amount as may be necessary to guarantee to the carrier that its operational accounts will be balanced and that there will be a reasonable profit based on efficient service. The question of determining the amount to be paid by the Post Office Department is not one which the Department has any control of. It is a determination made by the Civil Aeronautics Board—a system which is altogether wrong and should not exist, but which can be corrected only by substantive legislation.

Because of those unknown factors I can see some reason or basis for fear on the part of mail carriers and of the Post Office Department itself as to the results of an apportionment of appropriated funds over the 12 months period for which they are appropriated. The law would require the appropriation to be made on a basis that will not permit of a deficiency. In other words, the operation must be handled for the amount of the appropriation for the full period of 1 year. Perhaps the Department can handle it for that amount of money, perhaps it cannot; and yet the mail must go through.

There are other provisions in the law which I believe may be adequate for varying the apportioning basis. However, in my opinion, we ought to have another look at the entire problem with respect to this particular facet, and for that reason I think it would be wise to put the amendment in at this time and let the conference committee have another look at it.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in reference to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, it obviously pertains to the program or the legal formalities which the Post Office Department must go through in order to pay for the cost of transporting the mails. The chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, who will shortly give further observations on this amendment, knows that the Post Office Department has little or nothing to say about what it is going to pay for the transportation of the mail. As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] pointed out, so far as air mail is concerned, that is a matter for the Civil Aeronautics Board. So far as mail transported by railroad is concerned, that naturally is determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The junior Senator from Minnesota had many discussions with representatives of the Post Office Department about a year ago, when the railroads were requesting of the Interstate Commerce Commission a substantial rate increase for the transportation of the mail. The

ICC gave a temporary rate increase. The Post Office Department wanted to protest that rate increase. The Post Office Department, however, was denied under existing law, first the right of judicial review, which no other department of the Government is denied, of an ICC ruling; second, the Post Office Department could not receive any information from the carriers, because it apparently had no legal authority to receive information from the carriers as to the cost involved in transporting the mail as a part of the general shipment of traffic on railroad lines. Finally, after much negotiation, the Post Office Department, by the threat of committee action, was able to get from the railroads information to enable it to track down the cost of handling the mail.

I point this out only because yesterday the junior Senator from Illinois and the junior Senator from Minnesota offered an amendment to this bill, which was declared out of order because it was legislation on an appropriation bill. That would have gotten at the root of the trouble that is being discussed here. The root of the difficulty of the expense of transporting mail by railroad—speaking now only of railroad transportation of mail—is the round-trip permission which was authorized by a public law in 1916. Under this round-trip provision, the Post Office Department not only pays to send the mail out in full cars, but pays identically the same rate to transport the empty cars back. It is the only agency or the only industry in the world that pays for that kind of transportation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that in Canada the opposite rule applies, that Canada pays only for the actual transportation of mail and does not have to pay for the shipment back of empty cars without mail?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois is absolutely correct, and it was estimated by the General Accounting Office that there is at least a minimum of \$30,000,000 a year overpayment in the form of subsidy because of this round-trip provision.

The Senator from North Dakota is very well experienced in the field of railroad transportation of mail. I have been in the Senate now for about a year and a half. Regarding rail transportation of mail, I should like to say to the Senator from Colorado that his amendment meets a situation which exists because of a public law, and that the only way we are going to be able to change this situation is to change the public law. On the calendar there is a bill reported by the committee, Senate bill 1596, which refers to a possible liability upon the Government of the United States—the taxpayers—of \$2,000,000,000, according to the estimates of the General Accounting Office, within the next 20 years.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I must conclude my statement, because the time is limited, and each one of us has time in his own right. I see no particular objection, I may say, to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado. I see objection, however, to the failure of the Congress to remedy the basic public law, which we ought to remedy if we are going to be able to economize at all in the Post Office Department. It is a Department which is running a deficit of from \$550,000,000 to \$600,000,000 a year, and we have not even so much as moved a finger for the purpose of altering the public law to meet that deficit.

I submit, Mr. President, that these subsidies should not be charged to the Post Office Department. They should be charged somewhere else, and we ought to recognize that these subsidies exist, not only in the case of maritime shipping, but also in the case of the railroads themselves.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement with respect to the program which will be followed when the Senate eventually makes disposition of the amendments and bill which are now pending before the Senate since July 11. I am satisfied that the Members of the Senate will be very happy when we finally conclude the appropriation bill. Certainly I hope we can complete it this afternoon. In fact, we shall remain in session until that is accomplished.

After action on the appropriation bill, it is the intention of the majority to move a recess until Tuesday next. When the Senate convenes on Tuesday, we shall then proceed to call the calendar from the beginning. That will probably be the last time the calendar will be called from the beginning. So that if any Senators have bills which have been objected to heretofore, and if they feel that there is merit to them, they had better consult the real objectors, on the Republican side, between now and then, to ascertain whether they can persuade those Senators of the merit of their respective bills.

Anyway, Mr. President, that is the program we are now considering. By that time the House of Representatives will no doubt have finished with the defense production bill; and I am satisfied that the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate will also, by Monday of next week, have a bill to bring before the Senate. It is then the intention of the majority to proceed to the consideration of the defense production bill, following the call of the calendar.

I have made one slight error as to the defense production bill following the call of the calendar. As Senators know, I stated on Wednesday that we would proceed to the consideration of the nominations on the Executive Calendar which have been reported adversely. After the

call of the Consent Calendar, we shall move an executive session to consider the four nominations which have heretofore been objected to and which have been reported adversely by the respective committees handling those nominations. If we can conclude on Tuesday the call of the calendar in time to take up the Executive Calendar, we shall do that; if not, we shall take it up on Wednesday.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Illinois to say that he expects to take up the war production bill on Wednesday?

Mr. LUCAS. Following the disposition of the Consent Calendar and the disposition of the Executive Calendar with respect to the four nominations which are on that calendar and which have been reported adversely.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator think it would not be possible to take up the war production bill on Tuesday?

Mr. LUCAS. No; because we are going to recess until Tuesday, when we finish our work today. The call of the calendar will take most of Tuesday afternoon. If the call of the calendar should not consume the entire afternoon, we shall then proceed to the consideration of executive business, which includes four very important nominations which we must dispose of one way or the other.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to know what the parliamentary situation will be with regard to filing the report on the war production bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope the Senator will file the report as soon as he can. We shall take up the bill as rapidly as may be possible, because the President is very anxious to get the bill to his desk at the earliest possible time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to file the bill and the report, as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, during the recess of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Illinois has made a very clean-cut statement. The Senate has been alerted to the fact that the Legislative Calendar will be called, and, after that, the Executive Calendar. I should like to ask one question. Is it not the opinion of the majority leader that after that is done he can safely say there will be no debate on the control bill until at least Wednesday?

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is absolutely correct about that, and Senators can govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I came into the Chamber at the time when the Senator from Illinois was discussing the Legislative Calendar. I wondered whether he had made any mention of bringing up Senate bill 2311.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from South Dakota think that Senate bill 2311 is more important than the call of the

calendar and more important than the war-production bill?

Mr. MUNDT. The answer to that question, in the mind of the junior Senator from South Dakota, is emphatically "Yes."

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator would take up a bill which he knows is highly controversial before he would take up the defense-production bill which is being requested so earnestly by the President of the United States in these serious times.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me that the bill to which I have referred is as directly connected with the war effort as any other bill could possibly be.

Mr. LUCAS. That is not the question. The Senator tells the Senate and the country that he is more interested in the Mundt-Ferguson bill than he is in the war-production bill at this particular time. The Democratic policy committee has made its determination, and we believe that the call of the calendar on Tuesday is absolutely indispensable. We believe it should be called from the very beginning. We also believe that the war-production bill certainly is the next thing which must come before the Senate. That will be the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five more minutes to discuss the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois is that he allowed 5 minutes extra time to address the Senate. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to have the unanimous-consent request restated by the Senator from South Carolina. I should like to know whether some Senator will object to his request.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, all I asked was that as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee I might have the right to file the report on the war-production bill during the recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader, in view of the fact that he believes the calendar should be called, whether, after that, we shall have an opportunity to consider the Mundt-Ferguson bill.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will answer my question.

Mr. MUNDT. What was the Senator's question?

Mr. LUCAS. Whether he desires to tell the country again that he believes his bill is more important than the war production bill. I think he has stated that he thinks it is, but I should like to

hear him restate it. I have told the Senator from time to time that we have considered his bill and shall continue to consider it. I do not underestimate the importance of the Senator's bill, but the Senator for the past 2 or 3 weeks has been on his feet trying to needle this side of the aisle because he thinks he can get a political advantage as a result of it. The Senator knows the Mundt-Ferguson bill was on the calendar from March 21 last, and not until approximately 3 weeks ago did the Senator raise his voice in the Senate with reference to taking it up. He believed that it was good politics to try to embarrass the Members on this side of the aisle with these constant reminders. It is done at a time when we have so much important legislation dealing with the war effort to consider. We are not going to pass up the bill; we are going to consider it in the Democratic policy committee, but the Senator from South Dakota knows, and all other Senators know, that we take first things first in the Senate, and certainly the war effort is the first thing we should consider.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the majority leader mean that we will start from the beginning of the calendar and go all the way through?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have one further question, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator made the remark that probably this would be the last call of the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. That is very possible, because the Senate is hoping to leave here some time during the month of August so that Senators can return home. Some of us have some political campaigns to conduct. The Senator from South Carolina is already in, and I congratulate him on the great victory he won in South Carolina. I think the people of South Carolina did the right thing. I am glad to say that openly on the floor of the Senate. Many of us face elections a little later. Of course, my good friend from South Carolina can stay here and work without any political trouble.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like the Senator from Illinois to know that I hope everything will go all right in Illinois, too.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very grateful to my good friend from South Carolina for his expression.

Mr. BYRD. I understand that the distinguished majority leader intends to take up the Executive Calendar following the call of the Legislative Calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I understand that the Senate will consider the nominations which have been adversely reported.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I think that is fine, except that, if we should reach the Execu-

tive Calendar very late in the evening, I hope the Senator from Illinois will put it off until the following day.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall try to accommodate Senators in that respect.

Mr. BYRD. I think as many Members as possible should be here when the nominations are considered.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me reply in this way: If the call of the calendar takes all afternoon, we shall recess or adjourn until the next day. I do not intend to hold the Senate in executive session late in the evening.

Mr. BYRD. But the Executive Calendar will be called following the call of the Legislative Calendar?

Mr. LUCAS. Precisely so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to say further in answer to the question propounded to me by the majority leader as to whether I considered S. 2311 more important than the defense production bill that the junior Senator from South Dakota considers Communist-control legislation as a part of the defense program. He considers it as being on a parity with the defense program, and he feels that it would be helpful to the Senate and to the country if the majority leader could tell us when the Democratic Policy Committee expects to schedule that proposed legislation for consideration by the Senate.

I am a comparatively new Member of the Senate. Apparently the Democratic policy committee arranges these matters in secret and intends to keep them secret. Perhaps it should be done that way. However, I believe it would be helpful if we could have some assurance, first, whether we shall be afforded an opportunity to vote on the so-called Mundt-Ferguson bill; and second, if so, when we may have that opportunity.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to my good friend from South Dakota that I am only one member of the Democratic policy committee.

Mr. MUNDT. But a very potent member of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope I am as potent as the Senator thinks I am.

Mr. MUNDT. There is no question about it. I have been bumping against that potency for some time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota said that he has not been here very long. I merely wish to say that the Senator has been about as busy as any Member of the Senate, and as busy as any Member I have known during the past 12 years since he has been here. I congratulate him on his industry and indefatigability. He is always vigilant in everything.

Mr. President, I cannot tell the Senator when we shall take up the bill, if ever. The Democratic policy committee will make the decision some time in the near future. As I said a moment ago, we take first things first. We take first the things that we believe are important to

the country. It is the majority who is handling the legislative situation. I am only one humble member of the Democratic policy committee. Obviously we shall notify the Senator in due course.

Mr. MUNDT. Can the Senator tell us positively that we shall have an opportunity to vote on the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. I repeat what I said a moment ago, that I am only one humble member of the Democratic policy committee. I am frequently voted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota and the time of the Senator from Illinois have expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is some doubt in the mind of the Chair whether any Senator has a right to speak on "reserving the right to object" propositions when the Senate is operating on a 5-minute limitation of debate. The Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object to the unanimous-consent request, let me say apropos the statement made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I did not think the time had come when all the prerogatives of the Senate of the United States, in which 48 States of the Union are represented, had been surrendered either to the Democratic policy committee or the Republican policy committee, depending on who controls the Senate of the United States, because by virtue of the make-up of the Democratic policy committee many States of the Union are not represented at all on it. I hope the time will never come when the Senate of the United States as a legislative body surrenders all of its prerogatives in the handling of legislation and the determination of what the Senate should do in the interest of the country to any partisan group, of my party or otherwise.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with reference to the statement made by the Senator from California, I agree completely with him, and I assure him that so far as this side of the aisle is concerned Democratic Senators will never be controlled entirely by the Democratic policy committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to file during the recess of the Senate a bill and the report thereon. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I do not have very much to add, except that speaking on behalf

of my committee I emphasize the fact that a great many of the agencies that handle transportation, such as railroads, airlines, and shipping companies, have set the rates and the Post Office has nothing to do with it. Therefore because of the provisions of the existing law it is absolutely necessary to enact a provision along the line of the proposed amendment. It is for that reason only that I support the amendment. In the future we should formulate and pass a general law to cover the situation, and such a bill should be handled by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act provides as follows:

Committee on Civil Service, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

3. The postal service generally, including the railway-mail service, and measures relating to ocean mail and pneumatic-tube service, but excluding post roads.

Mr. President, we have had a lobby here ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. We have had a lobby for the railroads, getting more and more money for them at the expense of the taxpayers. We have had a lobby for the ocean transportation lines. We have had a lobby for the airlines. Of course, we have a deficit in the Post Office Department of \$550,000,000. Each year that deficit goes higher.

What do we find, Mr. President? We find that when legislation is introduced in relation to postal affairs, it does not come before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The Postmaster General does not come before our committee. Usually we find that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, headed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], takes up mail matters, and the price the Government is to pay. That committee has hearings on such legislation. It usurps the prerogatives of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Senators are asked to vote that one committee can ignore another committee, hold hearings on matters over which they have no jurisdiction, and entirely ignore bills such as the one introduced by the junior Senator from Maryland dealing with the ocean mail service, and the one introduced by the senior Senator from North Dakota dealing with the matter of the railway mail service.

As I have said, we have had this matter up for nearly 2 years. We had it up 4 years ago, we had it up 6 years ago, and just so long as the Postmaster General can ignore the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, so long as lobbyists can go to another committee and usurp the functions of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, just that long we will not get the legislation which was prayed for by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr.

HUMPHREY] yesterday. So long as the committee which has jurisdiction can be ignored, of course the persons affected are not going to be interested in legislation that would curb the amount of profits which are being taken by the ocean liners, the railways, and the airlines.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator says these persons go before other committees. I understand the pending amendment will involve quite a large sum, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$400,000,000. There are other estimates, however, which are smaller, I have heard.

No Postmaster General or Assistant Postmaster General has been before the Committee on Appropriations, which has immediate jurisdiction of the matter involved in the amendment, to tell us about the amendment. I think we ought to have the facts before any amendment is agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I fully agree with him. We ought to have the facts, instead of having the big deficits annually recurring.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Martin
Anderson	Hendrickson	Maybank
Bricker	Hill	Millikin
Bridges	Hoey	Mundt
Butler	Holland	Murray
Byrd	Humphrey	Neely
Capehart	Hunt	O'Connor
Chapman	Ives	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Darby	Kem	Russell
Donnell	Kerr	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eaton	Leahy	Sparkman
Ellender	Lehman	Stennis
Ferguson	Lodge	Taft
Frear	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McCarthy	Thye
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Graham	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] on page 472, line 4, on which question the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE (when his name was called). Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oregon just came from a committee meeting to the floor of the Senate. Will the Chair please advise him officially as to the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the precedent has been pretty well set with respect to such a request. The Chair is personally inclined to let every Senator know on what issue he is voting. By unanimous consent, the Chair will state to the Senator from Oregon that the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The name of Mr. MORSE was again called, and he voted in the affirmative.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who is detained on official business at one of the Government departments, would vote "nay" if present.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—59

Alken	Gurney	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Mundt
Bricker	Hoey	Murray
Bridges	Holland	Neely
Butler	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Hunt	Pepper
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Darby	Knowland	Sparkman
Donnell	Leahy	Stennis
Dworshak	Lodge	Taft
Eastland	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	McCarthy	Thye
Ellender	McClellan	Watkins
Ferguson	McFarland	Wiley
Frear	Magnuson	Williams
Gillette	Maybank	Young
Graham	Millikin	

NAYS—17

Douglas	Green	Ives
Fulbright	Hendrickson	Kem
George	Hill	Langer

Lehman
McKellar
McMahon

Martin
O'Connor
Russell

Smith, Maine
Wherry

NOT VOTING—20

Benton
Brewster
Cain
Chavez
Downey
Flanders
Hickenlooper

Jenner
Johnson, Tex.
Kefauver
Long
Lucas
Malone
Myers

Taylor
Thomas, Okla.
Tobey
Tydings
Vandenberg
Withers

So the amendment of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. BRIDGES. I call up my amendment to the bill on page 448.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 448, in line 14, after the colon, it is proposed to insert the following: "Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to provide assistance to any nation which is engaged, subsequent to the date of enactment of this act, in removing, destroying, restricting, or limiting the operations of, the peacetime industrial potential of western Germany."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is proposed to a committee amendment which has been agreed to.

Is there objection to the offering of the amendment? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the theory of the amendment is very simple, as the Senate can observe from the reading of the amendment.

First let me say that with our purposes and aims now being centered upon re-arming our allies to the greatest extent possible, so that they may be of assistance not only in the general cause of peace, but also in respect to defending themselves, that being a major project at this time in the interest of our own country, and also in order that they may become more self-sustaining, and thus, from an economic point of view, remove some of the load from the backs of the American taxpayers, this amendment would have the effect of preventing the further dismantling or destruction of German industrial plants.

Second, I think it is very unfortunate that during the past 3 or 4 years there has been in effect a widespread dismantling project in Germany. It has made the people of Germany less capable of producing their own equipment and supplies and less capable of supporting themselves. Considerable amounts of the equipment and supplies taken from those factories have gone to Russia and the satellite countries behind the iron curtain, thus adding to their war potential against us.

Third, the removal of such factories or the removal of equipment and material from the factories has resulted in placing a further burden on the backs of the American taxpayers. Today we are putting into Germany, alone—where we are supplying not only the American zone, but also the British and the French zones—hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in order to make up the deficit or the difference between what

the German people can produce and the amount of production necessary for their support. I think the dismantling policy—dating back to the old Morgenthau plan—is one of the most stupid policies which this country has ever entered into.

UNITED STATES TAXPAYERS PAYING REPARATIONS COLLECTED FROM GERMANY BY RUSSIA, ENGLAND, FRANCE, AND OTHER COUNTRIES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire whether the sleight-of-hand method of destroying and dismantling German industry and removing German plants to other countries, whether to our Allies or to Russia—and some of the plants have been taken to Russia, as well as to England, France, and other European countries, and now we are supporting the German people, as we have done since the end of the war—I want to inquire if such a procedure does not amount, in effect, to having the taxpayers of the United States of America actually pay the war reparations collected by the nations.

Mr. BRIDGES. It certainly does amount to that.

Mr. President, I have asked the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee if he will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I make the point of order against the amendment that it proposes legislation to an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the point of order for a moment, in order that I may associate myself with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very happy to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me say that I think that this amendment is a very important one. I hope the Senator from New Mexico will not raise the point of order, because I believe the Senate should have something to say about the policy of dismantling in western Germany.

On the Appropriations Committee we are taking evidence, and that evidence calls for appropriations to rehabilitate the very type of production which today is being retarded by the dismantling process now going on in Germany. That cannot be denied.

I did not know this amendment was coming up this morning. I have on my desk reports from Mr. McCloy regarding certain plants in which we have been interested. He himself has been most eager to help save some of them. More of them could be saved. I agree, and I think the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will agree, that most of the job has been completed. It is not as though we were beginning a new one. In that respect it might possibly be felt that the amendment is unnecessary. A few weeks ago I presented a report of the plants which still remain, but which, under the agreement, are to be dismantled. Not only are plants dismantled,

but in many instances they are destroyed. The Salzgitter plant was saved and many of its facilities have now been turned over for civilian production in a town of about 15,000, where there were many employees who otherwise would have been thrown out of work. We are trying to prevent the expansion of communism. The moment the facilities of the plants in western Germany are destroyed and the people thrown out of work, I ask, where can seeds of communism be planted where they will be likely to grow more quickly than in such a situation?

All we seek to do is to prevent the further dismantling and destruction of plants. I want to say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that some time ago I asked for a review. I am sure the Senator will remember the resolution which was offered, calling for another review, in order that we might work out with the British and the French an arrangement agreeable to the German people as to the reduction of plants.

I appeal to the Members of the Senate, in the very short time we now have, to give consideration to this amendment. Actually I think that wherever there can be preserved a facility which is now so desperately needed, it is foolish to destroy it, and require additional appropriations to accomplish our objective. I know the Senator from New Mexico has been very gracious to me in withholding his point of order. I, of course, cannot anticipate what the ruling will be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the policy of demolishing German industry originated in the period when the event that we most feared was the revival of German Nazism?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And is it not true that that danger certainly is not the most immediate danger at the moment; that the immediate danger is the rise of Soviet strength, and that there is a necessity therefore of making the Ruhr strong?

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for that observation. The conditions certainly have changed since the dismantling began, because at that time of course the purpose was to provide a limitation on German production, and bring about a complete agreement among the powers as to what the industrial production of Germany should be. At that time, viewed in that light, no doubt the considerations given appealed to those who made the decision. But, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois has said, conditions have now changed completely. I am one of those who have been advocating for many months that the place to stop communism is on the border of Germany. I think the people there are the ones who, with the placing of our equipment and our money, will do as good a job as can be done by any western European country, to stop an invader in event a hostile force should come across that 700-mile border.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, as soon as I complete this one statement. For that reason, not only in a military way am I in favor of equipping the German people with adequate arms for defense, whatever the limitation may be, according to the recommendations of the military authorities, but certainly the industrial capacity must go along with that if we are to get what we need in order to stop the expansion of communism. I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is there not some reason to suspect that some of the British authorities, in selecting German plants which were to be dismantled, selected plants which were in competition with British industry? And is there not more reason to suspect that the occupation authorities in the British zone have used this power in order to reduce competition with their own manufacturing plants?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I can say affirmatively that that is true. In a speech which I made on the Senate floor recently I cited several German plants which were in competition with the British, and the results are as the distinguished Senator from Illinois has indicated.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment, please. I am not saying that is the reason—I am not sure what the reason is—for the point of order made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I am not in any way imputing an improper motive to him in making it. He is within his rights, of course, in making a point of order. But the point I make once again—and it was raised very ably here by the junior Senator from Illinois—is that if we are to provide the wherewithal to permit the German people to defend themselves militarily—which we are going to do, and which the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommend—it seems to me we are certainly foolish to permit the destruction of a plant, whose destruction was authorized when we did not have the situation which now confronts us. I say we are certainly foolish under present conditions to permit such dismantling and destruction to continue, while at the same time we ask military funds with which to build facilities which will accomplish the same purpose. That is exactly what is being done.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. In furtherance of what the Senator from Illinois said, does the Senator from Nebraska know that a high official of the British occupation in Germany told a group of prominent

Americans that it was not Soviet communism that was feared but a revival of the German industry?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, I know that.

Mr. EASTLAND. And that today, with the critical shortage of steel which exists in the world, they were again dismantling one steel plant which produces 250,000 tons of steel a year from low grade ore, which is directly competitive with the steel industry in Great Britain?

Mr. WHERRY. That is absolutely correct, and that is in the statement I made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I appreciate very much his having given me the opportunity to make some remarks before pressing his point of order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know that I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico desire to make a brief statement in connection with his point of order? If so, the Chair would be pleased to hear it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to be heard, but before doing so, I shall appreciate an opportunity of yielding briefly to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask whether the distinguished Senator from New Mexico knows, in connection with the subject of the dismantling of plants in Germany, that soap factories and fertilizer plants have been dismantled, and that only a short time ago the Government of the United States paid more than \$3,000,000 to a concern in New York to ship fertilizer to Germany, and that, as a matter of fact, the shipment arrived a month late, and the fertilizer was no good when it got there, because the season was over?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I may say I should like to associate myself with a great deal of what the distinguished minority leader has said. As a matter of fact, in 1947, in cooperation and in conjunction with the present Assistant to the President, I may say, the distinguished W. Averell Harriman, who was then Secretary of Commerce, I visited Germany. We examined together the dismantling of German plants, and I filed with the President of the United States, in July 1947, a report in which I said it was time to stop the dismantling of certain sections of German industry, and pointed out that in one operation alone it was costing us \$13,000,000 to dismantle a plant which, when shipped to Russia, would be worth only \$1,000,000. In that memorandum I stated that "General Rust" was going to win the war, that these things were going to stand on platforms and be destroyed by rust, and not be useful to the economy. So that, so far as I am concerned, my record on this question, I hope, is clear, and, as I have indicated, I agree with a great deal and with nearly all of what the distinguished minority leader has said.

I point out only that this amendment would prevent any ECA funds being

given to any nation which participates in any way in the dismantling program. There are certain small, isolated plants which might still be dismantled and whose dismantling we are obligated to permit by treaties which we have entered into. I think the amendment is too drastic. I believe that the purpose of the Senator from New Hampshire is perfectly good. In my opinion the Senate should continue to express itself vigorously against this dismantling program, but I think this proposal might be destructive of the whole ECA program. It is because of that fear that I raise the point of order.

I should like to say to my very distinguished friend from Nebraska, the minority leader, whose observations I think have been extremely sound, that I would join him any time in demanding that we review and resurvey the ECA spending program, and if any of the sort of thing which has been mentioned here is going on, I should like to join with him in trying to stop it. But I do not like a proposal under the language of which some clerk would have to examine the situation and decide whether any nation receiving aid from ECA is participating in any way in any dismantling program, because there are dismantling programs going on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico wish to be heard on the question of whether this is a limitation or whether it is legislation, and would the Senator like to give the Chair the benefit of his ideas as to what the test is?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to say that I do not believe it is a limitation. It would require the Administrator of ECA to decide if any nation was now participating in any program of removing or restricting or limiting the operations of peacetime industrial plants in western Germany. We know that the steel potential of Germany has been limited, and therefore America perhaps could not give aid to England or to France or to any of the other nations. I think it is imposing an administrative responsibility upon the head of ECA, and, therefore, I believe that this provision attached to an appropriation bill is objectionable.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, to my mind it is purely a restriction. It is clearly drafted in the line of restriction and it is a restriction. If we follow it down through we find that the whole purpose is restriction. So far as the decision of which the Senator from New Mexico speaks, it is very simple; it applies to one country only, Germany. The United States, Great Britain, and France are the only three nations outside the Russian zone, which are parties to it. The United States is paying all the bills, so it should not be too hard for us to determine. But, from the purely technical standpoint, in my judgment, it is a restriction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the rule to be that if additional duties are imposed on an agency, that would be legislation.

Mr. BRIDGES. That may be one of the corollary elements in determining whether legislation is restrictive or not,

but I do not think that is the only test.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator have in mind other tests?

Mr. BRIDGES. An amendment which directs someone to do something is wholly different from restricting the spending of funds. It is the reverse. It is a restriction on the spending of funds, rather than a direction to do something. In other words, it is a negative approach.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the amendment briefly in order to indicate my general viewpoint toward Germany at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts is to be recognized, I think he should be recognized to discuss the point of order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not yield, and I think it is extraordinary that I should be interrupted in this way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asked for debate on the point of order alone.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to ask the Chair whether there is anything in the Senate rules which restricts me in anything I may have to say in the next 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has discretionary authority as to whether he will hear any Senator on a point of order. Literally, under the rules, a point of order is not debatable, but the Chair wants enlightenment from any Senator who may be interested, on one side or the other, as to whether the amendment is legislation. If the Senator from Massachusetts can help the Chair in that respect—

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Massachusetts thought he was exercising the normal right which any Senator has to discuss an amendment, and I consider it unusual, if not actually discourteous, to be interrupted twice in the beginning of a 5-minute speech, and to be called to order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not intend to be discourteous to the Senator from Massachusetts, but the Chair has a responsibility with reference to the rules.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts may be allowed 5 minutes in which to speak on the amendment or the point of order. It might throw light on how the Chair should rule.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, we were discussing the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is requested that the Senator from Massachusetts may take 5 minutes to discuss the point of order or the amendment, as he may see fit. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should first like to indicate what my judgment is on the question of Germany in the light of recent events in Korea. On Monday last, July 31, I stated that there should be a reorientation of policy concerning Germany and Japan. I said:

It is no exaggeration to say that the fate of these nations is a life-and-death matter for the United States, for, if the Soviets cap-

tured Germany and Japan they would possess such a huge industrial potential that they might think they could destroy the United States.

Then I went on to say:

We are deeply grateful to the nations which have realized that this fight is their fight and which have sent troops to Korea. We must also recognize that it is unfair to us and to these free nations to carry the whole load of combat alone. The former neutrals—and even the former enemies—of World War II must help in this struggle for survival of human freedom. It is only fair that they bear part of the burden since their own existence is also in danger.

I think it is important that when we adopt this policy toward Germany we do so on a multilateral basis, working in concert with the free nations, that we do not take a step all by ourselves, as if we were the only pebble on the beach, and as if we were crudely using the dollars we have in order to force an arrangement down the throats of other nations, whether they like it or not. I think if we do that, we are acting tactlessly. It is not only important to do the thing that is right, but it is important to do it with tact. If we spend billions of dollars and do it without tact, the money is thrown away completely.

I believe it is possible to have a policy toward Germany and to have a policy toward Spain which would be very much in the interests of France. I should be much opposed to alienating France, because I think France is the keystone of European defense. But I think it must be done in a way that is well thought out, in a way that is intelligent.

Coming to the point of order, the amendment is much more, in my opinion, than a limitation. It seeks to reverse the whole method of doing international business which has been developed since the war, which is epitomized in the United Nations and which is symbolized by the OEEC and the mutuality which runs all through ECA. It is drafted in such a broad way that it applies to any nation—and I emphasize the word "any." The words "peacetime potential" can cover everything that the mind of man can imagine. It is not limited to the dismantling of munitions plants or to the thing which I think it is desired to reach. In my judgment, it would be unfortunate if the amendment were adopted. I also think it is far more than a limitation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that we had the same question before us last year and that we were then told we should merely make a recommendation, and is it not true that that was done, that, presumably, the recommendations were conveyed to the British Government, and in spite of that, the British Government went ahead and further dismantled plants? In view of that situation, does the Senator think that for the second year we should content ourselves merely with an advisory attitude when it is desirable to take a more definite stand?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts

has expired. The senior Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I thank the Chair very much for finally recognizing me. It is an unusual compliment he has finally paid to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts was speaking by a special order of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

I want to say, Mr. President, that I hope the point of order made against the amendment will be sustained. The authors of the amendment did not come before the Appropriations Committee to submit facts upon which this amendment was based. No evidence was given. We are voting in the dark.

I am very much in favor of the terms of the amendment. I shall go even further than that. Ever since I was a boy, not much older than any one of our pages, whenever I was able to take a trip to Europe I always visited Germany. They are the finest kind of people. I do not believe there is a better people—well, I shall stop right there. I do not believe that any people are more able, stronger, or more vigorous, hopeful, helpful, and enterprising than the German people. Offhand I would say that they are the best people I have ever seen in Europe. I do not mind saying that I think they are better than the British, and I am a grandson of a Britisher.

However, this bill is not the place for the amendment. The Senator from Arizona has done well to make a point of order against it. I want to say perfectly frankly that if I had thought the point of order would be sustained I would have made it myself. We are under direction in the Committee on Appropriations to make points of order against amendments which we believe to be subject to them. I simply got tired of making points of order which were not sustained. They had been sustained heretofore, but for some reason the Chair does not sustain my points of order on the bill. I hope the Chair will not entertain that prejudice against the point of order of the Senator from Arizona. I think it ought to be sustained.

Not a line of proof has been offered on the amendment.

I do not believe legislation should be passed in that way. It is a very dangerous thing to do. The Committee on Appropriations undertakes to go into facts, as my friends on both sides of the aisle know. The committee makes its report based on the facts. The Committee on Appropriations has not made any such finding in this matter. It has not had any facts placed before it on which to make any findings. If a bill containing the same provision were introduced I may say to my good friend from New Hampshire that I would be for it. If he will introduce an independent bill I shall go the limit in helping him. I hope he will add another section to it. I should like to say that I want to see west Germany helped. I think it ought to be helped. However, it ought not to be helped by way of legislation on an appropriation bill.

My secretary tells me that this is the fifth consecutive week—more than a

month—that we have been considering the appropriation bill. I do not wish to make a speech, Mr. President. I pray, Members of the Senate, in the interest of good government, and with the knowledge that we are now acting on an appropriation bill, for heaven's sake and for America's sake let us vote on the bill today. It has been before us from day to day and from week to week. It is an important bill. It is the most important bill that could possibly be before us. Every department of the Government is interested in it. Every Senator is interested in it. His State is interested in it. For heaven's sake let us pass the bill and get it over with. I suppose it is not time yet, but when it gets to be around 5 or 6 o'clock I am sure someone will suggest that the bill go over, and no doubt it will go over again. I hope it will be passed today. I pray that it may be passed. I offer a prayer to each and every one of the 95 Senators: For heaven's sake let us vote on the bill and get through with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may I ask unanimous consent to have 1 minute to read a dispatch which has come over the wire?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator having an additional minute? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BRIDGES. This dispatch came over the wires within the last few seconds.

FRANKFURT, GERMANY.—A German steel mill is missing and believed to have been sent to Communist Hungary despite an Allied ban on such shipments, western authorities said today.

The authorities said they suspected the mill is only one of a growing list of items that have disappeared behind the iron curtain since the Germans were given enforcement of export controls last May 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order. The only test that has been supplied in the determination of the matter is what was stated to the Chair by the Parliamentarian, namely, the general rule is that if any additional duties are imposed on an agency of government in carrying out the provision of an amendment, it is legislation. Therefore the question is whether or not any additional duties would be imposed on an agency of government. Stated differently, the rule has been expressed this way: "It is the rule that anything carrying an affirmative, substantive change in existing law that limits the functions or jurisdictions of an executive officer so drastically as to constitute a change of policy, or that imposes upon a governmental agency new duties not imposed upon it by law, is beyond the definition of a limitation, and is therefore not in order"—meaning that it is legislation.

It seems to the Chair that the four words in the amendment "removing, destroying, restricting, or limiting," particularly the last two words, would necessarily impose additional duties on an

executive officer to determine in some manner whether or not certain nations were doing things that restricted or limited the peacetime industrial potential of western Germany. It impresses the Chair that especially the last two words could impose additional duties on the agency, and most probably would. Therefore the Chair, independent of the merits of the amendment—and this is strictly on a point of order—concludes that it is legislation.

The Chair is flattered by the fact that after the Chair had reached his conclusion, the Parliamentarian cited a precedent which had been set on October 18, 1949, at which time the same amendment had been offered. The Chair sustained the point of order. An appeal was taken from the Chair, and the Senate upheld the decision of the Chair.

The Chair holds this is legislation on an appropriation bill and, therefore, sustains the point of order made by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry, before the roll is called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has suggested the absence of a quorum. Does he withhold it?

Mr. BRIDGES. I withhold the suggestion for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the appeal debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The appeal is debatable. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will, therefore, call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Maybank
Anderson	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Hunt	Neely
Capehart	Ives	O'Connor
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kem	Russell
Darby	Kerr	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Leahy	Sparkman
Eaton	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Lodge	Taft
Ferguson	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarthy	Thye
Fulbright	McClellan	Tydings
George	McFarland	Watkins
Gillette	McKellar	Wherry
Graham	McMahon	Wiley
Green	Magnuson	Williams
Gurney	Malone	Young
Hayden	Martin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Before the vote is taken, will the Chair state the issue as it is now presented?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment was offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and a point of order was made thereon that it was legislation on an appropriation bill, the point being made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. After hearing argument, the Chair sustained the point of order and ruled that the amendment was legislation on an appropriation bill, from which decision an appeal was taken.

The question now is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate more than a minute or two. I wish to make the RECORD straight relative to some observations made by my distinguished friend from New Mexico to the effect that it was not proper to raise the issue in connection with an appropriation bill, but that it should be done in a legislative committee.

Mr. President, the question we are now considering has been raised for the past 3 years. I am not sure that the present occupant of the Chair joined with us, but 43 Senators joined with the junior Senator from Nebraska in 1948 in signing a letter, in the form of a petition, addressed to the Secretary of State, in which we referred him to a resolution, Senate Resolution 187, which contained a number of whereases setting forth why a review of plant dismantling should be had. The resolution was referred to a legislative committee. When the resolution was offered, we asked unanimous consent for its immediate consideration because we were then nearing the end of the session. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee objected, and the resolution was referred to committee, and not one thing was ever done about it.

When the junior Senator from Nebraska returned in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, one of the first things I did was to submit another resolution. At that time I did not ask to have names of cosponsors placed on the resolution because I felt it was unnecessary to do that. I submitted it simply in my own right. The resolution again contained a number of whereases and provided for an immediate review of plant dismantling. That resolution is on the calendar today. A date for considering the resolution has never been set.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Senate Resolution 187, together with the letter to the Secretary of State and the list of signers, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 187

Whereas there is abundant evidence that the dismantling of manufacturing establishments in western Germany has exceeded

prudent requirements for the prevention of rearmament of Germany; and

Whereas the economic and spiritual recovery of western Germany under a republican form of government is necessary in the interest of the industrial and agricultural recovery of all Europe; and

Whereas handicapping western Germany by the excessive dismantling of its industries and depriving it of the tools and establishments necessary for productivity is reflected in an additional tax burden upon the people of the United States for the support of German people deprived of their means of livelihood: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should cause to be convened at the earliest convenient time, preferably before the beginning of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, a conference among representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and France to review in the light of the declarations in this resolution the entire policy of dismantling German industrial establishments; and it is the further sense of the Senate that, pending completion of such conference and the official announcement of its findings, the President should request the Governments of the United Kingdom and France to join the United States of America in declaring a moratorium upon further dismantling, destruction, or removal of industrial establishments in the zones of Germany presently occupied by the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and France.

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 15, 1949.
The Honorable DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We, the undersigned Senators of the United States, beg to call to your attention the fact that on August 5 of this year we approved by unanimous vote an amendment to the 1949 ECA appropriations bill, which would make available to the ECA Administrator a certain sum of money for carrying out a new review of the German plant dismantlings.

We think that in all good faith the British Government should have ceased its program of dismantling German industry until the matter could have been reexamined, as requested by the Congress of the United States. Instead, we understand that there has been an increase in the dismantlings in the British occupation zone of Germany, as well as an increasing amount of scrapping of valuable equipment.

The solution of the dismantling question is vital to our future commitments regarding the European recovery program. We respectfully urge you to use your good offices to induce the British Government to order an immediate cessation in their occupation zone of all dismantlings of German plants, including the so-called forbidden industries, until the question can be satisfactorily reexamined, and a report of the findings made available to this Government, including Congress.

Respectfully yours,

The signers of this petition number approximately 44, and include the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the late Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the

Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPPEL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from New Mexico that it would be well to have such a provision placed in a legislative act. But apparently the only time any consideration is given to the subject of plant dismantling is when an appropriation bill is before the Senate, when those of us who are interested in the subject have an opportunity to seek to prevent appropriations to destroy plants which we are later going to ask the taxpayers of the United States to rebuild in western Germany. That is exactly what will have to be done. While we are asking for a review to be made, the dismantling continues and a plant is taken out of competition with Great Britain, and another plant is taken out of competition with France. I spoke of the Salzgitter plant.

By the way, I should like to tell the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for whom I have the highest respect, that this question has been brought before the full committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Can the Senator from Nebraska give me an instance of a plant which has been taken out of Germany because it is in competition with France?

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator wishes to have us get into a long discussion, I can call for the records. Many plants have been taken out of Germany because they were in competition with plants in other countries. One was a chemical plant. I cannot give the name now, but will send for the name.

Mr. LODGE. Was that plant taken out because it was in competition with France?

Mr. WHERRY. It was in competition with Great Britain. I will get the name of that plant. Recently Great Britain refused to consider a request to cease

dismantling a steel plant at Salzgitter. Great Britain was the country which refused to do anything about it. They sent their men to dismantle the plant and the German people in that little town protested. A request was made by the State Department that the British withhold dismantling. First the British said it was a munitions plant, and that it was one of those which had to be dismantled because of the agreement which, as Senators well know, we entered into with Great Britain and France. But the fact is that only a part of that plant made munitions of war. The British wanted that plant for many purposes of civilian production. It was then that Mr. McCloy was brought back to the United States. I do not mean that he was brought back only because of this particular dismantling, but he was asked to return to the United States, and among other subjects he discussed the dismantling of the plant. While he was here the Subcommittee on Appropriations asked him to come before the full committee, and there he gave considerable testimony about all the plant dismantling which was taking place in Germany. The committee heard Mr. McCloy, and his testimony appears in the record of the hearings before the committee. Mr. McCloy said exactly what the Senator from Massachusetts has said, with which I agree, that we are bound by certain treaties and agreements.

Mr. President, I say the proper way to act is by adopting a resolution such as one of those to which I have referred. It seems, however, we cannot secure any action on such a resolution.

Mr. McCloy said he would review the situation of dismantling of plants when he returned to Germany and that he would let us know what should be done. Mr. McCloy stopped the dismantling of the plant I referred to which could be used for civilian production. In doing so I think he performed a great service.

Of course many plants in Germany have been destroyed or dismantled. That is something which is now past history. As I said earlier in my remarks, the horse is out of the barn. The Germans are down to their last few plants. Inasmuch as it seems we can secure no action in a legislative committee, the only sensible thing to do, it seems to me, is to adopt an amendment dealing with the subject, in connection with an appropriation bill.

The junior Senator from Nebraska is not going to vote to appropriate money to help countries rehabilitate themselves, in the light of new conditions, when we now have a war on our hands, if other countries are going to continue to remove plants from Germany for their selfish gain, or if they are going to destroy completely plants which we will have to rebuild if we provide a defense for Germany militarily or industrially. I believe the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will agree that, under proper limitations, it is necessary to provide such defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Nebraska that his time has expired.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I do not seek recognition in order to speak again. I have already spoken on the appeal. But I should like to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, following my remarks, the name of the plant Bergische Stahlwerke, in Remscheid, Germany. It is a machine-tool plant in the British zone of occupation. It is not a plant which has been designated as a munitions plant. It is 97 years old, and it is now being destroyed in Germany.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I also ask for the insertion of the memorandum relating to prohibitions and restrictions on the coal chemical industry in Germany.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the memorandum will be inserted in the RECORD as requested.

The memorandum is as follows:

PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS OF THE COAL CHEMICAL INDUSTRY

I. GENERAL REMARKS

The provisions of the Washington agreement of April 1949 have most seriously affected two important processes of the German coal chemistry—the high pressure hydrogenation and the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis.

By neither of these two processes has any war material been produced. The plants that have used these processes do not represent a war potential in the actual sense of the word. Hydrocarbons in general and particularly liquid fuels are indispensable to a modern national economy with a normal standard of living. Prohibitions and restrictions in this field, therefore, cannot but have an extremely adverse effect on economic development.

Though, in the following, we request that greater liberties be granted in the carrying out of high-pressure hydrogenation and of the Fischer-Tropsch process, we are fully aware that due account must be taken on the allied side of the demand for military security. In recognition of this fact, the German plants will not undertake anything that might constitute a violation of the disarmament provisions or of the orders of the Military Security Office.

II. HYDROGENATION

Under the Washington agreement, the direct or indirect production of petrol, oil, and lubricants from coal or brown coal by the Bergius hydrogenation process is forbidden. It was determined that of the four hydrogenation plants now existing in western Germany three were to be destroyed or to be removed from Germany.

Only the Wesseling plant was exempted from these provisions and given a permit to process oil residues by hydrogenation.

Pursuant to the Petersberg agreement of November 1949, dismantling of the three hydrogenation plants was stopped. One of them, the Gelsenberg Benzin A. G., that was in operation already from March to August 1949, received an authorization in February 1950 to process crude oil by distillation and hydrogenation.

Now that the fundamental objections of the Allies in respect to hydrogenation plants have evidently been removed, the German side would like to submit the following requests:

1. It should be left to the German Federal Government to determine to what extent the hydrogenation plants should be employed in the processing of mineral oil.

2. The processing of products of the carbonization by high and low temperature of

coal and brown coal (tar and tar oils) in the hydrogenation plants is still prohibited. A lifting of these prohibitions would place the German hydrogenation works in a position to process some 200,000 tons of these products into petrol and Diesel oil every year, thus effecting an annual saving of at least \$5,000,000 in foreign exchange.

These wishes are principally backed by the fact that hydrogenation involves a process that has been developed in Germany herself and that the resumption of work at the hydrogenation plants would provide employment for some 3,000 to 5,000 workers.

In recognition of the importance of the hydrogenation process, several experimental plants have been erected in recent years in the United States of America (e. g., the plant of the Bureau of Mines in Louisiana and Missouri), in which coal is processed into petrol and Diesel oil.

III. FISCHER-TROPSCH SYNTHESIS

Under the Washington agreement of April 1949, the direct or indirect production of petrol, oil, and lubricants from coal or brown coal by the Fischer-Tropsch process is prohibited.

Pursuant to the Petersberg agreement of November 1949, all six Fischer-Tropsch plants in western Germany were removed from the dismantling list. The fundamental prohibition of the Fischer-Tropsch process, however, was not lifted and in consequence, the two Fischer-Tropsch plants in operation—Krupp and Victor—were forced to close down on December 31, 1949.

In German opinion, it is not the meaning of the Petersberg agreement that the plants saved from dismantling should remain idle and be allowed to rust. Accordingly, three Fischer-Tropsch works submitted proposals for a switch-over of production which are at present awaiting examination by an Inter-Allied and German committee of experts.

Without prejudice to the result of this examination and to any subsequent decision of the Military Security Board it must again be emphasized that the Fischer-Tropsch process has no war potential.

We trust, therefore, that the fundamental prohibition of the Fischer-Tropsch process will be reexamined at the earliest possible date, so that the German economy may be freed of any restrictions in respect of this branch of manufacture.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I want to say that this matter has been debated many times in the last 3 years. It has been conclusively shown that the United States taxpayers have been forced into a position of paying the reparations to the European nations which are being exacted from Germany by our former allies the European nations, including Russia. Various plants are continually being dismantled and transferred not only to England and France, but to Russia. The United States taxpayers are the ones who are supporting Germany, and paying the reparations exacted by our erstwhile allies from a beaten foe.

Mr. President, other amendments of a similar nature to the one before us have been offered and debated and voted upon, without any question being raised concerning them. I cite as an example, the amendment providing that no money should be given to nations who had trade treaties with Russia and with the iron-curtain countries under which they were furnishing goods to those countries which would arm them for the third world war, or give them assistance in consolidating their gains in eastern Ger-

many or in China. That amendment was debated at some length and voted on without any question being raised against it.

The Senator from Nevada offered a joint resolution on January 24 which would do the same thing. That joint resolution has been buried in a democratically controlled committee ever since. As the Senator from Nebraska has said the only way we can get action, or even debate such an amendment is to bring it up in connection with some measure which is under consideration on the floor.

Mr. President, the Morgenthau plan has continually been carried on in Germany. Operations under that plan have not slacked up appreciably, in spite of all the debates that have been had about it on the Senate floor for 3 years.

The junior Senator from Nevada visited Germany in 1947, in November and December. He visited the Ruhr. He went into steel mills and into chemical plants in Germany in the Ruhr and in Frankfurt. He visited steel mills and coal mines in the Ruhr. I do not now have time to repeat what has already been said on the Senate floor in that connection. But I want to say to the junior Senator from Massachusetts that many plants can be named, and have been named on the Senate floor of the chemical plants in Germany in which, at the instigation of the British, a change over was made from coal to oil-burning furnaces.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. My question was directed to whether an industry was taken out of Germany because of competition with France. I have the impression that that has not been done.

Mr. MALONE. These plants were changed from coal burning to oil burning. The British furnished the oil, since there was no oil in Germany. It cost much more to manufacture the chemicals by using oil-burning furnaces, after they were installed, because of the distance that the oil must be transported, while coal was available under their feet in Germany. There was no other source of oil than from the British source, so the industry became controlled by the British, and became an additional market for oil.

Mr. President, I could continue along this line, as I have on the Senate floor, at length, but no one seems very much excited about a plan to wreck German industry and make them permanent star boarders of ours.

The fact remains that Germany can produce only 40 or 45 percent of her food needs. Never in her history could Germany supply all her food needs. Germany must manufacture something to sell in order to buy the necessary food; otherwise we must support her. The only chance there ever is to debate any such a subject as this is on the Senate floor in connection with a current bill.

That has been done before in exactly the same manner as the present occupant of the Chair has now ruled is out of order.

All resolutions or bills proceeding in the regular manner remain buried in the Democratically controlled committees.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and ask permission to make a motion to suspend the rule, so the question may be voted on immediately under suspension of the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire requests unanimous consent that he may withdraw his appeal from the decision of the Chair, and also that he be permitted to offer, for immediate consideration, a motion that the rule be suspended.

Is there objection?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that if I knew just what was meant by the text of the Senator's amendment, I might not object. However, until I understand the amendment better, I do not know whether it is worth while for us to go through the procedures proposed, because it seems to me that the amendment is very vague and indefinite.

For instance, the amendment contains the words "the peacetime industrial potential of western Germany." I do not know just what that means.

Mr. BRIDGES. It means the industrial capacity of the plants which were in western Germany. We are talking, in effect, about western Germany and the three zones there, occupied, respectively, by the United States, Great Britain, and France. The amendment refers to the peacetime potential of those zones, which is a certain amount.

Of course, we started with the Morgenthau plan, so-called, and then we had subsequent variations of it, whereby certain of those plants were used for reparations to friendly countries and also to Russia and the satellite countries.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand that; but all those dealings are with certain definite plants or manufacturing establishments. However, the expression "peacetime industrial potential" is so vague and indefinite that I do not understand what it means.

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, we now have set up in Germany what we believe is a schedule of peacetime potential, a schedule of what is necessary for Germany.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator from New Hampshire would say that the items included in a certain schedule are to be affected, that would be different. However, the term "potential" means almost anything; it means something which could happen at some time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I call for the regular order. Has the Senator from New Hampshire submitted a motion? If he has, I am going to object when the opportunity is afforded. I call

for the regular order, because I think we might as well proceed in that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is requested.

The unanimous-consent request now pending is that the Senator from New Hampshire be permitted to withdraw his appeal from the decision of the Chair, and also be permitted to file a motion for suspension of the rule, so that the amendment may be immediately considered.

Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well, Mr. President, let us proceed with the appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the decision of the Senate?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I do not believe any Member of the Senate today doubts the seriousness of the situation in Korea. All of us pray in our hearts that we will win, but none of us is sure that we will not be driven from that peninsula. The events leading up to that situation I think are attributable to bad leadership and stupidity and certainly to bad management. The Communists in all of Asia used the industrial plants they took over to manufacture war equipment for their armies of aggression. They have trained in the newest techniques of warfare the Communists in that wide area; and now our forces are battling those Communists.

Mr. President, the policy we are following today in Germany is somewhat similar to the policy we have followed in Korea. Certainly the day may come when we may be facing an attack in Germany or some other area on the perimeter of Russia.

So it seems to me it is time that we quit this foolish business, and face the realities of the situation. We should be using the German industrial plants for the manufacture of the things Europe needs for her recovery. If we need bridges in Korea—and we shall be rebuilding those bridges soon, as our forces march back in Korea—we should be manufacturing them in Japan today. We may need the plants in Germany for similar purposes.

In my opinion, we could just as well be manufacturing some of the war equipment in Germany and in western Europe, whereas now we are endeavoring to manufacture that equipment in the United States, and thus are taxing our own economy unnecessarily.

It seems to me stupid to continue our present policy of dismantling of those plants, and thus further handicap the entire recovery of Europe.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of any Member of the Senate who can answer it. Would the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire have the effect of violating any agree-

ment which the United States has with any of our World War II allies? I ask that question of any Senator who can answer it, for I think the point is important.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there are some agreements between the United States and other countries with regard to dismantling. So there would have to be some negotiations, or else whoever administered the amendment would be put in a difficult position, and perhaps would find himself acting in the face of an agreement which we may have with England or with France.

I wish to make it clear that for 3 years I have been in favor of stopping the dismantling; but I do not think we can attain that objective by the means here proposed.

In the first place, I think the Chair is correct in ruling that the amendment constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

Furthermore, I do not think we can call upon the ECA to act as a policeman in connection with this policy. The matter should have been handled in a different way, we should call upon our allies to change the policy.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from New Jersey think the amendment would violate an agreement with England or with France?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No, I do not think this particular amendment would do so; but I think it would put the person who was charged with administration of the amendment in a position of holding off assistance under the ECA Act, for example, to countries with whom we are in agreement in regard to how the dismantling should be done.

However, I understand that practically all the dismantling by England and France, in particular, and possibly by Belgium, is near completion—although I am receiving letters from persons who have been shocked, as I was when I was there, by the continuation of the dismantling, when there is need to restore production in Germany.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from New Jersey think there is any likelihood of attaining this objective in the near future, by any other means?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Does the Senator mean by any means other than this amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. Does the Senator from New Jersey think England and France will agree to stop the dismantling immediately?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I cannot answer that question, for I do not know.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to find out whether any Member of the Senate does know. I should like to ascertain the situation in that respect.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it seems to me that there is a tendency, which perhaps is very natural in connection with a matter of this kind, to go into the merits of the proposal, rather than to deal with the point at issue.

This is simply an appeal from a ruling of the Chair on a point of order; and the question presented to us, as I see it, is not at all whether there is merit in the view of the Senator from New Hampshire in regard to the facts of the case, but the sole question is whether the Presiding Officer of the Senate was correct in his decision and in his statement of the rule covering this particular amendment.

It would appear to me that the point of order was correctly decided by the Presiding Officer. In making that statement, I am not expressing myself in regard to the merits of the proposal—in other words, in regard to the question of whether there should or should not be a cessation of the delivery of ECA funds to nations which are engaged in the destruction of the industrial potential of Germany. I have a great deal of sympathy with the position set forth by the Senator from New Hampshire, the Senator from Nebraska, and other Senators, and I can well realize the merits of that position.

However, what is the fact as to whether the ruling of the Chair on the question presented to him was correct? The Chair was presented with a question of whether this amendment is legislation or whether it is a limitation upon the use of funds proposed to be appropriated.

Mr. President, what is the amendment? It is clearly one which restricts by a certain provision the recipients of participation under the ECA. Entirely independent of the reason which was assigned by the Chair, I take the view that the Chair's ruling was correct. The provision in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, in section 111 (a), is that—

The Administrator may, from time to time, furnish assistance to any participating country—

Mr. President, what is a participating country? My time limitation is such that I cannot read it, but I ask at this point to have set forth in the Record section 103 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act, also sections 102 (a) and 102 (b) of the Economic Cooperation Act, plus the opening paragraph of Public Law 47 of the Eighty-first Congress, and also section 102, in its entirety, of title I of Public Law 535 of the Eighty-first Congress.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 102. (a) Recognizing the intimate economic and other relationships between the United States and the nations of Europe, and recognizing that disruption following in the wake of war is not contained by national frontiers, the Congress finds that the existing situation in Europe endangers the establishment of a lasting peace, the general welfare and national interest of the United States, and the attainment of the objectives of the United Nations. The restoration or maintenance in European countries of principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence rests largely upon the establishment of sound economic conditions, stable international economic relationships, and the achievement

by the countries of Europe of a healthy economy independent of extraordinary outside assistance. The accomplishment of these objectives calls for a plan of European recovery, open to all such nations which cooperate in such plan, based upon a strong production effort, the expansion of foreign trade, the creation and maintenance of internal financial stability, and the development of economic cooperation, including all possible steps to establish and maintain equitable rates of exchange and to bring about the progressive elimination of trade barriers. Mindful of the advantages which the United States has enjoyed through the existence of a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers, and believing that similar advantages can accrue to the countries of Europe, it is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage these countries through a joint organization to exert sustained common efforts as set forth in the report of the Committee of European Economic Cooperation signed at Paris on September 22, 1947, which will speedily achieve that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity. It is further declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in Europe through assistance to those countries of Europe which participate in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation: *Provided*, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States. It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that continuity of assistance provided by the United States should, at all times, be dependent upon continuity of cooperation among countries participating in the program.

PURPOSES OF TITLE

(b) It is the purpose of this title to effectuate the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section by furnishing material and financial assistance to the participating countries in such a manner as to aid them, through their own individual and concerted efforts, to become independent of extraordinary outside economic assistance within the period of operations under this title, by—

- (1) promoting industrial and agricultural production in the participating countries;
- (2) furthering the restoration or maintenance of the soundness of European currencies, budgets, and finances; and
- (3) facilitating and stimulating the growth of international trade of participating countries with one another and with other countries by appropriate measures including reduction of barriers which may hamper such trade.

PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES

SEC. 103. (a) As used in this title, the term "participating country" means—

- (1) any country together with dependent areas under its administration, which signed the report of the Committee of European Economic Cooperation at Paris on September 22, 1947; and
- (2) any other country (including any of the zones of occupation of Germany, any areas under international administration or control, and the Free Territory of Trieste or either of its zones) wholly or partly in Europe, together with dependent areas under its administration; provided such country adheres to, and for so long as it remains an adherent to, a joint program for European recovery designed to accomplish the purposes of this title.

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth and fifth sentences of section 102 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 are hereby amended to read as follows: "Mindful of the advantages which the United States has enjoyed through the existence of a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers, and believing that similar advantages can accrue to the countries of Europe, it is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage these countries through their joint organization to exert sustained common efforts to achieve speedily that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity. It is further declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the unification of Europe, and to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in Europe through assistance to those countries of Europe which participate in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation: *Provided*, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 102. (a) Section 102 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, is amended by striking out in the fourth sentence thereof "trade barriers" and inserting in lieu thereof "barriers to trade or to the free movement of persons"; and by inserting in the fifth sentence thereof the word "further" before the word "unification".

(b) Section 102 (b) (1) of such act is amended by inserting a comma and the phrase "increased productivity, maximum employment, and freedom from restrictive business practices" after the word "production."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the law itself says that the Administrator may furnish assistance to any participating country. The definition of "participating country" as set forth in the law is not, as I see it, the definition which is set forth in the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire. Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that clearly this amendment undertakes to change the law. If it is a change in law, it is legislation, it is not a mere limitation upon the use of funds.

Therefore, Mr. President, without at all going into the merits of the matter—that is, the merits of whether there should be destruction or dismantling of property, whether countries which are participating in it should or should not be deprived of the use of ECA funds—I submit that, upon the legal proposition which has been decided by the Chair, and which is the only proposition before the Senate at this time, the Chair was right and that the appeal should not be sustained.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Missouri upon the position he has taken in this matter. The rules of the Senate have been adopted for the purpose of securing orderly procedure, and for the reason that it has been found necessary to have rules. I am in sympathy with the objectives of the Senator from New Hampshire, sought by this amendment, but I do not think the matter should be handled in

this fashion. If we are to overrule the Chair and thereby disregard the rules of the Senate we may as well throw them out the window—and we know just about how we would get along without rules. So I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri for the remarks he has made. I think they are timely. I hope that the decision of the Chair will be sustained.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Paraphrasing the Holy Scriptures, would the Senator from Arizona say that the Senate was made for rules, or that rules were made for the Senate?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator may answer that question for himself.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. Last evening we approved an amendment proposed by about 30 Senators which carried a 10 percent overall cut with certain exceptions. A question has arisen in my mind today in regard to the effect of this amendment on the Coast Guard. Not only am I concerned about the appropriations for the Coast Guard, as a part of our national defense, but I am certain the House subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office is likewise concerned about it. I believe it was the intention of the Senator from New Hampshire that the Coast Guard appropriations would not be included in the amendment. I should like to have the RECORD show the position of the Senator from New Hampshire in regard to the appropriations for the Coast Guard, in connection with the 10 percent cut.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am getting a copy of the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was exempted in the original amendment, if I remember correctly.

Mr. BRIDGES. By page 4 of the amendment, the Coast Guard, in time of war, is considered to be a part of or may be transferred to the Defense Department.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is not a question concerning a time of war.

Mr. BRIDGES. I point out that, on page 4, starting in line 10, listing the exemptions, it says: "or the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of crimes against the criminal laws of the United States."

In respect to the Coast Guard, there may be some question such as the Senator raises about the interpretation, but in normal times, that is the function, or at least a part of the function, of the Coast Guard, is it not?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. I wanted the RECORD to be clear, before the bill goes to conference, so

that there may be no doubt in the minds of Senators, who perhaps might agree with the Senator from New Hampshire and myself, that certainly at this time this amendment should not affect the Coast Guard.

Mr. BRIDGES. In answer to the Senator, I may say that if the emergency becomes greater, the Coast Guard will be put automatically on the same basis as the Navy, as was the case in previous wars. That would automatically follow as to all branches of the national defense. But in peacetime certainly a part of the Coast Guard would be exempted. The only part of it not included in the exemption might be the rescue service, as to which we could probably work out an agreement in conference—could we not? The intention was to exempt that part of the Coast Guard from the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, as the distinguished Senator says, we are not at war. The question as it relates to the Coast Guard, is under the House Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office. If the Senator believes it is appropriate language and will be helpful in the conference, I believe we can work it out. I should like to have some expression from the Senate, because there is considerable confusion, I may say, at the present time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely make this suggestion in order that there may be no misunderstanding about the effect of the bill (H. R. 7786) so far as the Coast Guard is concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this time, a motion by the Senator from South Carolina substantially along the line indicated, could only be handled by unanimous consent.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask unanimous consent.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to ask a question and get an answer. The inquiry is: Did the Thomas-Taber amendment except the Coast Guard? I am concerned with that answer, because if it did not, there is a grave question as to whether we can take care of the matter in a conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is what I hoped could be done.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may point out that under the basic law—and this is one of the principal things under consideration here—the Coast Guard is considered at all times to be a basic part of the national defense system of the country. That was written into the unification bill in 1948, I think. We have proceeded on the assumption that the Coast Guard is exempted from this cut.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also true—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the Coast Guard be

exempted from the operation of the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. BRIDGES. Reserving the right to object, based on the basic military law of the country, plus the sections which I quoted in order to clarify the situation so that there would be no mistake, so far as I am concerned, I would have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall not yield if it comes out of my time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, was the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from South Carolina agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in view of the short time I have in which to speak, I assume that the interruption will not come out of my 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be understood.

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] that I very much dislike taking even 5 minutes from the discussion of the appropriation bill in order to say what I wish to say at this time. However, next week I hope to present considerable documentary evidence on the question of disloyalty in the State Department. I think that before that evidence is submitted this matter should be brought to the attention of the Senate.

I have before me, Mr. President, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20, on which date the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] addressed the Senate. I might say that I sent word to the Senator from Maryland to be here, advising him that I was going to discuss a matter which concerned him personally. I am sorry he did not see fit to come.

Let me say, first, that during the course of the investigation there has been considerable dispute as to whether, in Wheeling, W. Va., I said there were 57 or 205 Communists in the State Department. Normally, it might not be considered too important as to which figure was used. However, those figures have been made of great importance by the chairman of the subcommittee and by the majority members of the subcommittee.

I have said that I sent the President a telegram calling attention to the fact that I had a list of 57 Communists. I have also called attention to the fact that there was a spy ring extending deep into the State Department, and that a complete investigation of Amerasia would furnish part of the key to that ring. I also have quoted from a letter from former Secretary Byrnes, dated July 26, 1946, in which he pointed out that 284 individuals in the State Department at that time were bad security risks, and that 79 of them were dis-

charged, leaving 205. I have stated that all of this information was known to Secretary Acheson for the reason that complete FBI reports on all of these individuals are available to him.

Following the day on which I made the speech in Wheeling, W. Va., I sent a telegram to the President in which I asked him to get the names of the additional 205 persons whom former Secretary Byrnes had named. So the figure 205 has been used in connection with the letter of the former Secretary of State, and the figure 57 has been used in connection with the names I personally had, which names were given to the Tydings-McMahon committee as well as additional names in which the evidence was not strong enough to list them as part of the 57, but nevertheless unfit for sensitive Government jobs. This made a total of 81 on July 20. The Senator from Maryland told the Senate that the junior Senator from Wisconsin had said in West Virginia that he had the names of 205 Communists and then went on to say, and I quote:

Mr. President, I wonder if I can get unanimous consent to play a radio recording of the Senator's own voice. I am not asking Senators to take my word, but to hear the Senator's own voice. He says he has not made this statement.

In other words, the statement of 205. Later on, on the same page, the Senator said:

They have gone from 205, in Wheeling, down to 57.

The Senator from Maryland complained about the lack of newspaper coverage his talk would get—well this statement of Senator Tydings got coverage. The press apparently understood the Senator from Maryland. I have before me a copy of the Washington edition of the Daily Worker, the Washington Post, from which I quote:

All the apparatus was in place. Tydings was about to let the Senators hear the Wisconsin Republican's own voice charging there were 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department. McCARTHY had made the claim in a broadcast over Station WWVA at Wheeling, W. Va. last February.

I have before me a copy of the Milwaukee Journal of July 6, 1950, in which it is said:

Tydings said he had a phonograph recording of the West Virginia speech to prove McCARTHY lied, but was not permitted to play it on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, it is very important, I think, to determine whether the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from Maryland lied. That one of them lied is obvious. Either the Senator from Wisconsin was lying when he said that he used the figure 57, or the Senator from Maryland was lying when he said, "I have here a recording of McCARTHY's voice which will prove he was lying."

While this question may not in itself be very important, I think it is important to have a decision on the matter, once and for all, so that the Senate and the country can better evaluate the report of the majority members of the subcommittee, and other statements made

by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings].

I do not know how the Senate can force the Senator from Maryland to play that recording; I do not know how it can call his bluff. This is one time when the press can perform a service to the country and to the Senate. Members of the press can go to the office of the Senator from Maryland and say, "Mr. Lard, let us hear that recording. Let us hear the voice of McCARTHY using the figure 205." Let the press say to the Senator from Maryland, "Show us where McCARTHY used the figure 205, 206, or 207 in any place except in connection with the letter of former Secretary of State Byrnes."

I have stated on the floor of the Senate a number of times that I have only used the figure 205 in connection with Secretary Byrnes' letter. That figure was in the wire to the President the day after I spoke at Wheeling. I said, "I do not have the names of those 205. I do know the names of 57."

As I have said, whether it is 205 or 57 may not be important in itself, but it becomes important when the Senator from Maryland says McCARTHY has perpetrated a fraud on the Senate in saying he used the figure 57 when he actually used the figure 205. It is now important to know whether the Senator from Maryland may not have been practicing a fraud when he stated he had a recording of my speech which would prove that the Senator from Wisconsin had lied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator that he has spoken more than 5 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to force the Senator from Maryland to play the recording so that we may know whether the Senator from Maryland or the Senator from Wisconsin deliberately lied. It is a very simple matter to find who spoke falsely.

It is a rather a serious matter to tell the Senate and the country that you have a recording to prove another Senator lied and then lack the honesty to play the recording.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6454) to authorize the appointment of two additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 99) relating to the reenrollment of the bill (S. 1654) for the relief of Kyra Kite Riddle.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2160. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize annual and sick leave with pay for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, to authorize the

payment of accumulated and accrued annual leave in excess of 60 days, and for other purposes;

S. 2591. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in matters relating to arthritis and rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, poliomyelitis, leprosy, and other diseases; and

S. 2863. An act to provide for the expansion and disposition of certain national cemeteries.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for the yeas and nays and to submit the question to a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the request of the Senator from New Hampshire is withdrawn.

The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seems to have it; the "ayes" have it, and the ruling of the Chair is sustained.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 325, line 17, to strike out "\$63,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$12,500,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Members of the Senate to turn to pages 325 and 323 of the appropriation bill. It will be recalled that last week I sought to decrease the authorization on page 326 from \$64,875,000 to a much smaller figure. I did this because, as the Members of the Senate will see, the House originally provided for an appropriation of \$63,000,000 for new ship construction, and the Senate Committee on Appropriations added an additional \$64,875,000 in extended authority making a total of nearly \$128,000,000. I pointed out that this global sum of \$128,000,000 was more than \$40,000,000 in excess of the amount which the Administrator, Mr. Koehler, stated it was possible for the Maritime Administration to obligate during the coming year. I also pointed out that the effect of the two provisions taken together would be to give the Maritime body a blank check for approximately \$50,000,000 more than they had present commitments or could possibly have commitments for during the current year.

I was then told by eminent Senators that I should have presented my amendment, not to the authorization of nearly \$65,000,000, which the Senate committee had made, but instead to the \$63,000,000, which the House had provided. It was implied at least by some Senators that the point which I had made was correct, but that I had located the pea under the wrong shell. I was told that what I should do was to put the pea under the shell on page 325. It was partially as a result of that point, which was made by the distinguished senior Sen-

ator from Wyoming, that by a close vote the Senate rejected my attempt to cut nearly \$50,000,000 from the authorization on page 326.

Therefore I now come to the shell on page 325. I hope it will not be said now that the pea should be located on page 326. I hope we are not in a legislative shell game, in which the patron of the game, no matter where he turns, is told that the pea should be located on page hope we can now locate the pea on page 325.

I should like to point out, Mr. President, that the original provision for \$63,000,000 was inserted, according to the signed statement of Mr. Koehler, in the belief that the Maritime Administration would provide new luxury ships as substitutes for the old ships in the good-neighbor fleet, operated by the Moore-McCormick Line, and that it had developed they could not provide the ships nor sign the contracts within the coming year. Therefore the original reason for the appropriation of \$63,000,000 has disappeared.

Mr. President, additional claims for construction are now being put in to take the place of the "good-neighbor fleet." However, if they are analyzed, they seem to consist of four items, namely, the Pacific Coast Steamship Co., for trailer ships, amounting to \$22,000,000; the Arnold Bernstein Line, for converting troop ships into merchant ships, \$9,500,000; construction of Navy prototype ships, \$10,000,000; the design of prototype ships, \$2,500,000. That makes a total of \$125,000,000 for these last two items. If we take all four items together they amount to \$44,000,000, and not \$63,000,000. If we analyze the four programs which the Administrator says are the only ones which can possibly be constructed, work started on, or contracts let for during the coming year, we find that the Pacific Coast trailer ship proposal of \$22,000,000 has already been included in the \$64,875,000 item on page 326. We should not have the same pea under both shells. If it is on page 326, under the allowance for \$64,875,000, it should not also be included in the \$63,000,000 appropriation. Therefore \$44,000,000 is reduced by \$22,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Illinois that his time has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois that he be permitted to speak for an additional 2 minutes? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to finish on my own time. After I have concluded my remarks, if the Senate will grant me additional time, I shall be glad to reply to the questions of the Senator from Michigan.

I submit that the Arnold Bernstein Line item is strictly contrary to our interests, because it represents a conver-

sion of troop ships into merchant ships. We do not want to decrease our troop-carrying capacity in order to increase merchant-ship capacity. The proposal was made prior to the Korean difficulty. It may have been perfectly proper then; certainly it is not proper now. I submit that the project is not needed in the coming year. It would weaken rather than strengthen our national defense. Therefore, we have left only \$12,500,000 of construction which is really needed or possible. That is the reason why I have moved that the \$63,000,000 be written down to \$12,500,000, or a saving of \$50,500,000.

Mr. President, it seems to me that for these reasons the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, unfortunately I was not present and I did not hear all that the Senator from Illinois said with reference to this maritime matter. I think perhaps I can clear up a little of the misunderstanding which may be involved in this subject. First, with reference to the Arnold Bernstein proposal, with which I am quite familiar, there has been for a long time a lack of passenger space to Europe. I refer to passenger space which would carry not only DP's from Europe, but ECA supplies and military supplies, for example, for the Marshall plan and the rehabilitation of Europe.

Two troop ships are involved. I believe they are the *General Meigs*—

Mr. DOUGLAS. The *General Weigel* and the *General Pope*.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The *General Weigel* and the *General Pope*. They are on the Pacific coast, where they are slowly deteriorating. These ships are in need of repair. I tried to get some ship-repair money appropriated yesterday, but I did not succeed. Therefore the Arnold Bernstein Co. conceived the idea of taking the ships and converting them. The conversion would be only in the nature of putting in partitions so that cabins could be provided. They would still be available as troop-carrying ships. Under no circumstances would they be converted so they could not be used to carry troops. They would be even better as troop-carrying ships than in their present condition, and they would be better troop-carrying ships than those used in World War II, because they would be similar to the troop ships I have been on, which are the cafeteria style of ship, and I believe they would be able to carry even more troops after they were converted in the way I indicated.

I do not know what the controversy is about with respect to the money involved, but I am certain that the new Maritime Board, which will be appointed by the President this week, the Chairman having been appointed, after the Maritime Commission had been abolished, would surely have first on their agenda any proposal which might take away from us troop-carrying ships. I hope that the Senator from Illinois will let the Committee on Appropriations amount go to conference. In the meantime I can almost assure the Senator

from Illinois that a decision will be made on these matters that involve the question of troop-carrying ships.

The Navy, which now has consolidated all military transport, and the Maritime Board have been working in close conjunction. As a matter of fact, the temporary Chairman, Mr. Taylor, is the Assistant Secretary of the Navy in charge of what we call Navy transport. I am sure, first, that the proper agency is looking into this matter; and second, although I do not know what the amount is, there has been a kind of novel proposal before the Board which has stirred the interest and the attention of many people in the shipping business, namely, the proposal to build a kind of truck-carrying ship.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, that item is already included in the estimates which furnish the basis for the \$64,875,000 contract authorization on page 326. My objection is that we should not count it twice, on page 326 and also on page 325. It is very hard to nail these peas down. They dance around. That pea was located on page 326. Do not let it also show up on page 325.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may I have three more minutes on this matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator having three more minutes? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact, I do not know where the peas are, but I am sure there is no objection—and I do know a little about this maritime question—to the two peas being abolished altogether in this case. It is a novel scheme to do something which has no place in wartime.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I correct in my understanding of the remarks of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that the construction of the two luxury liners proposed to be constructed for the Moore-MacCormack Lines will not be undertaken this year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That I do not know, but there are six liners under construction in the United States at the present time. The designs and purposes of those liners have been gone over by the Department of Defense, with the idea of making them easy to use in time of war. As a matter of fact, some of the funds for that construction have been furnished by the Department of Defense, so that these ships can be so equipped as to be easily converted in time of war. The lack of passenger ships has been notorious in the last few years.

Mr. AIKEN. Construction has not been started on those two ships, has it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think it has. I believe the Senator is correct. But the construction has started in the case of two American President Line ships. If Senators will listen, I think I can give some information on this

matter. Construction has started on the two President Line ships. The ships of the American Export Line—the *Constitution* and *Independence*—are well on their way, and will be valuable in time of war or time of peace. The big United States liner is not quite so far along, but it will be valuable also in time of war and peace.

A great deal of money from the Defense Department is involved in this matter, the ships are easily convertible, and I think it is vital that construction should go forward on these passenger ships for use both in time of war and in time of peace. They will be needed in both periods. We are tremendously short of passenger space to be used for troops even in peacetime operations. I merely desired to inject this information into the consideration of the bill.

For years I have known a man by the name of H. F. Alexander, who wants to have some sort of a maritime truck line between Los Angeles and San Francisco. I think that could be cut out of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the item disappears from page 326, there is no reason why it should appear on page 325.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would just as soon—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the Senator's time has expired.

WAR RISK AND MARINE LIABILITY INSURANCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may I submit a unanimous-consent request while I am on my feet? It will save time. I would just have to take the floor again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Calendar No. 1834, Senate bill 2484, is a bill to provide war-risk and certain marine liability insurance. There was objection to the bill on the last call of the calendar. It is a very important bill, which must be passed on by the Congress within the next week in order to make certain there will be insurance on ships now plying the waters of the world. I ask unanimous consent that, along with three other bills which have been agreed upon, this bill be placed at the foot of the calendar, so that the next time the calendar is called there may be discussion of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the calendar on Tuesday next will include all bills.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I think it is important that the Senate proceed according to the unanimous consent agreement, and that we vote on the amendments as they are reached. If every Senator asks for extra time, we will be here indefinitely tonight. The question now under consideration, that is, appropriating funds adequate for a strong merchant marine, was debated in detail and at length, and now the Senator from Illinois comes forward with another amendment. I hope it will be voted down, and that we can proceed with something which has not been discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is enforcing the rule. All a Sen-

ator has to do is to object to any unanimous consent request submitted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hayden	Malone
Anderson	Hendrickson	Martin
Bricker	Hill	Maybank
Bridges	Hoey	Millikin
Butler	Holland	Morse
Byrd	Humphrey	Mundt
Capehart	Hunt	Murray
Chapman	Ives	O'Connor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Darby	Kem	Russell
Donnell	Kerr	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eaton	Leahy	Sparkman
Ellender	Lehman	Stennis
Ferguson	Lodge	Taft
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarran	Thye
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tydings
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Graham	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, on page 325, line 17, to strike out \$63,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$12,500,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

On a show of hands the yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask that Senators desiring the yeas and nays be permitted to rise and be counted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators favoring the yeas and nays will please rise. A sufficient number have indicated a desire for the yeas and nays, and the clerk will therefore call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KILGORE (when Mr. NEELY's name was called). My colleague, the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS], are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote

"nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—31

Alken	Holland	Schoeppel
Bricker	Humphrey	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Hunt	Stennis
Capehart	Ives	Taft
Douglas	Kem	Watkins
Dworshak	Langer	Wherry
Ferguson	Lehman	Wiley
Flanders	Lucas	Williams
Fulbright	McCarthy	Young
Graham	Malone	
Hendrickson	Martin	

NAYS—49

Anderson	Hill	Millikin
Butler	Hoey	Morse
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Cordon	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Darby	Kilgore	Pepper
Donnell	Knowland	Robertson
Eastland	Leahy	Russell
Ecton	Lodge	Saltonstall
Ellender	McCarran	Smith, N. J.
Frear	McClellan	Sparkman
George	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	McKellar	Thye
Green	McMahon	Tydings
Gurney	Magnuson	
Hayden	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—16

Benton	Jenner	Thomas, Okla.
Brewster	Kefauver	Tobey
Byrd	Long	Vandenberg
Cain	Myers	Withers
Downey	Neely	
Hickenlooper	Taylor	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I call up the amendment which I have at the desk, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. . Not more than 95 percent of the funds appropriated or reappropriated by this act to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall be available for expenditure or obligation during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, yesterday by a vote of 55 to 31, the Senate reduced by 10 percent the expenditures to be made here at home for most of the nonwar purposes. Before that, amendment was voted upon an

amendment offered by the able Senator from New Jersey to exempt ECA from that cut was approved by a vote of 45 to 40. Mr. President, we are in this position: We have made sacrifices here at home in connection with various vital and important programs, programs which are constructive in character, programs involving projects that are badly needed, and projects which, if and when constructed, would add materially to the economic strength of this Nation.

In the ECA program there are many similar projects, which are of no more importance to the rehabilitation of Europe and particularly of the participating countries than are these projects here at home to the expanding economy and needs of our own domestic program.

Mr. President, we are in the position here now of having made a sacrifice, of having called upon our people to make a sacrifice, of having called upon the Government, in exacting a sacrifice from it in the normal programs which we would carry out; yet, the vote yesterday indicated we are unwilling to make the same cut in substantially the same program abroad.

The purpose of this amendment is to give the Senate one more chance to say whether it will make any cut whatever in the program abroad. This amendment simply would reduce it 5 percent. Are Senators willing to go along with that, or do we want to let the record stand and the bill be enacted into law in its present inequitable condition, with a 10-percent reduction in our country, with our people making all the sacrifice in the war effort, and not exacting the same sacrifice on the part of others whom we are undertaking to assist?

Mr. President, I cannot feel that I have done my duty in the position I occupy, my duty to my country and to my people and to the taxpayers of this Nation, if I vote to appropriate money abroad in this time of crisis for projects of the same character as those that we are curtailing at home. This will save about \$135,000,000. Is that too much to ask? Is that too great a sacrifice to call upon the European countries to make? Is that going to wreck the war program? Is that going to wreck a reconstruction program? No, it will not. But in the course of the days ahead, which may be very dark and trying, not only for this Nation but for all the people of the world, we had better be a bit conservative, notwithstanding how worthy a program might be. Mr. President, we had better begin now—that is the purpose of this amendment, to begin now—to make some cuts where they can be made and where they will do equity and justice to the people of this Nation.

It is in our own self-interest to do this. We owe it to ourselves to do it. We owe it to those people over there who may need weapons more than they are going to need a pig trail down in Siberia or somewhere else before this war is over. We had better begin conserving and concentrating where our power is most needed. I hope the Senate will accept this amendment and will let us make

this very small cut in this program abroad.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I dislike to disagree with the able Senator from Arkansas, for whose judgment I have great regard and with whom I am often in accord. But I feel impelled to rise and oppose this amendment. I feel that the distinction which he seeks to draw between the people "over there" and the people "over here" is a false distinction. In my judgment, everything that we spend for ECA we spend for our own good, and, since the outbreak of the war in Korea, we spend it for our own security. The utterly necessary foundation for any kind of military effort is a sound political structure and a sound economic structure, and the maintenance of ECA is absolutely basic toward the building of an armed force in Europe that will have real defensive value.

As I understand, the amount for ECA has already been reduced from a budget estimate of \$3,100,000,000 to a figure of \$2,450,000,000, which is a total reduction of \$650,000,000. I feel it would have a bad moral effect abroad if we were further to reduce this amount. I feel it would weaken and slow up the attempt to build a strong armed force over there, and if there is one thing that is utterly pressing and that deserves the highest priority and the greatest amount of speed we can give to it, it is the building of forces in Europe which are capable of resisting aggression. Such forces, as a practical matter, do not exist today. Therefore, I hope very much that this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the general thoughts expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts. It may not appear to be so, but this appropriation is a military appropriation. It is the equivalent of offering money to the participating countries to help increase their armament, and in so doing, to help increase the total resistance to Russian aggression, if, as, and when it comes.

No military machine is any stronger than the economic machine which supports it. If this country does not have a dynamic economy it cannot possibly evolve the taxes with which to pay for the huge military establishment which many of us at this critical hour in world affairs think is essential. To take away the productivity of America, to take away her ability to create wealth, to take away her great industrial turn-over, is to take away revenues from the Treasury; and when the revenues are taken away from the Treasury, it is necessary then to cut down each military appropriation.

The situation in Europe is this: Most of the countries of western Europe were occupied for 4½ years by a foreign foe. Their bridges were destroyed, their factories were ruined, the machinery in their plants was taken away, their har-

bors were full of sunken ships, their railroads were torn up by mines, their freight cars and passenger cars were destroyed, and so forth. Obviously, until they can be rehabilitated and a vital economy restored, these countries cannot produce the tax revenues to support military establishment. If we cut down this appropriation I predict that we shall have to replace it with more arms to Europe and meet ourselves coming back.

I commend the able Senator from Arkansas for his fine effort in trying to reduce nonessential expenditures of our own Government at this time, but I believe in this particular case it is not sound economy.

Mr. President, I think I have 2 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute.

Mr. TYDINGS. Furthermore, I desire to reemphasize the fact that, in my judgment, the countries of western Europe, because of the impact of the recent war upon them, cannot perform the military role which we are assuming they are going to perform. They are yet too weak to do it. That is the reason we are helping them. If they are not quickly in a position to do it, and to do it with expedition and thoroughness, we must spend more for the protection of ourselves.

I am supporting the appropriation through self-interest, for the defense of the United States, for the defense of the great reservoir of liberty and industrial might without which we shall stand all alone, surrounded, in a Communist-dominated world.

I hope the amendment to cut the appropriation 5 percent will not prevail.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I want to lend what little aid I can in the form of votes and otherwise to the Senator from Arkansas who offered this amendment.

The amendment cuts only 5 percent. We have already cut the home folks 10 percent. We say to the people of Europe, "We shall not cut you 10 percent, but only 5 percent, although we are cutting the people of America 10 percent."

So far as I am concerned, I want the people of the world to know that I do not believe we can buy their friendship with money. We shall find that out in a very few short years. For that reason, Mr. President, I am not in favor of pouring money over there and running a deficit in America. I think the sooner we tell them that, the better it will be for us in the long run.

That is my position, Mr. President, and I have taken that position all along with regard to ECA. If we had the money without running a further deficit, I would not mind sending it over there, but, so far as I am concerned, I shall continue to vote to cut ECA appropriations until the budget is balanced.

Mr. ROBERTSON obtained the floor.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Virginia would yield to me, because I am overdue at a committee meeting. I ask unani-

mous consent that the Senator from Virginia may yield to me without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I desire to express, in 2 minutes, my reasons for voting against the amendment. We are spending billions of dollars and adding new billions to our expenditures for containing militarily or restraining communism. Our most successful operation up to this time has been the ECA. It has saved France, it has saved Italy, and I am for continuing the most successful operation we have inaugurated in this particular undertaking. It would be the part of folly to cut down on its successful operation while we spend money on operations which have not yet proved their worth.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have frequently said, and I now repeat, that unless the ECA program contributes to our security through the development in western Europe of allies ready, able, and willing to stand with us against Communist aggression, it has no validity, and the whole program should be ended. It should not be cut 5 percent or 10 percent, but should be wiped out. We have not cut the security of our own people 10 percent. On the contrary, we are proposing to add ten and one-half billion dollars to our domestic budget, to increase our defense equipment, and to protect our people.

As the Senator from Maryland suggested, the British leaders on yesterday advocated asking Parliament to increase their defense spending over a period of 3 years by the sum of \$10,000,000,000. That is a large amount for a small country which has not yet recovered from a terrific war effort.

Mr. President, in this appropriation there are no programs to build pig trails. Paul Hoffman is an able and successful businessman. I think he has been the best Administrator of a large and difficult program I have known in the 18 years in which I have been in the Congress. He believes as much as I do in economy, and I believe in economy as much as does the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I think I have demonstrated that fact in connection with this bill in the committee. I voted for more cuts in the committee than were adopted by the committee. I have voted for only one addition to the bill since it has been before the Senate, and that was for ECA, to bring the appropriation back to the figure to which 13 out of 17 members had agreed.

Mr. President, if we had enough men, enough arms, and everything else to stand alone in this world where communism now controls the lives and the destinies of more than a billion persons, we could forget about western Europe; we could forget about many things we are now doing abroad. But we do not have those things, and we need allies. Norway, Denmark, and Sweden love their liberty, and they will stand with us. The people of Great Britain love their liberty, and they will stand with us. I hope that all nations under the program

will stand with us. As has been pointed out, but for ECA we would have already lost both Italy and France.

So, Mr. President, I hope very much that this essential defense program will not be cut in a way that will cripple its usefulness.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, much as I should like to join the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who is sincere in his desires to economize, and much as I should like to join him in the proposed 5 percent reduction in ECA appropriations, I cannot do so. We have cut the home folks, quoting almost verbatim the words of the able Senator from Arkansas, on some recommendations for domestic appropriations, but so far as the military is concerned, we are now considering increasing the appropriation by \$14,000,000,000. That is only the beginning, in order to meet the crisis in Korea. In western Europe we want to avoid a crisis comparable to that in Korea. If one should develop, we might have to appropriate several times \$14,000,000,000.

Mr. President, I was privileged for a matter of a few days to look at the situations of some of the economies in western Europe. I was greatly impressed with what was being achieved through ECA funds in increasing the morale of the people and putting them in a state of mind to determine to fight communism in government, and to rebuild their economies. When we were in Norway, even though that country was compelled to ration food and even children's hose—they were under rigid rationing—yet they almost prayed in thankfulness to the Americans because, through the ECA, they were able to rebuild their fishing fleet. It was ECA which was bringing the economy of Norway back. I could speak about the agricultural economy of France and Italy. I wish I could paint a word picture showing the groups of farmers improving their agricultural operations through the assistance of agriculturalists in the ECA. I could give the Senate a very beautiful picture if I had the time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, is it not true that the Scandinavian countries are now measurably—

Mr. THYE. I should like to yield to my good friend from Virginia, but I am speaking under a 5-minute limitation, and therefore I cannot yield.

Mr. President, those of us who sat with the ECA officials in Italy were given an explanation of what they were doing in reclamation. Here was a country that was unable to feed its many people. They showed us what they were doing with the reclamation projects which they had under way at that time. We came away feeling that we could probably bring back to the economy of Italy order and a satisfied people instead of confusion and the inroads that communism had made on the very Government of Italy. I realize that I cannot take any more time to speak on this subject of what has been achieved through ECA. However, if we are to appropriate many billions of dollars to meet communism, as we are doing in the Pacific and were we compelled to do in western Europe,

what we are doing in the South Pacific, we would have to appropriate much more than we are appropriating for ECA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

CUT THE ECA BUDGET AND ADD IT TO THE WAR CHEST

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I join the senior Senator from Arkansas in his amendment. It is a well-known fact that the 16 Marshall-plan countries are on an average of 120 percent recovered over the 1937-38 index, and that they have not recovered at a greater rate from 1948 to 1950 than they did from 1946 to 1948 when no Marshall plan or ECA was in existence.

It is a well-known fact that the 16 Marshall-plan countries have at least 96 trade treaties with Russia and iron-curtain countries, under which they ship everything that Russia needs to consolidate its gains in eastern Europe and China and to fight world war III with us. They are still doing it. They have never stopped. This money would go the same route.

It is also well known that England and France each have nonaggression pacts with Russia that startlingly resemble the Atlantic Pact. Under the treaties both England and France are bound to help Russia and Russia is bound to help them. They agree not to join any pact that would interfere with such help. Mr. President, they cannot be on both sides.

Mr. President, it is impossible to build a peacetime industry and wartime industry at the same time. What are we doing? Next week we shall take up consideration of laws to put rationing and price controls into effect and stop all building for peacetime projects, and start on a wartime basis. What are we talking about, Mr. President? It is well known that reclamation and other peacetime projects are being constructed in the European area under the ECA while we are stopping many of our own. Are we to build up Europe for peacetime?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I should like to finish the sentence first, and then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas. News dispatches today carried England's challenge that if the United States would furnish England with \$10,000,000,000 they would be happy to furnish the countries of Europe with all the arms they needed. All they wanted was full financing with a profit.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, did the Senator read in yesterday's Washington Star an editorial on what France has furnished to help us in the Korean war?

Mr. MALONE. They have furnished us a resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. They have furnished in this war effort one sloop. That is how much help we are getting from France. I wonder if the Senator believes that the treaty which France has with Russia may have something to do

with their not being more enthusiastic about giving us help in this crisis.

Mr. MALONE. They have a separate formal nonaggression pact with this nation and with Russia. I do not believe it builds up any enthusiasm to help us—they can remain neutral or go with either the United States or Russia when the showdown comes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. If I have time at the end of my remarks I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Florida. Mr. President, if we could have the entire ECA budget, as the Senator from Nevada has suggested in debate a number of times, added to the war budget, we could really accomplish something. Mr. President, if we could do that, we could really arm ourselves. We are not armed. We should be able to take 500 tanks in airplanes and set them down in Korea in 48 hours. If we had the airplanes and tanks we had in World War II we could do it.

We are not ready. In other words, when the President's Committee on Air Affairs and the Congressional Committee on Air Affairs reported late in 1947 that it would take \$17,000,000,000 over a 5-year period to manufacture for this country a 35,000-plane striking force, and that was sufficient to stop an aggressor, what happened to the report? Mr. President, it is still buried.

The junior Senator from Nevada, on the floor of the Senate at that time, asked that the ECA money be devoted to this building program if the Armed Services Committee upon investigation found it to be feasible. What would have happened if we had had a 35,000-plane striking force at this moment, or even half of it? Mr. President, the war in Korea would have been won before it was started. Russia would not have urged the North Koreans to move.

In addition and in closing I simply want to call attention again, as I have on many occasions, that all real authorities in military affairs agree that it is not possible to arm Europe so it can defend itself or so we can defend Europe against Russia in an all-out war under a cost of between fifty and one hundred billion dollars.

Mr. President, anything less will simply fall into the hands of the Russians when they start to move.

Mr. President, that has happened in Korea—it happened in China—and it is about time we determined where we are going.

So we are planting these supplies to be taken over when the Russians start to move. It does not make sense for us to continue to build industrial plants in nations that never have been on either side in wartime. The Low Countries of Sweden and Norway never have been, and there is no evidence that they ever will be. The controlling parties, the labor parties, in France and England have said time and time again that in case of trouble between the United States and Russia they would not take sides and they would not fight for us.

Mr. President, Bevin and Wilson early in 1948 said, "We want to be neutral. We want to be the bridgehead between Soviet Russia and capitalistic America. We want to trade with Russia." The junior Senator from Nevada put a trade treaty into the RECORD at that time—on March 4, 1948. The first item in it was 1,100 locomotives, and it went on from there to include the products necessary to consolidate their gains in eastern Europe and China and to fight world war III with us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Nevada that his time has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. TAFT was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate for the remainder of today.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I spoke a few days ago on the proposed 10-percent cut in appropriations and I urged the inclusion of ECA funds in that cut. I want to speak today in behalf of a 5-percent cut in ECA appropriations, since the Senate has voted not to apply the 10-percent cut.

In doing so I wish to bring certain figures to the attention of the Senate which are important as revealing the history of this appropriation. I hope they will clarify the record on the questions of whether this item can be cut without serious damage, and whether it has already been subjected to a percentage cut.

In his budget message the President requested \$3,100,000,000 for ECA, which included \$2,950,000,000 in new money and an estimated carryover of \$150,000,000. The Congress authorized \$2,700,000,000 in new money and that authorization was again premised on an expected carryover of \$150,000,000, so what Congress apparently expected could be spent as a maximum was a sum of \$2,850,000,000. Subsequently, it developed that the carryover was in fact \$277,000,000 rather than \$150,000,000.

On the basis of the authorization a revised budget estimate was submitted, for \$2,657,000,000, or just under the authorized total. It was on this figure that the Senate committee acted. Combined with the actual carryover of \$277,000,000 it totaled \$2,934,000,000 or almost \$100,000,000 more than Congress must have had in mind for 1951 expenditures when it placed the authorization for new money at \$2,700,000,000.

The Senate Appropriations Committee voted to reduce the request for new money from \$2,657,000,000 to \$2,450,000,000, and then by a vote of 11 to 10 applied a 10-percent reduction to the budget estimate, which resulted in a

figure of \$2,392,000,000 that was initially reported to the Senate. Immediately thereafter, upon the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the budget figure less 10 percent as reported from the committee was increased on the floor by \$58,000,000. That restoration took the total back to \$2,450,000,000, which had been the last action of the committee prior to its voting a 10-percent cut.

So much for the history of this appropriation item. Mr. President, it is now our foremost responsibility to consider the welfare of this Nation's economy. I submit that the added pressure upon our price structure being generated by \$16,640,000,000 in emergency spending requests—\$10,500,000,000 for domestic rearmament, plus an additional \$4,000,000,000 for foreign arms aid, plus some other increases—is most definitely and most terrifyingly threatening to cause America to abandon her republican principle of operating in a free economy.

Let us call this an expenditure for war for the moment, though it is also a domestic expenditure. By the pressure of expenditures such as this we are being compelled to adopt the very principles of economic regimentation which Russia has had to adopt and which characterize her system.

Think of that, Mr. President. Poland will be told, and Czechoslovakia will be told, that America can function only by adopting controls very similar to those which must be adopted under the Russian system of government. Why is that? It is because our free economic system is threatening to expire under pressure from expenditures such as that under consideration.

We talk about selling democracy abroad. Are we selling our free institutions abroad when we subject them to such pressures that they must be converted to the very system we hope our friends abroad will oppose?

As I said the other day, and I repeat, I know the people of Europe will understand that America must be sound in her economy, as well as that Europe must be sound in her economy, if we all together are going to prepare for war.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the letter written by Mr. Foster, the Acting Administrator for ECA, to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], in which it is said that he recognizes much of the expenditure under this appropriation is based on purely peacetime considerations, and that therefore the ECA is going to review them. I ask the Senate whether in that kind of review, if it is a real review, they cannot accept a reduction of only 5 percent as is proposed here at this time.

The Senate went on record yesterday, by a vote of 55 to 31, in favor of reducing certain nondefense domestic expenditures by 10 percent. In view of that determination regarding domestic expenditures, why cannot the expenditures for this particular appropriation be cut at least 5 percent? That is the question facing the Senate today.

Mr. President, we simply must consider the economic condition of America. The foreign nations must consider theirs, and

we must work as a team to defeat communism.

The reduction in expenditures we are in a position to make by this amendment has far-reaching importance, not only in principle but in substance. I therefore shall vote for the 5-percent reduction in these funds, as proposed.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

It is not at all difficult to make wild statements. Unless one is compelled to document what he says, he may let his fancy roam where it will. It is very easy to substitute emotion for judgment.

Mr. President, I wish with fact to appeal to reason, to justice, and, at the same time, temper justice with mercy, in considering the ECA cut. I have no quarrel with the principles of ECA, but this country faces a continuing mounting deficit. This country does not have the money with which to pay its current bills. It cannot get the money with which to pay its current bills.

Mr. President, this country has been going into debt year by year, to furnish the money with which to retire the debts of some of the ECA countries. Let us get at the facts for the moment. The total of funds up to now furnished ECA countries is, roughly, \$10,000,000,000. Of that amount, \$6,600,000,000 went to the countries with which to purchase certain goods, materials, and supplies, not for the nation's use but for the purpose of resale to their own citizens. And I do not mean gifts; I mean resales. When they resold to their citizens, they received their own currency to the full value, including ocean freight—much of which, incidentally, they paid to their own shipowners.

Mr. President, that means that two-thirds of all of the so-called relief with ECA money has gone to purchase goods in this country for private citizens in the ECA countries. That has been a good thing, but the point is that that two-thirds has been resold by those nations to their own citizens for those citizens' own efforts in private industry.

What has happened with the \$6,600,000,000 which the countries have received from their own citizens in their own currencies, the so-called counterpart funds? Let us take a look at it. Senators will hear some familiar descriptive words as I go down the list.

First, the United States has said to the particular country, "You may spend so much of the counterpart fund." Then of the \$6,600,000,000 there has been approved for withdrawal \$4,155,000,000, in their currencies, of course. Now, get this. Of that amount, \$1,114,000,000 has been used by those countries for the retirement of their national debts. The national debts of the whole of them is but a fraction of the national debt of the United States. While we were furnishing the money to retire their debts, we were adding that amount to our own debt. We have not been too niggardly.

What has happened to the balance? Follow me. The nations are spending this money—and this money they got from their own people, understand that—for agriculture, \$319,000,000, for

the promotion of agricultural production.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that his time has expired.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I desire to join the very able Senator from Arkansas in the amendment he has offered, which should be adopted unanimously by the Senate. I have always supported the ECA since its inception. I recognize the good it has accomplished throughout the various countries affected. I realize that the Marshall plan was undertaken largely, if not primarily, in our own self-interest. But yesterday the Senate voted to cut 10 percent off all the other appropriations in the bill, and we exempted the ECA fund.

We hear much about people and nations trying to save face throughout the world. The ECA fund should be cut this afternoon 5 percent in order that the Senate may save its face. We have cut all the appropriations pertaining to our domestic projects and the departments of Government in our own country. Thousands of people will be thrown out of jobs. I have already received letters and telegrams which say, "You are willing to cut out a lot of things in this country, but you won't cut out anything that goes to the rest of the world."

I think it is imperative that the Senate adopt the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. After all we are appropriating the people's money. It is not our money. We are the trustees for the people. In fact, the people do not have any money in the Federal Treasury for us to appropriate. All we can do is to mortgage their future and place an indebtedness upon their children and their grandchildren. I think it behooves all of us to recognize that fact and to realize the tremendous indebtedness which is hanging over the United States. I do not believe the ECA program would be materially curtailed by adoption of the amendment.

Mr. President, yesterday I voted to cut the ECA program 10 percent so as to treat all the various appropriations the same. I think the American people expect us to be just as good to them here at home as we are to the people throughout the rest of the world. I expect to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] may have 5 minutes more to address the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has asked unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon be permitted to speak for 5 minutes more.

Mr. FERGUSON. I may add that I make the request so the Senator from Oregon may complete the figures he was presenting when his time expired, so the RECORD may be complete.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Reserving the right to object, I wish to say that if we begin the practice of extending time for 5 min-

utes here and 5 minutes there, I do not know where we will land. Yesterday I tried to secure 10 minutes to place important matter in the RECORD, and my request was objected to. I am not going to object at this time, but I advise the Senate that if any other Senator, whether he be Democrat or Republican, makes a similar request, I shall object. We are trying to complete action on the bill today. I certainly hope we can do so. I am now sorry we did not continue in session last night.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I withdraw my request. I understand the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] will put the matter I referred to in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan withdraws his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] was placing certain figures in the RECORD when his time expired. He was speaking of ECA approvals for withdrawal of European counterpart funds and actual withdrawals, cumulative, through May 31, 1950. The distinguished Senator from Oregon, when referring to promotion of reduction, gave the figure for agriculture of \$319,800,000; land reclamation, \$94,300,000; forestry, \$3,000,000. Other agricultural programs, \$222,500,000.

Then he gave a total figure of \$365,800,000 for extractive industries, \$361,600,000 being for coal mining, and \$4,200,000 being for metal mining.

The total figure for manufacturing is \$227,600,000. Included are the following subjects: Primary metals; machinery; petroleum and coal products; basic textiles; chemicals, except fertilizer; food products, manufacturing; fertilizer; pulp, paper, and paper products; stone, clay, and glass products; rubber and rubber products; lumber and sawmill products; miscellaneous manufactures. The total being \$227,600,000.

Then follow transportation, communication, and utilities, including electric, gas, and power facilities; railroad; merchant and fishing fleet; waterways and harbors; roads; communication facilities; water systems; a total of \$1,336,600,000.

Mr. President, I ask that the table, giving the purposes which have been approved for withdrawal, and the sums approved for withdrawal, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. The purpose, as I stated, is to complete the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECA approvals for withdrawal of European counterpart funds and actual withdrawals, cumulative through May 31, 1950

[In millions of dollars]

Total	4,155.9
Monetary and financial stabilization	1,114.0
Debt retirement	1,114.0

Promotion of production	2,407.8
Agriculture	319.8
Land reclamation	94.3
Forestry	3.0
Other agricultural programs	222.5
Extractive industries	365.8
Coal mining	361.6
Metal mining	4.2
Manufacturing	227.6
Primary metals	93.9
Machinery	35.7
Petroleum and coal products	16.7
Basic textiles	14.0
Chemicals, except fertilizers	12.7
Food products	10.8
Fertilizer	9.6
Pulp, paper, and paper products	9.6
Stone, clay, and glass products	6.3
Rubber and rubber products	3.0
Lumber and sawmill products	1.5
Miscellaneous manufactures	13.8
Transportation, communication, utilities	1,336.6
Electric, gas, and power facilities	733.1
Railroads	405.4
Merchant and fishing fleet	108.6
Waterways and harbors	32.9
Roads	32.5
Communication facilities	14.7
Water systems	9.4
Deficiency materials	38.1
Loans to commerce and industry (not elsewhere classified)	7.5
Technical assistance	6.9
Undistributed	105.5
Other purposes	634.1
Construction of public buildings and housing facilities	233.8
Housing	219.2
Public buildings	14.6
Special relief projects	130.9
Care of refugees and miscellaneous social services	110.0
Health and sanitation	12.2
Transportation of relief packages	8.7
Payments to German exporters	150.0
Tourism	8.9
Undistributed	110.5

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not intend to speak on the proposed 5-percent cut. I am quite satisfied the Senate knows how I feel about cutting the appropriations, not only for purposes at home, but for purposes abroad. I said yesterday and I say today, I cannot see how in the world any Member of the Senate can refuse to cut appropriations for projects abroad when he is willing to cut appropriations for identical projects at home. I do not think any contrary position is tenable.

The distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee made a statement a moment ago to the effect that the appropriations for foreign projects can be justified on a military basis. It seems every time we turn around we find a proposal for appropriation of money which is justified on a military basis.

Mr. President, yesterday I stated that the total appropriations contained in the bill before us, plus the \$10,500,000,000 since asked for, and the \$4,000,000,000 we are about to appropriate, not considering the supplemental appropriations or the deficiency appropriations, will reach a grand total of \$51,000,000,000. When we try to cut appropriations for projects in foreign countries we are told "Oh, you cannot touch them." Finally, by cutting projects here at home, mostly in connection with civil functions and the Department of the Interior, we arrived at a total cut of \$552,000,000, that sum to be taken from an appropriation of \$51,000,000,000. That is the best we could do.

Now we are asked by the Senator from Arkansas to adopt his amendment—and I wish to associate myself with his very able remarks—which represents an attempt to cut 5 percent in the total ECA appropriations carried in the bill. The total appropriations for ECA are \$2,450,000,000. The 5-percent cut would mean \$122,500,000.

Mr. President, in answer to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that these are military appropriations, I submit the figures and the facts which were presented by the Senator from Oregon.

I want to present only one more fact, because my time is drawing short. I read from a Department of State release dated July 21, 1950, weeks after the Korean war began:

A "more concentrated drive" for the economic development of dependent overseas territories of western European countries is advocated by John E. Orchard, retiring Marshall plan adviser on territorial development.

During the past year, he said, France has received \$3,106,000 for road development in the Cameroons, French West Africa and French Equatorial Africa; and for equipment for mining iron ore in French Guinea. It also received assistance for a soil erosion program in Algeria and for a rice cultivation project in Morocco.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the matter set forth on page 4 of the release be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF EUROPE'S OVERSEAS AREAS CITED

ECA

A more concentrated drive for the economic development of dependent overseas territories of western European countries is advocated by John E. Orchard, retiring Marshall plan adviser on territorial development.

Dr. Orchard, who is returning to the faculty of Columbia University, pointed out that the territorial development work, an integral part of the European recovery program, stimulates the flow of commodities from dependent territories to Europe and thus decreases the European need to buy dollar area goods. At the same time, he added, the dependent territories are aided in producing dollar-earning goods to compete in the world market.

Progress of project reviewed

"During the fiscal year 1949-50," he said, "ECA has approved expenditures for specific development projects totaling between seven and eight million dollars from a reserve established for that purpose. These expendi-

tures are a part of the ECA effort to push a program of development in the overseas territories which can make an important contribution to the economic recovery of western Europe and to the improvement of the standard of living of the peoples within the territories."

Progress has been considerable, Dr. Orchard said.

"However," he warned, "the Marshall plan countries, with their many commitments in Europe, are pushing their overseas investment programs about as far as their own restricted financial resources will permit. In the earlier months of the Marshall plan the limiting factor in economic development was dollar exchange for obtaining essential equipment. With industrial recovery in Europe more and more of this equipment is becoming available within the participating countries and the great need now for any expanded program of development is additional financing."

Development fund being increased

During the past year, he said, France has received \$3,106,000 for road development in the Cameroons, French West Africa, and French Equatorial Africa, and for equipment for mining iron ore in French Guinea. It also received assistance for a soil-erosion program in Algeria and for a rice cultivation project in Morocco.

British territories in Africa, the West Indies, and southeast Asia have been granted \$1,235,000 for road development and for agriculture. The Belgian Congo has received a loan of \$1,718,000 for road-building equipment and \$60,000 for technical assistance as part of the 10-year development program for that area.

Dr. Orchard pointed out that these dollar costs represented less than 10 percent of the total estimated costs of the projects, the balance being provided from local or European sources.

To expand its program ECA is increasing its special development reserve fund to \$45,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950-51.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, according to the news dispatches the President has within the hour requested an additional \$1,155,000,000 for arms purposes, about \$900,000,000 of it to be spent for naval planes. This addition to the requests already made for military purposes will bring the requests for national defense purposes for this year alone up to an amount in excess of \$25,000,000,000. The amount which is under consideration in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] I understand is approximately \$135,000,000.

Mr. President, the end of World War II found the countries of western Europe impoverished, discouraged, and their morale at the breaking point. They were ripe for the Communist harvest at that time. The United States had the choice of either helping to restore the economy of the countries of western Europe and thereby bolstering their morale and courage as well, or of letting them fall and having to maintain a completely militarized North America, which we would have had to do had these western European countries not recovered. In my opinion, we made the right choice. We helped the countries of western Europe to recover in their economy. If they have recovered beyond the prewar point, I am glad of that. I doubt if many of them have, however. And we have not had to militarize our own country. If we did have to do this we could lose our liberty here

at home almost as completely as if we were invaded by the troops of a foreign nation.

Since we undertook to restore the economy of western Europe and to help the people there back on their feet, where we wanted them to be, we have spent in that undertaking about \$10,000,000,000, according to one of the speakers on the floor this afternoon. That \$10,000,000,000, Mr. President, would probably pay the expense of the United States in another world war for a period of between 2 and 3 weeks.

I think we have proved conclusively that it is cheaper for us to maintain strong economies in countries of western Europe than it is to have another Korea all over western Europe. The \$10,000,000,000 we have spent there has not been money thrown down the drain. It not only has added greatly to our national security, but a large part of it has been returned to us in the form of increased business. I do not know how many billions of the \$10,000,000,000 has been spent in America for goods and services, but it is safe to say that a good share of it has, and that the ECA program has been largely responsible for maintaining the American economy itself at such a high level during the recent years. I am satisfied we would have had a far greater recession than we had in 1949 had it not been for the ECA program.

Here we are quibbling over \$135,000,000 which we have already planned in connection with working out the program for the recovery of western Europe. Certainly it is worth \$135,000,000 for us to have friends at a time like this. I do not wish to imply that we are attempting to buy friendship; of course we are bound to them by much closer ties than the selfish interest of our own national security.

Mr. President, the first two months of the Korean war have resulted in requests for approximately \$12,000,000,000 for additional appropriations by the Congress. Therefore, it seems to me that we would be most unwise to jeopardize in any way the program for the recovery of western Europe, which we have planned, by making a reduction of \$135,000,000 in the total amount planned for that purpose. I do not say such a reduction cannot be made; if it can be made, I am sure the administrators of ECA will do it. It may be that the war itself will result in a further recovery of the western European economy. If that is the case, I am confident that Mr. Hoffman will see to it that all of the money provided for ECA is not spent, if some of it can be used to better advantage in another way.

So, Mr. President, let us carry out our program for the recovery of western Europe as we have planned it, because by so doing we shall achieve a greater security, as well as an actual saving in expenses, over the long run.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe it was the Senator from Oregon who said that during the heat of discussion there are times when one's emotions get the better of one's knowledge of the facts and of the statistical evidence. In the last few moments we have

seen such a demonstration, Mr. President, when emotion got the better of the facts.

For example, it has been stated here on the floor of the Senate that in our conflict with the Communist aggressors—and of course the statement was made with particular reference to the situation now existing in Korea—the French Government has contributed only one sloop. However, Mr. President, I think it important to note that the struggle with the Communist forces not only is occurring in Korea, but is world-wide in scope. Today there is military combat in Korea, but there are other places where the struggle against the Communist forces is also being carried on, although not by means of military combat.

Another country which must be considered in that connection is Indochina, to which we have pledged military and technical assistance. In that country the French Republic has 150,000 soldiers, who for more than 3 years have been fighting the Communist guerrillas.

So, Mr. President, I think we must keep in mind that while the French do not have troops in Korea this does not mean that French soldiers are not fighting for freedom. They are fighting for freedom in Indochina.

Further in this connection, Mr. President, let me remind the Senate that in World War I, the people of Belgium gave many more lives than we did; and in World War II the people of Belgium held out against the juggernaut of nazism for more than 18 days in the effort to save western civilization.

Mr. President, now let me make a few observations in regard to the ECA. I wish to concur in the remarks made by several Senators, including the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Vermont, and my colleague, the Senator from Minnesota. We now find that there is a proposal to make a reduction in the funds for ECA, and that attempt is made on the ground that ECA is successful. Mr. President, I have never heard such so-called logic. Here we have a program which everyone, with but few exceptions, admits has performed miracles in the rehabilitation of western Europe; but now we are told that we must cut the funds for that program by 5 percent because we are engaged in a war. Nevertheless, one of the reasons why ECA was established in the first place was that if we ever got into a war, we would have allies who would have the strength to help us in the fight. However, now it is claimed that because the ECA has been doing a good job, inasmuch as now we are engaged in a war, we should reduce the funds available to ECA. Mr. President, such a proposal does not make sense.

Let me point out that those who today are advocating cutting the appropriations for ECA because of the Korean situation, were advocating reduction of ECA funds before we ever talked about Korea. With very few exceptions, the same Senators who are making the present request are the ones who in the past have requested reductions of \$500,000,000 or \$150,000,000 or \$250,000,000 in the funds available to ECA. The present request

to reduce the ECA's funds is made despite the evidence, presented to us by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the Administrator of ECA has done one of the most remarkable jobs ever performed in administrative affairs in our Government. So the proposal to reduce the ECA's funds is entirely illogical.

Mr. President, let me remind the Senate that the present situation involves not only a war of arms, but also a conflict of economies and politics. There seems to be a belief that the only way to combat the Communists is with airplanes, tanks, and soldiers. Of course, Mr. President, that is the way to combat them on a battlefield; but it is through the ECA, through the Voice of America, through the United Nations, and through the point 4 program that we stop communism before we reach the point of having to fight and, perhaps, die on the battlefield in stopping communism.

Apparently there are too many persons in the United States Senate who believe that the only way to stop communism is by the death and slaughter of thousands and thousands of American boys and American women. I would rather be guilty of overappropriating for ECA, because the ECA program has proven again and again that it is doing this job, and is doing it well.

The junior Senator from Nebraska has talked about the various colonial territories of the European nations and the fact that some of the funds appropriated for ECA are proposed to be used for roads in French Equatorial Africa or in British Honduras. I would remind the Senator from Nebraska that those territories produce commodities which are vital to us, for they produce rubber, uranium, and many other commodities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of today and all of next week.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have been quite interested in the last three or four speeches, particularly those made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. They are so typical of what we heard in 1932. O Mr. President, what this Democratic Party was going to do at that time for "the lower third." A new millennium was coming, Mr. President, so we were told and told and told time and time and time again and again and again.

But what have the Democrats done? They have accomplished just as much in that respect as they have accomplished with the so-called Marshall plan—in other words, they have accomplished nothing—as compared with the misery, want, suffering here.

I am proud of the fact that I voted against every single dollar requested for ECA, every time that question has been before us.

Mr. President, to prove my statement that the Democratic Party has accomplished absolutely nothing for "the lower third," I wish to produce the evidence presented by certain Democrats themselves. The Democrats, who now have been in power for 18 years in this Government, have recently organized a so-called Public Affairs Institute, composed of 66 men and women. Who are those 66, Mr. President? Let me read their names: A. F. Whitney, Ohio; Morris L. Cooke, Pennsylvania; Morris L. Ernst, New York; John M. Carmody, Washington, D. C.; Theodore J. Kreps, California; James G. Patton, Colorado; Abe Fortas, Washington, D. C.; Alvin Johnson, New York; John Franklin Carter, Washington, D. C.; Fowler Harper, Connecticut; Morris S. Rosenthal, New York; Hubert Humphrey, Minnesota; Thurman Arnold, Wyoming; Chester Bowles, Connecticut; J. Frank Burke, California; Hugh B. Mitchell, Washington; Bryn J. Hovde, New York; Charles A. Murray, Montana; Harry W. Schacter, Kentucky; Paul S. Taylor, California; Cass Canfield, New York; Jerome I. Udell, New York; Wendell Berge, Washington, D. C.; Joseph Borkin, Washington, D. C.; Robert A. Brady, California; Edmund G. Brown, California; Stuart Chase, Connecticut; Clifford E. Clinton, California; John M. Coffee, Washington; Mabel C. Costigan, Colorado; Paul A. Dodd, California; Clifford J. Durr, Virginia; Thomas I. Emerson, Connecticut; William T. Evjue, Wisconsin; John Anson Ford, California; Morris E. Garnsey, Colorado; Harry Girvetz, California; Shirley E. Greene, Indiana; Alvin H. Hansen, Massachusetts; Charles M. Hardin, Illinois; Leon Henderson, Washington, D. C.; William S. Hopkins, Washington; Thomas B. Keehn, Washington, D. C.; Elizabeth T. Kent, California; Freda Kirchway, New York; Harold D. Laswell, Connecticut; William M. Leiserson, Maryland; Walter C. Lowdermilk, California; Myres S. McDougal, Connecticut; Maury Maverick, Texas; Robert R. Nathan, Washington, D. C.; John R. Nichols, New Mexico; Culbert Olson, California; George Outland, California; Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, Pennsylvania; Langdon W. Post, California; James Roosevelt, California; Mrs. J. D. Ross, Washington; Eugene V. Rostow, Connecticut; Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Massachusetts; Harry Slattery, South Carolina; George Soule, New York; Jerry Voorhis, Illinois; Aubrey Williams, Alabama; W. Willard Wirtz, Illinois; W. S. Woytinsky, Washington, D. C.

Mr. President, for 18 years the Democrats have had a President in office. This Public Affairs Institute committee has been organized, and it has hired one of the best experts in America. On January 9, 1950, he wrote me a letter, the first paragraph of which I now read:

MY DEAR SENATOR: The startling revelations of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the plight of low-income families shocked us all.

Mr. President, I am talking about the record of the Democratic Party. I now hold in my hand the report made by the man hired by the Public Affairs Institute and its committee of sponsors—all Democrats—Mr. Dewey Anderson, executive director. He says:

It is this underprivileged lower third—

The same third, Mr. President, that Roosevelt was going to save. In 1932 he said on the political platform that he would save them; and again, in 1936, he said he was going to save them—save them all over again; and in 1940 he was going to save them, save them, save them all over again; and in 1944 he was going to save them, save them, save them, save them all over and over and over again. Now his son Jim in California, 18 years later, says he is going to save them. Now, the Senator from Minnesota says he is going to save them out in Minnesota. But here is what their executive director, who is an expert, hired by these 66 Democrats has to say after 18 years of saving this one-third.

It is this underprivileged lower third that deserves the special attention of us. Common humanity calls for the alleviation of their poverty-stricken condition.

Mr. President, I will conclude by saying this: I am going to vote for this 5 percent cut, because I would rather help those poor, poverty-stricken people who are here, after 18 years of Democratic rule, than to vote to help people in a foreign country, many of whom are in better shape than the one-third here. We need hospitals, schools, and roads to schools, medicines, education, pay for teachers, employment for those who are crippled but wish to work, more and better care of our veterans. Yet, while the plea is that we have no money for our own, we shovel the money out to foreigners, where often the rank and file of the people who need it do not get it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the last speech by my friend from North Dakota really rather amazes me. Aside from the bipartisan foreign policy which a number of Democrats and Republicans have been following here for a good many years, my friend from North Dakota has been supporting practically all the Democratic humanitarian measures. Usually when we need a vote on a liberal proposition, we can get him to go along with us. It is a somewhat shocking to find the Senator criticizing the Democratic administration the way he does, because, after all, he is perhaps really more of a Democrat than he is a Republican. There was some talk last year in his home State about his running for the Senate on the Democratic ticket, because he thought so much of the liberal ideas of the Democratic Party. So I am a little surprised that my friend should take the Democratic Party to task, especially when his people in North Dakota, are so much better off today—and he must admit it—than they have been at any other time in the history of North Dakota. In fact, all our citizens are prosperous and happy; that applies to farmers, the laboring men, the businessmen, and to everyone. Everyone has plenty in America.

Mr. President, I should like to say a word with respect to what the Senator from Nebraska has been saying about certain overseas projects. The Senator attempts to prejudice the Senate against some \$13,000,000 worth of projects which have been devised by the United Kingdom, Belgium, Netherlands, and Portugal, projects to be financed for overseas development, and yet it will be seen from reading the report that all these projects are for roads or other projects dealing with critical and strategic materials which will be useful in case we get into an armed conflict, or materials that when they finally receive them will add to the economy of their own respective countries. There is only \$13,000,000 involved in the entire amount that is being appropriated, according to the program, and yet if one were to listen closely to the argument of my friend from Nebraska one would think that practically all the money that is being appropriated for ECA is to go for the construction of a road down in Honduras or palatial highways to be built in different sections of the world upon which the natives may take their morning walk. That is not the idea at all.

I undertake to say that Paul Hoffman is as good a businessman as there is in America. He employs thousands upon thousands of people in his industry. He probably pays as much in taxes as any man in America. He is in the top bracket as far as income taxes are concerned. Everyone admits that he is an unusually strong administrator. He is a Republican. He is not of the faith of those on this side of the aisle.

In whom are we to place our trust and confidence in a matter of this kind, as far as the administration of an act of this kind is concerned? No one charges Paul Hoffman with dishonesty. No one charges him with ineffectiveness, so far as administration is concerned. Last year we had a carry-over of about \$250,000,000, which he reported. He probably will save that much again. At least I hope so. But, as the Senator from Minnesota said, let us not be niggardly on this proposition. Let us not take a chance in the particular crisis which confronts us at the present time. This is serious business, Mr. President. You can look into any country in the world today and find communism at work, it matters not where you go. Yet we, here, know that the ECA fund has been responsible for stopping the expansion of communism in Europe. Mr. President, if we did not have an ECA fund, and if, through infiltration, communism were to have France and Italy by the throat at this particular time, together with certain of the other western democracies, Senators would be clamoring to get on the band wagon to support some kind of program that would take communism out of those countries in which our friends live.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot yield; I am sorry. Yesterday we settled this question by a vote of 45 to 40, and we should

not take another 5 percent off of this particular fund. We provided \$100,000,000 for Spain, through the Export-Import Bank, with only 15 votes against it; \$100,000,000 was added there, and it was done in that way primarily to keep the ECA funds intact. Senators now desire to take \$133,000,000 from those funds, as we near the close of this debate, in order to destroy the effectiveness of ECA. As the Senator from Minnesota said, the same group of Senators who have always been against ECA are the most active in this debate. I undertake to say that if we adopted this amendment, we would be doing seriously wrong, so far as our own security and our own safety are concerned.

Let us give the people of western Europe what they need at this particular time, even though it might be a little bit too much. Let us retain them as our friends and allies, in this, the most dangerous hour in the history of America.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I shall not take more than a minute. My position on this question is well known. I merely want to state to my colleagues the substance of some of the conversations I have had with Mr. Hoffman at various times, dealing with figures. At the very beginning of the ECA operation, Mr. Hoffman asked a few of us whether it was wise in submitting estimates to make them excessive, in the belief that they would probably be cut. He said he understood many departments did that. We advised him definitely that that would be the wrong line to take, that his job was one which should be carefully conducted from the beginning, and that the correct figures should be submitted. He was advised further that if any savings could be made, they should be made, and that any money that was left over should be put back and carried over to another year.

From the very beginning, and for three successive years, we have had the experience of having the funds turned back and applied to the next year's appropriation.

This year the situation was such that we realized there might be a call for cuts. I took the matter up with Mr. Hoffman. He said, "Yes, Senator, if it is necessary for us to take a cut on the figures agreed on in the first authorization I am willing to do that, provided others are doing it, and provided there is not to be more than one cut in our fund." We took the figures which were set by the Senate. The authorization was in the sum of \$2,700,000,000. In the appropriation bill the figures are 10 percent below that. The question is asked now, "Should we not cut that figure 5 percent more?" Had we not exempted the ECA from the 10-percent cut of yesterday we would have cut the ECA a total of 20 percent. What I have been pleading for is that we take Mr. Hoffman at his word and accept his representations. He is willing to take his 10-percent cut, which he has taken, but not to take a further cut.

That was understood when we were working on these figures as the basic figures by which this program could be carried on. I merely wanted to make myself clear on that point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be happy to yield if I have any time left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a little time left.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that Mr. Hoffman is almost unique amongst administrators, in that if he does not spend all the money appropriated, he turns it back to the Government?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator, entirely. That is what I have tried to emphasize in the debate, and I am glad that the Senator has brought out the point and emphasized it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that in three successive years he has been able to carry out his program on less than the amount appropriated, and has turned the balance back to the Government, and that this year he has turned back approximately \$275,000,000 out of the appropriation for last year?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does it not follow, Mr. Hoffman being the type of man he is, that it is pretty certain that if he does not need to spend all the money we appropriate, it will not be spent?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is he not also unique in that when he turns it back he has to have it reappropriated?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Oh, no. All he asks this year is \$2,450,000,000 new money in addition to the carry-over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that when the reorganization bill was being considered the Senate voted for an amendment cutting off half a billion dollars, and there was a tie vote in the Senate, and half a billion dollars more was appropriated because there was a tie vote?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The cut was \$250,000,000 in the Senate version.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chavez	Eaton
Anderson	Connally	Ellender
Bricker	Cordon	Ferguson
Bridges	Darby	Flanders
Butler	Donnell	Frear
Byrd	Douglas	Fulbright
Capehart	Dworshak	George
Chapman	Eastland	Gillette

Graham	Leahy	Pepper
Green	Lehman	Robertson
Gurney	Lodge	Russell
Hayden	Lucas	Saltonstall
Hendrickson	McCarran	Schoeppel
Hill	McCarthy	Smith, Maine
Hoey	McClellan	Smith, N. J.
Holland	McFarland	Sparkman
Humphrey	McKellar	Stennis
Hunt	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Ives	Magnuson	Thye
Johnson, Colo.	Malone	Tydings
Johnson, Tex.	Martin	Watkins
Johnston, S. C.	Maybank	Wherry
Kem	Millikin	Wiley
Kerr	Morse	Williams
Kilgore	Mundt	Young
Knowland	Murray	
Langer	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—38

Bricker	Gillette	Maybank
Bridges	Hendrickson	Millikin
Butler	Holland	Mundt
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Darby	Knowland	Stennis
Donnell	Langer	Watkins
Dworshak	McCarran	Wherry
Eastland	McCarthy	Wiley
Ecton	McClellan	Williams
Ferguson	Malone	Young
Frear	Martin	

NAYS—41

Aiken	Hill	McMahon
Anderson	Hoey	Magnuson
Chapman	Humphrey	Morse
Chavez	Hunt	Murray
Connally	Ives	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Ellender	Kerr	Robertson
Flanders	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
George	Lehman	Sparkman
Graham	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Green	Lucas	Thye
Gurney	McFarland	Tydings
Hayden	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—17

Benton	Kefauver	Taylor
Brewster	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Cain	Myers	Tobey
Downey	Neely	Vandenberg
Hickenlooper	O'Conor	Withers
Jenner	Taft	

So Mr. McCLELLAN's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 260, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "\$17,758,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$17,813,403"; and in line 20 to insert the following proviso: "Provided further, That the Director of the Bureau of Mines, for the purpose of the project now in progress under this appropriation on chromite deposits near Nye, Mont., is authorized to reacquire for the Government certain land, buildings, and other facilities essential to the conduct of that project and known as Plancor 587, at a price not to exceed \$55,403."

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, this amendment was in the bill a year ago.

The Senate approved it but it was taken out in conference. It merely permits the Bureau of Mines to reacquire certain property in Montana for the purpose of guaranteeing a supply of chromium whenever we need it in this country. The Korean situation has made it almost mandatory that we do everything possible to insure a supply of chromite to help in the war effort. The Federal Government spent between \$20,000,000 and \$25,000,000 during World War II on this project in Montana. If I am informed correctly at least 75 percent of the known chromite deposit in the United States is in Montana. We all know that we must have chromium in order to build tanks, guns, and battle-ships. Immediately after the war the property was turned over to the War Assets Administration, and it was sold for about 5½ cents on the dollar. The man who purchased the buildings and equipment at the mine paid \$44,000. As I understand, he is willing to turn the property back to the Government for the amount he paid for it after the war, plus the taxes he has had to pay and the expenses he has incurred since that time, which means a little more than \$11,000 in addition to the cost.

I am asking that the Senate consider the amendment, and at least take the amendment to conference to see if it is not necessary for the Government to reacquire the property and buildings. If the Government is not interested, the buildings will be torn down completely in the near future.

I think we should be reminded that during the war we got all our chromium from Russia. I have been informed that Russia advised this country about 3 months ago that they would not supply any more chromium to the United States.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. Not at the moment. I have a news clipping before me of August 1 from a Baltimore newspaper. According to this article a Washington official stated that a 6,700 ton shipment of chromium arrived last week, which was the first of that metal to be received this year from Russia so far as he knew.

The Government records were complete only to May. These records show that the only previous deliveries this year of either magnesium or chromium were 6,500 short tons.

Mr. President, if that is all the chromite we have gotten from Russia since January 1, and if our supply is to be cut off henceforth, I think we should make provision in this appropriation bill so that the Government can reacquire this property at Nye, Mont., in order to have it as an insurance against the possibility of having our supply of chromite, a mineral we simply must have in an all-out war, being cut off entirely.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the amendment refer to a chromium mine, or what is it?

Mr. ECTON. It is a mine, where chromite is mined. The Government

put up buildings and sent equipment in during the war, and spent over \$20,000,000 in developing the property.

Mr. KILGORE. That answers a part of my question. It is a mine out of which chromite is gotten for the production of chromium.

Mr. ECTON. That is correct. The Government took out about 100,000 tons in Montana, but after we could get the chromite from Russia, in 1943, it was much more feasible to get it from our war-time ally.

Mr. KILGORE. I think I understand the Senator. As in the case of many such plants, this is a plant which should be operated only in wartime. It is an emergency plant, for use when the Government must have the metal. The present owner is willing to unload it, and it is an anchor to protect us.

Mr. ECTON. The Senator is correct. It is merely a stand-by proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which was submitted yesterday in behalf of myself and several other Senators, relating to the mental health activities, cancer, heart, and dental care appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The amendment proposed by Mr. MAGNUSON on behalf of himself, Mr. BENTON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. KERR, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCFARLAND, and Mr. LEAHY was, on page 149, line 24, to strike out "\$15,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$39,875,000"; and on page 150, line 10, to change the period to a colon and insert the following: "Provided, That funds shall be transferred to the appropriations 'National Cancer Institute', 'Mental health activities', 'National Heart Institute', and 'Dental health activities' in the amounts of \$8,500,000, \$8,000,000, \$14,000,000, and \$1,500,000, respectively, and amounts so transferred shall be available for the objects specified herein under these heads and for grants for drawing plans, erection of buildings and acquisition of land therefor to provide facilities for research, and, with respect to dental health activities, for plans, specifications, construction, and equipment of a research building and facilities for the National Institute of Dental Research."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the amendment is the same amendment that was discussed yesterday. It relates to an increase in the appropriation for the vital matter of research in cancer, heart disease, mental diseases, and dental care.

The proposed amendment cuts the amounts included in the amendment of-

ferred yesterday by 50 percent. We arrive at the cut of 50 percent in the hope that the amendment may be accepted. The projects now under way have been carefully screened by the leading medical men, scientists, and many lay organizations, including the Public Health Service, and they are now in operation or have been screened and are ready for operation. They can all be justified.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is the same amendment offered yesterday, except that the Senator has reduced the amount, is it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has already been voted on, and it was defeated yesterday.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. MAGNUSON. I still have the floor, and I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I know that yesterday a great number of Senators voted against what all the sponsors of the amendment consider a very worthy amendment, because they felt this activity may not be in the category of what we call essential spending, against the background of war.

We have appropriated money for matters not nearly half so necessary, and, in the interest of the preservation of the health of our people, I do hope that the amendment may be taken to conference. We have appropriated as much money for research into diseases of cattle as we are asking for research into the three great killers in the United States.

I need not go into any more figures. I hope the amendment may be taken to conference, as I have said. I am sure the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Society, the great medical societies, the presidents of the great universities in which these projects are now under way, can more than justify the expenditure of the money requested, in the interest of the Nation's health.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise to oppose an amendment of this kind, and I point out that this matter came before the Committee on Appropriations. Over a period of years we have been increasing, as we could, the funds for this very worth while work. As a matter of fact, the Senate committee allowed the full amount of the Budget estimates in this field. We increased the amounts over those allowed by the House. It is a field which has a great appeal. I am sure all of us, from our personal experience or from our knowledge of the subject, recognize that much more work needs to be done along this line. But I submit to the able Senator from Washington that the correct way to proceed is for the responsible Government department to go before the Bureau of the Budget, request the funds they desire, and make their justifications.

Mr. President, I have not had a chance to examine the RECORD, but if this amendment is in the same language as that of yesterday, I believe a point of order is good against the amendment because it provides that amounts trans-

ferred as requested shall be available for grants for drawing plans, erection of buildings, and so forth, and because there is no substantive law authorizing this activity in connection with health activities or with respect to dental care, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from California will withhold his point of order until two or three Senators vitally interested may have an opportunity to take their 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I temporarily withhold the point.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it certainly was not the intention of the sponsors of the amendment to go outside the scope of the authorization. Every one of the appropriations included in this amendment is for a national institute established by the Congress of the United States—the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart Institute, the National Mental Health Institute, and the National Dental Institute. These institutes have broad authority provided by the Congress of the United States to carry on research in their respective fields. It may perhaps be accurate to say that the Mental Health Act does not carry authority for construction. I am not quite sure about that. But I am confident that the Senator from California is in error with respect to the other three institutes.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make the point of order based on that particular technicality. The amount sought by the amendment which was acted on yesterday is only a \$79,000,000 increase for the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart Institute, the National Mental Health Institute, and the National Dental Institute. All this money is to be used for research. It is not to be used for raising salaries of employees; nor is it to be expended in the city of Washington by the national institutes and their executive directors. It is to be distributed all over the country and to be employed in the finest schools, colleges, universities, and hospitals of the Nation.

Every project has been approved, not only by the heads of the institutes and the Surgeon General but by the advisory councils consisting in most instances half of laymen and half of skilled personnel, such as doctors who are of outstanding competence in their fields.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The record shows all the approved plans we seek to cover. For instance in California alone the University of California Medical School, San Francisco; the University of California, Los Angeles; Los Angeles County Hospital; University of Southern California, and Stanford University all have approved projects but would not get the funds if the amendment is not adopted.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure the Senator from California has confidence in those outstanding institutions.

Mr. President, the need for this research is a growing need. It will be valuable in peacetime, and even more valuable in war. Think of the saving

of human life which has been accomplished by the wartime development of penicillin and many other drugs which received their real stimulus toward success in our wartime economy and effort.

Mr. President, if we are going to have war there is no way to measure what may be the saving in human life resulting from research into the cause and cure of cancer, the cause and cure of heart disease, the cause and cure of mental disorders and of dental disabilities.

Mr. President, in the last month one of the dearest friends of my life passed away from a cardiovascular disease. Outstanding experts stood by that man's side acknowledging that they knew nothing by which they could contribute to the salvation of my dear friend's life. Another dear relative was stricken by cancer and died a short time thereafter.

Surely, when we have billions to spend for other meritorious projects, we would not deny to the outstanding colleges and universities of the United States the meager sum of a few million dollars—not hundreds of millions of dollars, but a few million dollars—in order that they may carry on these great research projects.

Mr. President, we have now made the concession of a 50-percent cut in the request that was made yesterday. It was apparent from the vote that was had in the Senate that a great many Senators conscientiously believed that we should not ask as much as the amendment called for. I think thirty-odd Senators voted for the amendment. But I believe there was manifested a very strong sentiment on the part of the Senators that something might be added to what has already been provided, because numerous applications have come in for research programs since the agency in charge appeared before the Bureau of the Budget. I have a characteristic list of some of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must advise the Senator from Florida that his time has expired.

Mr. PEPPER. So we hope, Mr. President, we may make a fair compromise by cutting in half the appropriation carried by the original amendment and that that much will be provided for these necessary and worthy projects.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer rule on the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order was withheld temporarily.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to join in the point of order made by the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to advise the Senator from Tennessee that I temporarily withheld the point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Chair will sustain the point of order when he comes to rule upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. While the Senator from Tennessee is on his feet, may the Chair inquire if he has available the basic law which it will be necessary to consult in deciding the point of order—that is, the authorization act?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, I do not have the authorization act before me.

Mr. PEPPER. If I may do so, before the Chair rules on the point of order, I ask that Senators be permitted to be heard upon that question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wants to obtain all the facts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have just sent for a copy of the basic law.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from California that in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress authorization was made for \$3,000,000 for the building of a dental research institute in connection with the naval hospital at Bethesda, Md. \$100,000 was appropriated for plans and specifications for the building. Those plans and specifications have been completed. I regret to say, however, that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget did not make the additional \$2,000,000 that was authorized available for the building. So I think the distinguished Senator's objection does not hold.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment. I believe, as we pointed out yesterday, that in this country several times as many persons die of heart disease, cancer, and mental illness as died in World War II on the battlefields or from wounds. I again wish to point out that in the United States eight and one-half million persons suffer from mental illness; that 40 or 50 percent of all those who consult doctors consult them because of mental disease, and that one-sixth of all the young men and women who presented themselves to the draft boards during World War II were rejected because of psychoneurotic illness.

I think the question involved is not only one of serving our own interests over a long period of years, but is of the greatest importance to us now as a defense measure, because I am certain that if we can devise through research, new means of prevention and cure we will certainly strengthen our defense and our security.

Mr. President, we have no hesitation in voting great amounts for flood control, for reclamation projects, for the construction of buildings. I know that most of these purposes are worth while, but I also know that many of them could be deferred without any great loss to our country. Yet we hesitate to vote a relatively small amount of money which will mean so much to the health and the welfare of our 150,000,000 people, and serve as an added weapon of defense and security in the fight in which we are now engaged, and which, I fear, will become far more all-embracing as the weeks and months pass.

I strongly hope the Senate will vote in favor of the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New York, the Senator from Washington, and the Senator from Florida. I am a cosponsor of the amendment. I never felt more proud of anything in my life than to be a cosponsor of an amendment the purpose of

which is to relieve suffering and to increase the life expectancy of the American people.

Not long ago the Senator from Washington made a comment which I think should be reiterated; he pointed out that we are spending more on research for the health of pigs and cows than we are spending for research to improve the health of the American people.

As I have listened to the debates in the past few days, I have been reminded many times that we should stick to the facts. In that connection, let me say that in the May 28, 1950, issue of the Washington Sunday Star there is a feature story entitled "Medical Research Costs the United States \$28,000,000 a Year." I read from the article:

The Federal Government spent about \$28,000,000 a year for research and development of medical and allied sciences, as compared with \$30,000,000 spent by one Federal agency alone for research in animal and plant diseases.

Mr. President, I have not heard any Member of the Senate raise a great deal of fuss about the fact that we are spending \$30,000,000 to take care of our fine cattle. I am glad we are taking care of the cattle, and I know that is a worthy purpose. I am glad to see cows contented, if for no other reason than to make Carnation-milk cows happy.

However, it is inconceivable that we have to fight to obtain the appropriation of a small amount of money to provide for research to protect the health of the people of our country. After all, so far as the national defense is concerned, what is more important than to have the American people healthy and able and strong?

Mr. President, the requested appropriation of \$14,000,000 for research in the field of mental health is so desperately needed that I submit that no Member of the Congress could return to his home and face his own conscience if he were to vote against this proposal.

When we understand that there are in the United States only 5,000 psychiatrists, most of whom will be taken into the Armed Forces, we must realize that in that event the mental hospitals will return to the condition they were in a few years ago—with only a few elderly doctors, kindly though they may be, but insufficient in number to take care of the large number of mental cases.

Mr. President, there is nothing more humane than to provide for the caring of such cases.

It is hard to believe that in the Congress of our country, so fabulously rich as our country is, when it has a national income or more than \$250,000,000,000 a year, there would be an argument over spending a small amount of money for this program, which will affect in a vital way the health of the American people.

After all, Mr. President, more money has been spent in the United States for liquor than for medical care. In fact, I venture the assertion that, if we were to take up a collection at the cocktail parties held in the city of Washington, we could obtain sufficient funds for this pur-

pose, and those who attend such parties would be glad to sponsor this endeavor.

Mr. President, I say that a Nation so great and so strong as ours cannot afford not to support this basic program. Unless we follow through by means of adopting the amendment of the Senator from Washington, we shall lose much of the effectiveness of the research program which is already under way.

For example, in the field of mental health, if we do not follow through with the present program, the State of Oklahoma, which has appropriated vast sums of money for its hospitals and psychiatrists, will lose much of the effectiveness of the program it has developed. In fact, 110 psychiatrists are needed there now.

My State of Minnesota has developed a great program in this field, but Dr. Rosen, of our State, is looking for more psychiatrists. After all, Mr. President, the sick are not cared for by the provision of brick and stone alone.

So I appeal to the humanitarian instincts of all Members of Congress, and I request that they ease up a little and provide the money that is needed for this purpose.

After all, we are not requesting for this purpose \$1,000,000,000 or the \$100,000,000 which was provided for Spain, or the \$2,900,000,000 which has been voted for the ECA; but we are asking for only \$32,000,000 for 150,000,000 American people. We are asking for approximately \$32,000,000 to take care of the greatest research program the world has ever known. We are asking for it, not on the basis of political considerations but because the American Medical Association, the National Heart Institute, the Psychiatric Association, the Mental Hygiene Association, and the greatest research experts the world has ever known, all are pleading with the Congress to provide a reasonable amount of money which can be used with efficiency and dispatch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall not argue the point of order, but again I wish to call attention to the fact that yesterday we passed on this matter.

The Senate may remember that last year we appropriated a very large sum of money for all these purposes. Last year the appropriation for cancer research was \$19,000,000, and the appropriation for construction was an additional \$6,000,000.

The appropriation last year for mental health research was \$8,000,000, and an additional \$2,000,000 was appropriated for construction in that connection.

The appropriation last year for research in the field of heart disease was \$10,000,000, for general purposes; and \$5,000,000 more was appropriated for construction in that connection.

For the purpose of dental research, the appropriation last year was \$1,908,000.

In total, the appropriations made last year for these purposes amounted to approximately \$40,000,000.

The remarkable point is that those who will spend the money which is appropriated this year for these pur-

poses—and who are the same persons as those who spent the money appropriated in this field last year—now have on hand \$780,000 which they are unable to spend. Yet by these amendments, Senators undertake to appropriate for them more money than they now request. Those who operate this program do not have a set-up capable of using such a large sum of money.

Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] referred to certain cases which he said touched him very deeply and all of us, perhaps, have knowledge of similar cases; so, of course, this is a subject which touches the hearts of every Senator. Cancer is a terrible disease, and so is tuberculosis. All these diseases should be dealt with, and they are being dealt with. Private institutions are spending many millions of dollars every year in the attempts to eradicate these diseases, and the Congress is spending \$40,000,000 a year in connection with these four diseases alone.

However, the present set-up of the organization handling this program is such that those in charge of the work simply cannot spend additional funds.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

If Senators say that a larger establishment should be set up, Senators should realize that that cannot be done under the provisions of this bill, for this is an appropriation bill, and legislation cannot be included in it. If the amendment were offered to a legislative bill for this purpose, I should be glad to join in it.

However, Mr. President, in these circumstances, when a request is made that we appropriate money in addition to the amount of money requested by the agency in charge of the work, it seems to me that the request is entirely improper. So I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the sake of the record, I should like to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of the facts relative to the appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, the estimates for 1951, the appropriations for this purpose for 1951, as carried in the present appropriation bill as passed by the House of Representatives, and the amount of the appropriation for this purpose as recommended by the Senate committee. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the figures for the appropriations made under these various items for the fiscal years 1948, 1949, and 1950.

This record will show, Mr. President, that we have made a steady advance in this field; that in most instances the Senate committee has voted to increase the amounts voted by the House of Representatives; and that in all instances the Senate Appropriations Committee has voted to allow for these purposes amounts equalling the full amounts of the budget estimates.

Mr. President, I happen to serve as a Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle; but I do not believe that the administration, represented by the Senators on the other side of the aisle, have

been unmindful of the great problems of public health. Certainly we have provided the full amounts of the budget estimates, as recommended by the administration which those gentlemen represent.

So I ask unanimous consent for the insertion in the RECORD of the statistics to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the statistics were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

<i>Comparison of appropriations by years</i>	
NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE	
1948 -----	\$14,500,000
1949 (plus \$8,000,000 contract authority) -----	14,000,000
1950 (plus \$6,000,000 contract authority) -----	18,900,000
MENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES	
1948 -----	4,250,000
1949 (plus \$2,300,000 contract authority) -----	9,028,000
1950 (plus \$2,150,000 contract authority) -----	11,712,000
NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE	
1948 -----	None
1949 (transferred from other accounts) -----	2,835,400
1950 (plus \$5,350,000 contract authority) -----	10,725,000
DENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES	
1948 -----	None
1949 (transferred from other accounts) -----	1,733,202
1950 -----	1,780,000

Comparison of 1951 estimate and awards provided in present bill

	Estimate, 1951	Contained in bill	Compared to estimate
National Cancer Institute.....	\$20,086,000	\$20,686,000	+\$600,000
Mental health activities.....	9,944,000	10,000,000	+\$56,000
National Heart Institute.....	14,150,000	14,750,000	+\$600,000
Dental health activities.....	2,140,000	2,140,000	-----

Mr. KNOWLAND. I also wish to point out, Mr. President, that we are not giving dribbles in this field. In the first place, the American people have been very generous through their various voluntary organizations. Furthermore, some of the great industrial firms have contributed large sums of money. The State governments are doing much in this field. In the field of public health, for 1950, the Congress appropriated \$199,828,000, and the Senate bill this year recommends \$270,779,000. I merely want the RECORD to be clear. I renew my point of order that the amendment is not in order, for the reason that it contains substantive legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has made a point of order that the amendment contains legislation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state the situation, please. Specifically, do the proponents of the amendment have any authority for an authorization as to a mental- or dental-health program, as included in the bill? If so, the Chair will be glad to hear them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the point of order for just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize, first, any Senator who has any specific authority with reference to the authorization.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have a right to address myself to the point of order, have I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not recognized the Senator from Washington. It is not a debatable matter, except in the discretion of the Chair, as the Chair understands. All the Chair wants is light on the subject.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was trying to address myself—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is not recognized. Does any Senator indicate that he has some authority with reference to the authorization?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am addressing myself to the point of order. I have a right to do that, have I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is debatable, in the discretion of the Chair. The Chair desires information on the law pertaining to the authorization.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Chair deny me the right from the floor to address myself to the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has stated that what he wants first is a citation of authority for this appropriation. What authority is there for it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Chair will allow me, I shall be glad to contribute what light I may have toward the Chair's dilemma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is desirous of saving time. It seems to the Chair that the provision is either authorized or it is not, and that it could be settled within a very short time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I still ask the right to attempt, in my feeble way, to give the Chair what I hope might be some light on that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair speak for a moment, with reference to express authority. The Chair previously asked the Senator from Tennessee whether he had anything on that point, and he did not have.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I may say to the Chair, with respect to the point of order, that I sent to the desk the substantive law relative to this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is what the Chair wants. There can be argument on it, after the Chair reads it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There is no question but that—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order. The Chair has denied the Senator from Washington the right to present an argument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state that he has not denied any Senator the right to be heard.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What did the Chair just do?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to know what, if any, authority there is in law for this appropriation, and then the Chair will hear argument on it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely wanted to address the Chair on the point of order, to suggest that the bill itself, if the Chair will read it, does not authorize anything. It merely says that the amounts to be expended in the case of the National Institute of Dental Research shall be expended for certain things. The National Institute for Dental Research has been authorized by law, and the amounts for the National Heart Institute, the National Cancer Institute, and the mental health activities have all been authorized by the Congress, in the provisions relating to the United States Department of Public Health.

This would merely appropriate money for the purpose of continuing those activities. In the case of the dental health activities, the Dental Institute and dental research, it merely specifies how the money shall be spent. I thank the Chair for his very kind indulgence.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. If I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Washington give information as to what amount has been authorized for the mental health or the dental health clinic?

Mr. MAGNUSON. One million four hundred thousand dollars, for dental research. I do not have the exact amount, for mental health activities, but it has been authorized on one or two occasions within the general authorization of activities of the United States Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized next.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in the first place may I call attention to the fact that the amendment of the able Senator from Washington and his associates does not identify the purpose for which the funds are to be expended. The amendment says:

On page 149, line 24, strike out "\$15,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$79,750,000."

That was the original amendment. The figure of \$79,750,000 had been reduced by half. It does not say "for construction purposes." It is to be appropriated for the purposes that are specified in the appropriation bill, within the terms of the authorization. May we look at page 149? The amendment says, "on page 149, line 24." At the bottom of the page, the next line to the last, appears the figure that is in the bill, \$15,750,000, and the provision, continuing in line 24, reads "of which not less than \$3,600,000 shall be available exclusively for grants for studies with adrenocorticotrophic hormone," and so on. There is nothing in the bill or in the amendment specifying that it has to be used for construction. It is enlarging the fund.

The second amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington and other Senators is:

On page 150, change the period to a colon and add—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair ask the Senator, while he is on that point, Do not the last three lines of the amendment provide, with respect to dental health activities, "for plans, specifications, construction and equipment of a research building and facilities for the National Institute of Dental Research"? That is the basis of the question that is in the Chair's mind, namely, whether there is any authority for it.

Mr. PEPPER. On page 2, beginning in line 2, the amendment says:

Respectively, and amounts so transferred shall be available for the objects specified herein under these heads and for grants for drawing plans, erection of buildings and acquisition of land therefor to provide facilities for research.

As I understand, there is no question about heart and cancer research. It is not questioned in those two cases. In respect to the dental health activities, I may call attention to the fact that the last lines of the amendment, with respect to dental health activities, read:

For plans, specifications, construction, and equipment of a research building and facilities for the National Institute of Dental Research.

In other words, there is evidently to be in Washington, in the completion of the plant that is authorized by the law in Washington. It is not, as in the other cases, to be spread around over the country. Looking at the law itself, section 5 reads as follows:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research.

There is an express authority, at least to that amount, for providing the facilities of the National Institute of Dental Research in Washington. It is not required, Mr. President, under this amendment, that where authorization does not exist the expenditure has to be made outside Washington and the equipment of the national plant.

So, Mr. President, if we look at the mental health authorization we find there is authorization for the construction of mental health facilities in Washington, under the act. The distinguished jurist who now occupies the chair knows that the burden of proof of showing that the amendment is subject to a point of order is upon the one who makes the point of order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I renew my point of order. The whole question hinges on this point, namely, the language to which I have previously referred, "and amounts so transferred shall be available for the objects specified herein under these heads and for grants for drawing plans, erection of buildings, and acquisition of land therefor to provide facilities for research, and, with respect to dental health activities," and so forth.

There is no question but that there is authority involved for the erection of the

clinic at Bethesda. No one challenges that. There is no question but that there is authority at law for the grants for cancer and heart purposes. The point at issue is that this is substantive legislation insofar as it relates to grants for dental purposes, and is writing into the law something which does not now exist insofar as such grants for dental and mental facilities, as outlined, are indicated.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. With respect to the Dental Health Institute, the Senator does not assert, does he, that the amendment would require the construction of any dental facilities outside the National Institute in Washington?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I say it broadens the authority in the law by the language which provides for grants for drawing plans, erection of buildings, and acquisition of land therefor to provide facilities for research.

Mr. PEPPER. May I make this observation: Is it not a fair construction of the language with respect to the Dental Institute, that it is intended that with respect to that institute only the latter language shall apply? In other words, the first part of the amendment evidently refers to the other three.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to hear the Senator from California until he has completed his point.

Mr. PEPPER. I beg the Chair's pardon.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The point is, Mr. President, that there is no authority in law, so far as it relates to dental and mental health activities, on this matter of grants for the purposes indicated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to modify the amendment in the following respect: Strike out lines 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, on page 2, and insert, after the word "respectively", in line 2, "to the extent authorized by law."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the amendment is changed as indicated, would a point of order lie on the basis of transfer from the National Institutes of Health, as the Magnuson amendment proposes? Would not unanimous consent be necessary because these items were adopted too long ago to move reconsideration without unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the general rule is that the question of consistency or inconsistency will not generally invalidate an amendment. That is a matter which the Senate passes on when it casts its vote.

The question is on the adoption of the amendment as modified. The Chair understands that disposes of the point of order, since no point of order has been made to the modified amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should think that takes care of the point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (putting the question). The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. KNOWLAND and other Senators asked for a division.

On a division the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is too late. The decision has been announced.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If we are going to be so technical—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we have listened very patiently for over an hour to debate on points of order, which I have been agreeable to listen to because everyone ought to have his day in court. But the Presiding Officer announced the result of the vote, and when it is announced, we should proceed with the bill. It is now 6 o'clock.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the Presiding Officer did not announce the number of votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not customary to announce the number of votes on a division.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the motion of the Senator from Minnesota be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. HUMPHREY and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] voted in the affirmative on the division.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not recorded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That point would apply only to a recorded vote.

Mr. CORDON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	McMahon
Anderson	Hill	Magnuson
Butler	Hoey	Malone
Byrd	Holland	Martin
Capehart	Humphrey	Millikin
Chapman	Hunt	Morse
Chavez	Ives	Mundt
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Darby	Kem	Pepper
Donnell	Kerr	Robertson
Douglas	Kilgore	Russell
Dworshak	Knowland	Saltonstall
Eaton	Langer	Schoeppel
Ellender	Leahy	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Lodge	Sparkman
George	Lucas	Stennis
Gillette	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Graham	McCarthy	Thye
Green	McClellan	Wherry
Gurney	McFarland	Wiley
Hayden	McKellar	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to ask the Chair to state the question so that Senators will know what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment with reference to the heart, cancer, mental, and dental provisions was rejected.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR and Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is detained on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] who is also absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—37

Butler	Gurney	Mundt
Byrd	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Hendrickson	Robertson
Chavez	Hoey	Russell
Cordon	Holland	Saltonstall
Darby	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kem	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	McClellan	Stennis
Ellender	McKellar	Thye
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
George	Martin	
Gillette	Millikin	

NAYS—32

Aiken	Ives	McFarland
Anderson	Johnston, S. C.	McMahon
Chapman	Kerr	Magnuson
Connally	Kilgore	Morse
Ecton	Langer	Murray
Frear	Leahy	Pepper
Graham	Lehman	Sparkman
Green	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Lucas	Wiley
Humphrey	McCarran	Williams
Hunt	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—27

Benton	Hickenlooper	Taft
Brewster	Jenner	Taylor
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	Thomas, Okla.
Briggs	Kefauver	Tobey
Cain	Long	Tydings
Downey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Eastland	Myers	Watkins
Flanders	Neely	Withers
Fulbright	O'Connor	Young

So Mr. KNOWLAND's motion to lay on the table Mr. HUMPHREY's motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 335, between lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

No part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the United States Maritime Commission shall be used to pay the costs of national defense features under title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to pay such costs out of any funds appropriated for the Department of the Navy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I just listened to the reading of the amendment. It transfers the responsibility now vested in the Maritime Commission to the Navy Department. The amendment is clearly legislation in that it changes the authority from one Government agency to another.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder if the very able and eminent Senator from Wyoming would be willing to withhold his point of order until I explain the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator withholds his point of order, and the Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this amendment would require the cost of the national defense features of ship subsidies to be paid for by the Department of the Navy. I want to make it clear that I do not oppose these sub-

dies to shipping where they are of material benefit to national security. But I do think that, in the interest of sound accounting practices, the agency which passes on the expenditure of such funds should be the agency which pays the expense. Furthermore, the defense features of shipbuilding should be considered as part of the over-all national defense program.

Under the present law, the Navy passes on the expenditure of funds which are paid for by the Maritime Administration. That is, it will certify what it regards as the national defense features, and then the Maritime Commission has to pay the bill. Thus the necessity for integrating our naval defense needs is absent. However, it is my feeling that the Navy will look with a much more critical eye at Maritime subsidies if the funds come out of their appropriation. So I think the adoption of this amendment, if it does not save a nickel, will at least enable us to better provide for real defense needs.

Mr. President, this morning in the course of the debate it was developed that the Interstate Commerce Commission determines the amount which the Post Office Department will pay to the railroads for carrying the mail by rail, and the bill which the Interstate Commerce Commission presents to the Post Office Department must be borne by the Post Office Department even though the Post Office Department thinks the items are improper. Similarly, the Civil Aeronautics Board fixes for the Post Office Department the amount which shall be paid for the transportation of mail by air and the Post Office Department has no voice in the matter.

Mr. President, in the case of the maritime subsidies it is the Navy which certifies how much of the construction costs can be charged to defense features and borne by the Government, and the Maritime Commission has to follow suit.

In none of these cases do those who call the tune have to pay the piper. They can say what amounts should be paid, and some other agency has to foot the bill. It is easy to overcertify in these cases since it is always a temptation to be generous at someone else's expense.

At the present time, the Navy is given a certain amount of money to carry out its shipbuilding and maintenance program. Then they are also required to pass judgment upon the expenditure of some funds of the Maritime Administration for the defense features of ship subsidies. Defense needs are therefore not truly integrated. Actually, the Navy may in many instances feel that such funds could better be spent on other navy ships. If they did, it would be just too bad since the law prohibits this. However, if this amendment is adopted, the Navy could spend these funds in such a manner as to get maximum security and strength. Of course it may be that the Navy approves of defense features of the ship subsidy program feeling that this materially benefits national defense. In this case, they would go ahead and provide them, but at least we could be certain that our maritime defense policies were integrated and that

we were getting the most security for our money.

The adoption of this amendment would correct some of the flaws in our maritime setup, which were pointed out in the conclusions and observations of the House Executive Expenditures Committee in its inquiry into operations of the Maritime Commission. In this report (H. Rept. No. 1423, 81st Cong.) on page 21 the committee states:

There is evidence that the Commission disregarded its responsibilities by providing additional subsidy through the process of underclassifying commercial needs so as to promote a determination that certain commercial features were national defense features as contemplated by the act.

If the Navy were to spend its own funds for the defense features of these subsidies, as is contemplated in this amendment, I believe they would have blocked these excessive assignments to defense in order to keep a maximum of naval strength.

That this amendment should be adopted is further borne out in a recommendation included in a special report of the General Accounting Office. This report, which is Appendix I of House Report No. 1423, recommends on page 48:

That the cost of features incorporated for national defense uses be required to be paid from Navy Department appropriations so that the desirability of adding those features may be considered in the light of over-all naval and military requirements and funds available to meet those requirements.

This was recommendation No. 2 of the Comptroller General's report. Concerning this recommendation, Congressman HARDY, chairman of the subcommittee holding hearings on the operations of the Maritime Commission, stated during these hearings—page 510 of hearings:

The implication, to me at least, is that if the Navy had the appropriation for this purpose that they might be a little more careful in scrutinizing the defense features that they approved.

Admiral Wheelock, who was testifying at the time raised no violent objection to this recommendation. Not that he enthusiastically supported it since he knew that the various naval experts might take a dim view of these subsidies, they could spend more for destroyers, submarine, or what-have-you—see page 511 of the hearings.

But the point is, of course, that the defense features of shipping subsidies should harmonize with our over-all naval requirements. This is not done as presently set up. The adoption of this amendment would require it.

Mr. President, at a time when we need to get the very most for our defense dollar, I believe we should adopt this amendment. I believe that it would clearly contribute toward that goal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has to advise the Senator that his 5 minutes have already expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now renew the point of order. The statement the Senator has made only emphasizes the fact that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, forbidden by the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has examined the amendment,

and in the opinion of the Chair it is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill, and therefore is out of order, and the point of order is sustained.

Are there further amendments to be offered to the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which is subject to a point of order. It changes basic law. The budget has not approved it, but I should like to have the clerk read it, and then I should like to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 9, after the word "each," it is proposed to strike out "\$1,025,789," and to insert "Provided, That the basic annual rates of compensation of the following positions shall be: Superintendent of Senate Press Gallery at \$4,800 in lieu of \$4,320; first assistant superintendent at \$4,080 in lieu of assistant superintendent at \$3,600; second assistant superintendent at \$2,820 in lieu of assistant superintendent at \$2,400; third assistant superintendent at \$2,820 in lieu of assistant superintendent at \$2,400; messenger at \$2,220 in lieu of \$1,920; superintendent of Senate Periodical Press Gallery at \$4,060 in lieu of \$3,660; superintendent of Senate Radio Press Gallery at \$4,680 in lieu of \$4,020; first assistant superintendent at \$3,000 in lieu of assistant superintendent at \$2,580; second assistant superintendent at \$2,880 in lieu of assistant superintendent at \$2,580; third assistant superintendent at \$2,520 in lieu of assistant superintendent at \$2,100, \$1,032,030."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the information I am about to submit comes from those in the press gallery who are vitally interested in the amendment.

Mr. President, I think the Senate should know that twice in the last session of the Congress, the Senate voted unanimously to increase the salaries of employees in the press, periodical, and radio galleries. Twice, the House rejected the Senate amendment in the conference committee.

Since that time, the standing committees of the three galleries have unanimously agreed upon a schedule of equalized compensation which is in the amendment I have offered.

The House, accordingly, acted independently on a resolution raising the salaries of the gallery employees at the other side of the Capitol, through its contingent funds, retroactive to April 1 of this year. The amendment I have offered would bring the salaries of the employees in the Senate galleries exactly in line with the increases already approved by the House.

The three standing committees are unanimously agreed on every increase in the amendment I have offered. The increases asked this year are actually \$500

less than were approved by the Senate on two previous occasions, and in some cases the figure is even wider than that. The standing committees are agreed not to seek a higher rate of compensation than that granted by the House.

What I said last year on the floor of the Senate, Mr. President, applies equally today when I submitted an amendment similar to that which was adopted by the Senate last year. What I said on that occasion has double force now, since the House has already acted. The amendment I have offered would equalize and bring in line the salaries on both sides of the Capitol; it would give these men a more reasonable compensation for the valuable services that they perform; and finally it should settle the salary problem of these galleries for some time to come. The standing committees in this schedule of salaries have attempted to balance the payrolls and get the employees properly adjudicated according to their separate tasks and responsibilities.

Mr. President, this information has been submitted to me by members of the Press Gallery. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] takes issue, I believe, with some of the statements here made. I am not, of course, a member of the Appropriations Committee, but I do know there is no equality and no equity now existing between the House and the Senate as the result of what has been done in the House, if the statements are true. Certainly at some time or other the Senate gallery employees should be placed upon the same basis as those in the House, in some way, either through the Appropriations Committee or through some other committee. They should be placed on a parity with the employees of the House of Representatives. Our employees should not be paid less for the services they perform in the press and other galleries, than the personnel employed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I undertake to say these men are performing a most valuable service, not only to the country but to the Senators as well. Each and every one of us calls upon them occasionally to do things for us and they call on us. We need the most efficient men we can obtain in our press and other galleries. Certainly they should not be paid less than the House is paying its employees in a similar capacity. I hope the amendment will be taken to conference and there worked out in some way. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will not raise a point of order against the amendment. However, I stated in the beginning that the amendment is subject to a point of order for the reasons I gave.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment is out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

If there are no further amendments—

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, Mr. President. I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 342, before the colon, in line 16, it is pro-

posed to insert a comma and the following: "but the amount of obligations authorized to be incurred pursuant to such authority is hereby reduced by \$237,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an amendment to eliminate the extended authorization to build 16,000 additional Veterans' Administration hospital beds which were cut back by the President. I think the situation needs to be explained. There is no shortage of beds for service-connected disability cases even now. When the present hospitals which are presently under construction or under contract are completed there will be no shortage, even so far as the present waiting lists are concerned for non-service-connected cases. The proposal to build 16,000 beds on top of all this would be, therefore, a waste of money at the present time.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD exchanges of correspondence which I have had with various officials in the Veterans' Administration, and tables, to establish this point.

There being no objection, the correspondence and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 8, 1950.

Dr. PAUL B. MAGNUSON,
Chief Medical Director,
Department of Medicine and Surgery,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. MAGNUSON: Many thanks for the material you sent. It will come in handy. I was especially interested in the news story by Martin S. Hayden where he quoted you on certain aspects of the Veterans' Hospital program. However, I would appreciate a letter from you so that I may have some of these quotes directly. I would like to know:

1. The number of veterans presently in veterans' hospitals.
2. The percentage of these veterans who are in these hospitals because of service-connected disabilities as compared to the percentage whose disabilities are non-service-connected.
3. The size of the waiting list of the veterans declared eligible for hospitalization who want admittance but have not been admitted. I would also like this figure broken down according to the number of those with service-connected disabilities and non-service-connected disabilities.

Sincerely,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 14, 1950.
Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: At this time the Veterans' Administration is providing hospital care for approximately 35,000 veterans with service-connected disabilities. It is also providing hospital care for approximately 70,000 veterans with non-service-connected disabilities. Thus, the Veterans' Administration is now caring for twice as many non-service-connected cases as service-connected ones. Since service-connected cases receive a thorough priority in admission to veterans' hospital care, any extension in bed capacity of veterans' hospitals can be needed only for the care of non-service-connected cases.

Almost none of the 26,000 veterans who are on hospital waiting lists, is waiting on hospital care for any injury or disability resulting from his military service. They are there rather for medical care the need for which has not resulted from their military service.

The basic issue of public policy here is then not whether men who have been injured in battle shall be treated by their Government for their injuries to the full extent and in the best manner that the health sciences allow. The issue is rather, whether the Federal Government shall furnish free and unlimited hospital care at the expense of all of the citizens to men who are veterans, and for all of the health hazards to which all citizens, whether veterans or not, are exposed.

As a doctor, I must firmly assert that even if our Congress desires that the answer to this question be "yes"—and to my knowledge the Congress has not so indicated—the limits of our medical resources at this time simply do not permit such a course.

We may have the engineers to build the hospitals. We do not have the doctors and the nurses and the technicians to staff hospitals indiscriminately located. For every patient in a hospital bed we need between one and one and one-half employees. Our specialists and technicians and the other requirements of health care are not distributed with a nice concern for the distribution and concentration of populations. I look forward to a time when there may be a balance of health needs and resources that is more satisfactory to all concerned. We do not bring that day closer by a program of hospital-bed construction that is unrelated to our possible effectiveness in professional staffing.

I should like finally to acknowledge that some of our service-connected cases may have to be hospitalized elsewhere than in their own communities. I hope that we may continue to be able to do so. Such a practice has to be followed not because a community lacks beds, but because we want to bring our patients to the place where the professional talent is available. Such a practice reflects the distribution of medical resources in the private society, and, most important of all, involves a set of considerations applicable to the hospitalization of veterans and non-veterans alike. In other words, whether a man is a veteran or not he may have to seek for hospital care outside of his area and in an area of specialists and professionals if he is to receive adequate care. The indiscriminate geographic location and building of hospital beds of itself leaves this problem unanswered.

I am enclosing for your information, a table showing number of Veterans' Administration patients in hospitals, May 31, 1950, and number on waiting list June 15, 1950.

Very truly yours,

PAUL B. MAGNUSON,
Chief Medical Director.

Veterans' Administration patients in
hospitals, May 31, 1950

	VA hospitals		Non-VA hospitals		All hospitals	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Service-connected.....	31,641	33.1	3,770	38.9	35,411	33.7
Non-service-connected....	63,875	66.9	5,931	61.1	69,806	66.3
Total.....	95,516	100.0	9,701	100.0	105,217	100.0

Veterans on waiting list for hospital admission, June 15, 1950

	Number	Percent
Service-connected.....	28	0.11
Non-service-connected.....	25,284	99.89
Total.....	25,312	100.00

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of April 28, 1950]

MEDICAL CHIEF SAYS VA CAN'T USE MORE BEDS (By Martin S. Hayden)

The angry medical boss of the Veterans' Administration wishes that more Congressmen, chamber of commerce heads, and American Legion commanders knew what a hospital is.

Dr. Paul B. Magnuson says that, if they did, he would not be asked to seek doctors to work in Dublin, Ga., and Battle Creek, Mich., and there would not be talk of giving him 16,000 more veteran beds that he could not operate, if he had them.

In a blunt interview, the one-time Northwestern University surgery head, now VA medical chief, had his say about pouring taxpayers' money down drains under the guise of helping veterans. Specifically, he slapped the election-year alacrity with which the House Monday pushed through Representative RANKIN's \$237,000,000 bill to reinstate the 16,000 beds pruned by President Truman from the VA hospital-construction program.

"I couldn't use 16,000 more beds if they gave them to me tomorrow," Dr. Magnuson protested. "Some folks have the idea that all you do is spend \$15,000 to provide one hospital bed and everything is fine. They forget that, after the buildings are open, it takes \$12 a day per patient to fill the bed; that would be \$192,000 a day, or \$70,000,000 in a year for 16,000 beds."

And then, says the doctor, there is the matter of hiring doctors, nurses, and technicians.

"Do they want 16,000 boardinghouse beds, or hospitals?" he asks. "If they want hospitals, it might be well to remember that it takes 1½ people in a hospital to take care of each patient, year in and year out. We have nearly 4,000 of our present beds empty for lack of staff."

That gets the doctor around to Dublin, Battle Creek, and other small communities where, he says, "chambers of commerce and Legion posts raise hell till they get a veterans' hospital."

Dublin, in the home district of Chairman VINSON of the Armed Service Committee, now has its hospital. A modern 1,000-bed unit built by the Navy, 53 miles from Macon, the nearest city, and presented after the war to the VA.

"We authorize use of 500 of the beds," Dr. Magnuson says. "We've never been able to get enough staff to open more than 300. Dublin is a nice place but we just can't find hospital technicians, nurses, and doctors willing to move there. I took the bull by the horns and ordered 15 of our doctors down there and 8 promptly resigned."

In Battle Creek, Dr. Magnuson is criticized for not grabbing up the 1,200 bed \$30,000,000 Percy Jones Hospital which the Army is about to close.

"Another nice town," Dr. Magnuson comments. "But look at its census of doctors: No specialists in anesthesia, skin, or plastics; one each in neuropsychiatry, urology, and orthopedic surgery; three each in internal medicine, pathology, and nose-throat-ear; and five each in surgery and X-ray."

"If we asked those doctors for a guaranty of hours to help us, they would be too busy to give us a total of 10 hours a week. That would mean we would have to bring in a whole new staff, and you just can't get them."

At the opposite, and good, extreme Dr. Magnuson points to the situation in San Francisco where the VA has a staff of only 8 full-time doctors in a 430-bed hospital. The bulk of the work is handled by the Stanford and University of California Medical School staffs. He would like more beds in such cities.

"They are less expensive," he says, "and the patients have readily available the finest specialized talent that science can produce."

Dr. Magnuson snorts at some of the things said by impassioned House Members during the Monday debate.

Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican, of Massachusetts, declared: "It is a cruel thing to prevent men who have fought for us and who were injured from receiving hospitalization."

"There is no such veteran," answers Dr. Magnuson. "Any man disabled in the service can have a bed immediately and get the best medical treatment in the world. The only exception is when he insists on going to a specific hospital and refuses to let us send him where there is space available."

There is a 26,000-veteran waiting list for free VA beds, Dr. Magnuson admits, but all are veterans whose illness is in no way traceable to their service.

Under old law the VA may give notification for non-service-connected disability, provided there is "space available." The records show that, ever since Congress passed the law, it has poured out money to make space available, and, of the 99,311 veterans actually hospitalized as of last February 28, two-thirds were for nonservice disabilities.

Another objected-to congressional complaint was this, from Representative DAYTON PHILLIPS, Democrat, of Tennessee:

"Seriously ill veterans are being moved out of hospitals, many of them sent home to die."

"Bunk!" says Dr. Magnuson. "There has never been a sick man put out of a veterans' hospital. Some have died after they went home. But death was started by Adam and has been going on pretty consistently ever since. We can fight it, but we can't stop it."

MAY 4, 1950.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I would very much appreciate information on hospitals presently under construction and those for which construction is planned. On these hospitals I would like to know their names, locations, size, and type. I would be grateful if I could have this information as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D. C., May 12, 1950.

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Reference is made to your letter of May 4, 1950, requesting information on Veterans' Administration hospitals presently under construction and those for which construction is planned.

There is enclosed in duplicate a list of hospitals being constructed as of May 8, 1950, and those which are to be constructed under the current authorized Veterans' Administration hospital construction program.

Very truly yours,

F. H. DRYDEN,

Assistant Administrator for Construction, Supply, and Real Estate.

Veterans' Administration hospitals under construction as of May 8, 1950

	Beds
Albany, N. Y.....	1,005
Altoona, Pa.....	1200
Ann Arbor, Mich.....	1500
Baltimore, Md.....	300
Beckley, W. Va.....	1200
Birmingham, Ala.....	1500
Bonham, Tex.....	300, 150

Footnotes at end of table.

	Beds
Boston, Mass.....	1,000
Chicago, Ill.....	500
Chicago, Ill.....	500
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	500
Clarksburg, W. Va.....	200
Denver, Colo.....	500
Durham, N. C.....	500
East Orange, N. J.....	1,000
Erie, Pa.....	200
Grand Island, Nebr.....	200
Indianapolis, Ind.....	494
Iowa City, Iowa.....	500
Kansas City, Mo.....	500
Little Rock, Ark.....	500
Louisville, Ky.....	500
Madison, Wis.....	500
Manchester, N. H.....	150
Marlin, Tex.....	200
Miles City, Mont.....	100
New Orleans, La.....	500
Omaha, Nebr.....	500
Peekskill, N. Y.....	1,965
Philadelphia, Pa.....	500
Phoenix, Ariz.....	200
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	1,000
Poplar Bluff, Mo.....	200
Saginaw, Mich.....	200
Salisbury, N. C.....	1,000
Salt Lake City, Utah.....	500
Seattle, Wash.....	300
Shreveport, La.....	450
Spokane, Wash.....	200
Syracuse, N. Y.....	500
West Haven, Conn.....	400, 500
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.....	475

¹ General medicine and surgery.

² Tuberculosis.

³ Domiciliary.

⁴ Tumor clinic.

⁵ Neuropsychiatric.

Veterans' Administration hospitals to be constructed

	Beds
Brockton, Mass.....	1,000
Cleveland, Ohio.....	500
Cleveland, Ohio.....	1,000
Los Angeles, Calif.....	1,000
New York, N. Y.....	1,250
Oklahoma City, Okla.....	500
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	750
St. Louis, Mo.....	500
San Francisco, Calif.....	1,000
Washington, D. C.....	500

¹ Neuropsychiatric.

² General medicine and surgery.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the figures in this correspondence show that of the total of 105,217 veterans who are in VA hospitals or hospitals financed by the VA only 35,000 are service-connected disability cases, and that approximately 70,000 are non-service-connected cases. In other words, two-thirds of all existing VA patients were those with non-service-connected disabilities, and only one-third were suffering from service-connected disabilities.

But, Mr. President, it is said that there is a big waiting list that the Veterans' Administration cannot take care of. Well, the waiting list on the 15th of June, only 6 weeks ago, was only a little over 25,000 cases. Mr. President, let us note that only a total of 28 cases—I repeat only 28 cases of those on the waiting list were service-connected. Twenty-five thousand two hundred and eighty-four were non-service-connected. So that on the waiting list only one-tenth of 1 percent of those waiting admission were suffering from service-connected disabilities and 99.9 percent of the cases were non-service-connected.

Mr. President, there are already under construction, or plans drawn to be constructed, a total of approximately 29,000 beds. Only a little less than 21,000 beds are actually under construction. An other 8,000 beds are to be constructed. So that when these 29,000 beds are constructed, if the waiting list does not further increase, all of those on the present waiting list can be absorbed—even including all non-service-connected disabilities.

The proposal which was put through on the floor of the House, and which I am sorry to say was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this morning, provides for an additional 16,000 beds on top of all this, which will cost at least \$237,000,000. The extended contract authorization in this bill provides the money. These 16,000 beds are not necessary, doctors are not available for them, and building them would be useless.

Mr. President, I know that no one wants to vote against medical care for veterans, whether or not these veterans are suffering from service-connected disabilities or non-service-connected disabilities. I know it is an unpopular political thing to do so. But, as I have shown, these beds are not needed. Furthermore, I believe the United States has got to stop, look, listen, and study the cost of this hospital program, and that there must be a limit somewhere. I submit, Mr. President, that we ought to strike out the authorizations for these additional 16,000 beds and save \$237,000,000, particularly since all the hospitals which are now under construction will take care of the present waiting list, which, as I have said, is 99.9 percent non-service-connected.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely desire to say that a request was made to our committee to add \$237,000,000 to the bill for this purpose. We did not add it. The \$237,000,000 is not in the bill. Therefore, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, if I understand it correctly, is designed to prevent an appropriation or an authorization which was reported from a legislative committee today. The authorization reported by a committee does not carry any appropriation in this bill. I think the Senator's amendment does not belong here.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the authority to provide these additional 16,000 beds, which was given in previous acts of the Congress, is extended by the provisions from line 10 to line 16, on page 342?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is not my understanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say I have consulted the Budget Bureau. I have been informed by them that the previous authorization which otherwise would have lapsed is extended by this language.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Illinois is mistaken about that, I am sure. The authorization for the construction of hospitals was contained in a legislative enactment made several years ago. After that measure was enacted and after the program for hospital construction had been worked out by the Veterans' Administration, the President of the United States, Mr. Truman, directed the Veterans' Administration to abandon a substantial part of that program. The President ordered the Veterans' Administration to reduce the size of certain hospitals from 100 beds to 500 beds and to abandon certain other hospitals. That order was carried out by the Veterans' Administration.

I am very well aware of the fact that the House of Representatives has passed a new bill which directs the construction of these hospital facilities, but that authorization bill cannot possibly become effective because the reduced program is well on its way to completion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Wyoming—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has yielded the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, just in discussing the merits of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois, I wish to say that I have noted how the Senator from Illinois has voted on practically every item in this bill. Just this afternoon, when it came to a question of making a reduction of even 5 percent in the funds proposed to be appropriated for aid to Europe, the Senator from Illinois voted against the amendment proposing such a reduction in the appropriation; he was not in favor of reducing by 1 penny the amount proposed for aid to Europe. However, here, at this late hour, the Senator from Illinois would have the Senate adopt an amendment by which a reduction would be made in the funds to be provided for the care of our veterans who saved Europe.

I think the amendment should be rejected on its merits alone, for it reduces the question to one of Europe versus the veterans of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it; the "noes" have it, and the amendment is rejected.

The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment—

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, Mr. President; I wish to be recognized at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall not take up too much time for it is not my purpose to delay the Senate in its anxiety to go to more pleasant scenes. However, there are a few amendments which remain, and which I wish to have stated, although I appreciate the desire of the Chair to be expeditious in the handling of the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Can the amendments to be proposed by the Senator from Illinois be stated and voted on en bloc?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be willing to have that done. I have prepared the amendments in groups, according to the chapters of the bill to which they are offered; and for the sake of neatness I think it would be better to have the amendments stated in that way, by chapters.

So I send the first group of amendments to the desk and ask that they be stated and considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc, and they will be stated at this time.

The CHIEF CLERK. The following amendments are proposed:

On page 72, line 8, strike the figure "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$5,750,000."

On page 81, line 17, strike the figure "\$6,200,000" and insert "\$5,900,000."

On page 88, line 18, strike the figure "\$4,600,000" and insert "\$4,000,000."

On page 89, line 2, strike the figure "\$22,500,000" and insert "\$15,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, these proposals, I hope, will be voted on en bloc. They would effect total reductions of \$8,650,000 in the appropriations for the Department of Commerce. In most cases, the amendments would result in having the bill provide for the same appropriations as those made for these purposes last year.

In the case of forest highways, the amendments propose a reduction of \$7,500,000 in the appropriation, because of the large amount of funds appropriated for that purpose in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Illinois, which are to be voted on en bloc. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" seem to have it; and the "noes" have it, and the amendments are rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer another group of amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated and considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc, and will now be stated en bloc.

The CHIEF CLERK. The following amendments are proposed:

On page 128, line 16, strike the figure "\$1,382,000" and insert "\$1,227,000."

On page 128, line 19, strike the figure "\$1,861,000" and insert "\$1,800,000."

On page 129, line 14, strike the figure "\$714,000" and insert "\$700,000."

On page 130, line 2, strike the figure "\$281,000" and insert "\$250,000."

On page 130, line 8, strike the figure "\$2,788,000" and insert "\$2,700,000."

On page 134, line 11, strike the figure "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$1,500,000."

On page 135, line 4, strike the figure "\$9,396,400" and insert "\$9,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, these are proposals for reductions in the ap-

propriations for administrative expenses for the Department of Labor. In the past I have been charged with proposing reductions for Government departments other than the Department of Labor, and with treating the Department of Labor more gently. However, that is not the case. These reductions would total \$1,-225,000.

Mr. President, this afternoon, when I told a fellow Senator that I intended to offer these amendments, he said to me, "You are suffering from an extreme case of masochism." I did not at the time know just what that word meant, but I later found out that it meant "one who likes to inflict pain upon himself."

Mr. President, I assure the Senate that this is not true, yet I admit that it is not at all pleasant for me to offer these amendments, in the face of a tired and somewhat hostile Senate; but the pruning knife should be used on the appropriations items for all the departments—on those for which one may have a sentimental affection, as well as on the others.

I do not think these amendments, if adopted, would cripple the Department of Labor in the slightest. In fact, the Department could still go ahead with its program if it saved an additional \$1,-225,000.

I suppose these amendments will find favor with many Senators who voted down amendments pertaining to flood control and navigation appropriations. These amendments will give some Senators a chance to crack down on the Department of Labor. I hope Senators will indulge in their sadistic desires in that connection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Illinois. [Putting the question.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am glad that my amendments received two or three votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state the result. The "noes" seem to have it; the "noes" have it, and the amendments are rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up, finally, by amendment lettered "B," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 366, before the period in line 16, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used for construction of the Pine Flat Reservoir or the Isabella Reservoir, Calif., unless (1), within 6 months following the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Army shall have received reports with respect to the division of costs of such projects among flood control, irrigation, and other water uses from the Bureau of Reclamation and local organizations and, within 9 months following the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have made a determination as to the allocation of such costs, and (2) repayment contracts, complying with the

provisions of the reclamation laws and covering the portion of such costs allocated to irrigation and assigned for repayment by the owners of such lands, shall have been entered into by the Secretary of the Interior with irrigation, reclamation, or water districts or associations embracing at least 75 percent of the lands within the respective projects."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder whether my good friend, the Senator from California, will withhold the point of order for 5 minutes, until I can explain the purpose of the amendment. I hope the Senator will not try to drop the guillotine upon my hapless head too quickly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to be courteous to the Senator, and of course I wish him to have an opportunity to express his purpose. I wonder whether he will file his statement for the RECORD.

However, I shall withhold the point of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much.

Let me say first that the first part of my amendment is in line with a proposal made by the senior Senator from Arizona last year in reference to the Isabella Reservoir alone. It was approved by the Senate then, but rejected in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California withhold the point of order?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I withhold the point of order temporarily, Mr. President, but I wish it understood that I do not desire to lose my right to the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California.

Let me say that the amendment relates to the appropriation of funds for the continuing of construction of the Pine Flat Reservoir and of the Isabella Reservoir, in California, the total estimated costs for which are about \$65,000,000; \$13,250,000 is the amount of the appropriations now carried in this bill for these projects, but this amendment does not propose to reduce this figure. It merely imposes certain conditions on the expenditure of the funds.

Mr. President, this amendment is designed to meet a situation in which there is great danger that the allotment provisions, the acreage limitations, and the antispeculation features of the reclamation laws will be nullified. The amendment would condition the expenditure of further funds, under the appropriation for these two projects, upon a new allocation of the cost assigned to irrigation, and upon the making of repayment contracts in compliance with Federal reclamation laws, by owners of 75 percent of the lands within the project.

Now, Mr. President, the Nation has been providing hundreds of millions of dollars and will eventually spend billions of dollars in the future for irrigation projects, on condition that at least three terms be met: First, that the costs specifically chargeable to irrigation, that is

to say, the principal costs, may be repaid to the Government by those who benefit from it. The interest is forgiven. Second, that there shall be compliance with antispeculation features of the law, so that no one will get speculative profits on the sale of excess lands out of the money invested by the community in the project. Third, that the expenditures by the public are designed to promote the family-sized farm, with a 160-acreage limitation, which in effect is a 320-acreage limitation, because both man and wife are given 160 acres.

Now, the application of the reclamation law to the Kings and Kern River project, to which these two dams relate, has been denied by the water users' representatives, who have said that the reclamation law does not apply, although in my judgment it was clearly intended by Congress as the record of the debate on the bill in 1944 will show.

No repayment agreements have been made by the water users' association in Kings and Kern River Valleys, despite extended communications and negotiations.

No agreements having been signed to make repayment or to impose the 160-acre limitation, the construction of these dams and reservoirs, even without the completion of the irrigation ditches, will enable the landowners to secure a large part of the irrigation benefits through the seepage of underground water. And as pointed out in the letters of the President and of Commissioner Straus, which I inserted in the RECORD last Tuesday, it will then be difficult if not impossible for the Government to enforce the repayment provisions of the law.

The current estimated cost of these two projects is \$65,000,000. For Pine Flat alone, on the Kings River, it is \$51,121,000, which makes the original offer of \$10,000,000 which these people made for repayment, and the figure of \$14,250,000, which the Bureau recommended in 1946, quite unreal today. It is now said that irrigation will enjoy 60 percent of the benefits of the Pine Flat Reservoir. When the original estimate of the cost was \$19,700,000, and in 1946 when its estimated cost was \$36,500,000, then the original repayment figures of from \$10,000,000 to \$14,000,000 was all right, but now the cost of Pine Flat has gone up to \$51,000,000. The irrigation benefits are estimated at 60 percent, but the landowners are refusing to meet the added cost.

On the Isabella project on the Keru River no offers of repayment of any amount have been made.

If we do not deal with this issue now, we shall find that all through the Central Valley in California we shall be constructing reservoirs and irrigation ditches without the water users signing up and agreeing to obey the law, and then, once the ditches have been built, once the reservoirs are there, the landowners will get the benefits and the Nation will hold the bag. The water users in other parts of the valley who have already signed up repayment contracts in compliance with the law can then justly claim discrimination, and our reclamation policies will be seriously endangered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before renewing my point of order I desire to read to the Senate and to place in the RECORD a brief telegram addressed to me under date of August 3. It is from Carmel, Calif., is signed by Gilbert H. Jertberg, and reads as follows:

CARMEL, CALIF., August 3, 1950.

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Proposed rider to appropriation bill is a strong arm, arbitrary proposal obviously inspired by Bureau of Reclamation to get results it cannot get by propaganda and negotiations. It is contrary to Pine Flat project unanimously passed by Congress. It would be utterly unjust to Kings River water users, who are honestly and sincerely attempting to preserve their rights, maintain local administration in the public interest, and at the same time pay a fair price for irrigation benefits of Pine Flat. Rider would not permit sufficient time for negotiation of fair contract and would thereby stop work and cause blame to be placed on local water users to the delight of the propaganda mill of the Bureau. Local water users at their own expense, without Federal aid, have built up great irrigation system through democratic processes and have demonstrated their capacity to administer these resources in the public interest. The 35,000 farm families in this area should not be clubbed into a contract, but should be permitted to deal with their Government in a fair and independent manner. In my opinion, the rider should be vigorously opposed and thoroughly defeated in the interest of fair play and democratic processes.

GILBERT H. JERTBERG.

My point of order is that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois is out of order, both by reason of the fact that it is legislation on the appropriation bill, and also that it provides for certain contingencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has read the amendment. It is obvious that the point of order is well taken, and it is sustained. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from California would withdraw his point of order, and the Chair would reverse his ruling, if I now modify my amendment so as to eliminate the first proviso of the amendment. It would then read:

Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used for construction of the Pine Flat Reservoir or the Isabella Reservoir, California, unless—

I now omit the first proviso—
unless repayment contracts, complying with the provisions of the reclamation laws and covering the portion of such costs allocated to irrigation and assigned for repayment by the owners of such lands, shall have been entered into by the Secretary of the Interior with irrigation, reclamation, or water districts or associations embracing at least 75 percent of the lands within the respective projects.

Mr. President, this is not legislation. In its present form it is a restriction that we shall not go on with the construction unless there is an assurance that the people who benefit from the construction will agree to abide by the existing laws under which these appropriations are to be made.

This suggestion was first made in the Senate hearings, not by the Bureau of Reclamation, but by Mr. M. C. Hermann, Quartermaster Adjutant of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of California. It was earlier proposed by the President. It will merely limit the expenditure to require compliance with reclamation law and should be added to the bill as a restriction on the appropriation. It is not affirmative legislation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I renew my point of order on that, because it provides for a contingency. I still think it is out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken, and it is sustained. The bill is open for further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 7786) was read the third time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I shall support the pending bill, but with certain very definite reservations.

In my judgment, the bill is wholly unrealistic. It contains too many chunks of fat—fat which the United States may sorely need during the critical period ahead. And I am not talking about "pork."

The appropriations provided for are based on the situation as it existed prior to June 27, when the President ordered our Armed Forces into war. The bill does not take into consideration events which have occurred since that time. Recent developments have completely changed the picture.

As pointed out by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] 2 days ago, the President has submitted supplemental requests for appropriations totaling approximately \$16,640,000,000. This total includes \$10,500,000,000 for the Department of Defense, \$4,000,000,000 for additional military aid to Europe, \$260,000,000 for atomic energy, \$600,000,000 for stockpiling, \$89,000,000 for the Voice of America, \$46,000,000 for the Post Office Department deficit, and \$950,000,000 for additional planes for the Navy.

Before June 27, we had the word of Secretary of Defense Johnson that our national defense were "sufficient unto the moment." We know now that our national defenses are not sufficient unto the moment. Yet, the appropriations proposed in the pending bill for non-defense spending are based on the thinking previous to June 27.

I joined economy-minded Senators in supporting the Bridges-Byrd amendment which, as finally approved, provided for an over-all reduction of 10 percent of funds for most nondefense items. This amendment was desirable. I congratulate those responsible for a worthwhile accomplishment—but the reduction provided for is wholly insufficient to meet the realities of the situation.

I cannot justify the exemption of ECA from the operation of this amendment. I cannot justify saying to the American

people, "You must draw in your belts; you must do without those new roads, those new public buildings, and many other badly needed projects here at home," and at the same time saying to the governments of the Marshall plan countries, "Go right ahead with your electric power projects, your new public buildings, your new roads, in your colonies, everywhere—the United States will finance them all. Uncle Sam will pay the bills."

It is tragic for this country to continue to give away to Britain and other Marshall-plan countries huge quantities of vital materials of war, such as iron, steel, aluminum, and copper, only to have those same countries sell the same items to Russia and her satellites. Yet the Senate rejected an amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHEERRY] which would have corrected this situation. In doing so it refused to lift a finger against the action of Great Britain, for example, in selling twice as much electrical machinery to Russia during May 1950 as she sold during April 1950.

Mr. President, for a number of years the administration has pursued a policy of managed inflation. The idea has been to keep the fires of inflation burning—just slowly burning. The vast spending programs provided for in the pending bill would have continued this managed-inflation policy. The Korean war threatens to turn managed inflation into rampant inflation, with all its dreadful consequences.

Some of us have opposed managed inflation. All of us agree that an immediate effort should be made to curb rampant inflation. Few of us seem willing to do what is necessary to attack the problem at its roots. Where there is no will, there is no way.

The pending bill represents politics as usual. Every vote-buying program has been retained. There has been no retreat from the prewar political program, with its liberal infusions of socialism. Mr. President, must disaster overcome us before the Congress will put our finances on a war basis?

Nevertheless, the business of Government must go on. Above all, adequate funds must be provided for our national defense and to win the Korean war. A portion of the appropriations provided for in the pending bill are for strengthening our Armed Forces. I have voted for all defense appropriations in the past. I desire to vote for defense appropriations now. To do so we must swallow some bitter pills. They are made no less bitter on account of an obvious effort to give some of them a palatable political coating. But we have no alternative. Accordingly, I shall vote for the pending bill, but with misgivings and a premonition of evil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a copy of the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment, together with a memorandum from Frederick J. Lawton, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with accompanying tables.

There being no objection, the amendment, memorandums, and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. WHEERRY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. CORFON, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HOEY, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. ECTON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. IVES, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. THYE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. JENNER, Mr. TAFT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DARBY, Mr. KEM, Mr. MALONE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. BRICKER) (H. R. 7786): In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment on page 476 and 477, beginning in line 21 (sec. 1114), insert the following:

"Sec. 1114. Except as hereinafter provided, each appropriation, reappropriation, and contract authorization or reauthorization, made by this act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, to any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government (including funds of Government corporations authorized by this act for administrative expenses), is hereby reduced by 10 percent.

"Sec. 1115. In order to provide for the most effective use of appropriations and contract authorizations reduced by section 1114, the head of each department and agency in the executive branch of the Government is hereby authorized to make adjustments and transfers between such appropriations, and between such contract authorizations, within his department or agency; but no such appropriation or contract authorization shall be increased under the authority of this section to an amount in excess of that provided in other chapters of this act.

"Sec. 1116. The reductions provided for in section 1114 shall not apply to the following:

"(a) Title II of chapter IV; chapter X; so much of title I of chapter X-B as is contained in the paragraph headed 'Mutual Defense Assistance'; and the amount appropriated to the General Services Administration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946;

"(b) Appropriations in title I of chapter VIII for the Executive Office of the President under the headings 'Compensation of the President', 'The White House Office', 'Emergency Fund for the President', and 'Executive Mansion and Grounds';

"(c) Appropriations and contract authorizations for the atomic energy program;

"(d) Trust funds;

"(e) Funds of Government corporations excluding those made available in this act (1) for administrative expenses and (2) by appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury;

"(f) Amounts (other than under the Veterans' Administration) for furnishing medical and hospital services and domiciliary care, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, or clinic, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

"(g) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations;

"(h) Appropriations of, or measured by, receipts;

"(i) Amounts appropriated by this act for the operation of law enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Customs, Immigration and Naturalization Services, and the Secret Service; or for the payment of compensation and expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and such other officers and employees of other agencies whose duties primarily pertain to intelligence operations (including funds trans-

ferred pursuant to section 6 (a) of the act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 211) or to the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States;

"(j) Amounts provided for any program of the Veterans' Administration, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, clinic, or facility, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

"(k) Amounts provided for payments to States or political subdivisions thereof;

"(l) Amounts provided to make payment of or contributions toward pensions, retirement and disability annuities and benefits, employees' death or injury benefits, or other items of a similar nature; and

"(m) Appropriations for refunds, awards, and indemnities."

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1950.

Memorandum for Senator HARRY F. BYRD:

In accordance with your request, we have analyzed the proposed amendment as it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 14. This analysis is not a 100 percent refined job because a number of items involved relate to parts of appropriations, which parts only are affected by the amendment. It is, however, substantially accurate as we interpret the amendment.

Some items which may be exempted under more than one head have, in the attached table, been eliminated in the first amendment which affects them. An example of this is stockpiling, which in its entirety is eliminated under section 1003 (a), although part of the appropriation fund is for the liquidation of prior contract authorizations and would be covered by section 1003 (g). We have treated loan authorizations to non-corporate activities in the same manner as appropriations and contract authorizations, assuming that this was the intent of the amendment.

FREDERICK J. LAWTON,
Director.

Analysis of Bridges-Byrd amendment adjusted to take into account changes made in foreign aid chapter by action from the floor

AMOUNTS CONTAINED IN H. R. 7786 AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, ADJUSTED TO INCLUDE INCREASES IN THE FOREIGN AID CHAPTER RESULTING FROM FLOOR ACTION

[000,000 omitted]

Appropriations.....	\$32,531
Contract authorizations.....	2,183
Reappropriations.....	333
Loan authorizations (Rural Electrification Administration and Farmers Home Administration, ECA through Export-Import Bank)	800
Administrative expense limitations on Government corporations....	81
Trust accounts carried in bill.....	63
Appropriations of or measured by receipts specifically authorized in bill	62
Total authorizations contained in H. R. 7786.....	36,103

AMOUNTS OF AUTHORIZATIONS EXEMPT FROM THIS PROVISION, ADJUSTED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE SMITH AND M'CARRAN-O'MAHONEY AMENDMENTS

Section 1001, agencies outside the executive branch of the Government: Legislative, the judiciary, and contribution to the District of Columbia	—\$115
---	--------

Section 1003, title II of chapter IV, chapter X; and so much of title I of chapter X-B as is contained in the paragraph under the head "Mutual defense assistance" and the amount appropriated to GSA for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of July 23, 1946:

(a) Title II, chapter IV-----	\$527
Chapter X-----	14,681
So much of title I of chapter X-B as is contained in the paragraph under the head "Mutual defense assistance"-----	1,678
Amount appropriated to General Services Administration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of July 23, 1946-----	730
	-17,616
(b) Appropriations in title I of chapter VII for the Executive Office of the President under the headings "Compensation of the President," "The White House Office," "Emergency fund for the President," and "Executive Mansion and grounds"-----	-2
(c) Appropriations and contract authorizations for the atomic-energy program-----	-948
(d) Trust funds-----	-63
(e) Funds of Government corporations excluding those made available in this act (1) for administrative expenses, and (2) by appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury-----	
(f) Amounts (other than under the Veterans' Administration) for furnishing medical and hospital services and domiciliary care, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, or clinic, and (2) expenses for employee health-service programs-----	-48
(g) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations-----	-931
(h) Appropriations of, or measured by, receipts-----	-62
(i) Amounts appropriated by this act for the operation of law enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Customs, Immigration and Naturalization Services, and Secret Service; or for the payment of compensation and expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and such other officers and employees of other agencies whose duties primarily pertain to intelligence operations (including funds transferred pursuant to sec. 6 (a) of the act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 211, or to the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States-----	-247

Section 1003, title II of chapter IV, chapter X, etc.—Continued

(j) Amounts provided for any program of the Veterans' Administration, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital dispensary, clinic, or facility, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs-----	-\$5,266
(k) Amounts provided for payments to States or political subdivisions thereof-----	-1,827
(l) Amounts provided to make payment of or contributions toward pensions, retirement and disability annuities and benefits, employees' death or injury benefits, or other items of similar nature-----	-781
(m) Appropriations for refunds, awards, and indemnities-----	-73
Floor amendments to foreign aid chapter-----	-2,839
Amount of authorizations in the bill subject to 10 percent reduction-----	5,300

Schedule of amounts included in H. R. 7786 as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee (exempt under sec. 1003 (f))

Indian Service-----	\$10,800,000
Panama Canal-----	2,300,000
Penal institutions-----	1,000,000
Freedman's Hospital-----	2,500,000
St. Elizabeths Hospital (direct)-----	2,000,000
Public Health Service-----	29,300,000
Air Force (not identifiable)-----	
	47,900,000

Excludes Veterans' Administration; health programs; administrative expenses not identifiable with a particular hospital, dispensary, or clinic.

Schedule of amounts included in H. R. 7786 as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee (exempt under sec. 1003 (g))

CHAPTER III

State Department: Salaries and expenses, Philippine Rehabilitation-----	\$10,000,000
Justice Department: Federal prison system; buildings and equipment, penal institutions-----	540,000
Commerce Department:	

CAA:

Establishment of air-navigation facilities-----	22,000,000
Federal-aid airport program-----	34,000,000
Construction of public airports, Territory of Alaska-----	3,200,000
Air navigation development-----	2,885,000
Bureau of Public Roads:	
Elimination of grade-crossings-----	4,600,000
Federal-aid postwar construction program-----	385,000,000
Forest highways-----	22,500,000

CHAPTER V

Federal Security Agency: Howard University, construction of buildings-----	1,662,000
Public Health Service:	
Grants for hospital construction-----	100,000,000
Operating expenses, National Cancer Institute-----	5,000,000

Public Health Service—Con.

Mental health activities-----	\$2,375,000
Operating expenses, National Heart Institute-----	5,350,000
Construction of research facilities-----	11,100,000
St. Elizabeths Hospital:	
Construction and equipment-----	100,000
Construction and equipment of two treatment buildings-----	1,500,000

CHAPTER VII

Interior Department:

Office of Secretary, construction, Southwestern Power Administration-----	5,000,000
Bonneville Power Administration: Construction, Bonneville power transmission system-----	17,000,000
Bureau of Land Management, construction-----	200,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs, health, education, and welfare service (permanent indefinite)-----	1,000,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction-----	3,737,500
Bureau of Reclamation, construction and rehabilitation-----	4,595,700
Bureau of Mines, construction-----	550,000
National Park Service, construction and land acquisition-----	7,935,000
Fish and Wildlife Service, construction-----	50,000
Territories and island possessions, construction of roads, Alaska-----	8,000,000
Territories and island possessions, Alaska Railroad, special fund (permanent indefinite special account)-----	17,000,000

CHAPTER VIII

Independent offices (excluding AEC):

American Battle Monuments Commission, construction of memorials and cemeteries-----	5,000,000
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, construction and equipment-----	15,000,000
U. S. Maritime Commission, ship construction-----	30,000,000
VA, hospital and domiciliary facilities-----	160,000,000
General Services Administration:	
Acquisition and construction of Federal office building, Nashville, Tenn.-----	1,200,000
Federal Courts Building, District of Columbia-----	6,000,000
GAO Building, Washington, D. C.-----	15,358,194
Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion-----	3,400,000
Alaska public works-----	4,000,000
Advance planning of non-Federal public works-----	14,100,000

Total cash to liquidate contract authorization----- 930,938,394

Schedule of amounts included in H. R. 7786 as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee (exempt under sec. 1003 (i))

Department of Justice:

Federal Bureau of Investigation-----	\$57,400,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service-----	31,400,000
District Attorney-----	6,447,000

Treasury Department:	
Bureau of Customs.....	\$36,806,360
Secret Service.....	3,368,000
Internal Revenue.....	100,000,000
Bureau of Narcotics.....	1,908,000
Sec. 6 (a) of act of June 20, 1949 (63 Stat. 211).....	9,500,000
Total.....	246,829,360

Schedule of amounts included in H. R. 7786 as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee (exempt under sec. 1003 (k))
(Exempt under sec. 1003 (k))

Federal Security Agency: <i>Millions</i>	
Payments to States, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended.....	\$20.6
Grants to States for public assistance.....	1,200.0
Grants to States for maternal and child welfare.....	22.0
Control of venereal diseases.....	11.9
Control of tuberculosis.....	6.3
Assistance to States, general.....	14.2
Promotion of vocational education.....	20.0
Grants for hospital construction.....	150.0
Other.....	10.0

Department of Agriculture: <i>Millions</i>	
National school lunch program.....	\$83.5
Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska and Puerto Rico.....	27.1
Payment to States, experimental stations.....	12.0
Housing and Home Finance Agency: Slum clearance and urban development program (annual contributions).....	9.3
Department of Commerce:	
War and emergency damage, Territory of Hawaii.....	3.0
Federal-aid airport program.....	36.7
Department of Labor: Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration.....	178.5
Other agencies.....	22.0
Total.....	1,827.0

Schedule of amounts included in H. R. 7786 as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee (exempt under sec. 1003 (l))
(Exempt under sec. 1003 (l))

Civil Service Commission:	
Panama Canal construction annuity fund.....	\$2,803,177
Civil Service retirement and disability fund.....	305,000,000

Treasury Department: Retired pay, Coast Guard.....		\$15,575,000
Railroad Retirement Board: Railroad retirement appropriated fund.....		457,832,724
Total.....		781,210,901

Schedule of amounts included in H. R. 7786 as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee (exempt under sec. 1003 (m))
(Exempt under sec. 1003 (m))

Philippine War Damage Commission.....		\$40,200,000
Federal Security Agency: Bureau of Employees Compensation appropriation.....		25,000,000
General Service Administration: Refunds under Renegotiation Act.....		7,400,000
Total.....		72,600,000

Schedule of amounts included in the foreign-aid chapter of H. R. 7786 which were exempt by amendments offered from the floor

Economic cooperation.....		\$2,726,761,473
International children's welfare work.....		12,500,000
Spanish loan.....		100,000,000

Reductions in amounts carried in general appropriation bill, 1951, as reported by Senate committee under Bridges-Byrd amendment

Agency	Appropriations	Contract authorizations	Loan authorizations	Administrative expenses	Grand total
District of Columbia—Federal contribution.....					
Legislative establishment.....					
State Department.....					
Justice Department.....					
Commerce Department.....					
Judiciary.....					
Treasury Department.....					
Post Office Department.....					
Labor Department.....					
Federal Security Agency.....					
Related labor agencies.....					
Agriculture Department.....					
Interior:					
Reclamation.....					
Other.....					
Independent offices:					
Executive Office of the President.....					
General Services Administration.....					
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....					
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....					
U. S. Maritime Commission.....					
Veterans' Administration.....					
Other.....					
Army, Civil:					
Corps of Engineers.....					
Other.....					
National Security Council.....					
National Security Resources Board.....					
Department of Defense:					
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....					
Army.....					
Navy.....					
Air Force.....					
Economic cooperation.....					
Assistance to Korea.....					
International Children's Welfare Work.....					
International development (point 4).....					
Mutual defense assistance.....					
Government and relief in occupied areas.....					
Government in occupied Germany.....					
Aid to Palestine refugees.....					
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....					
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....					
Total.....					
Total amount to which cuts apply.....					

Footnotes at end of table.

Reductions in amounts carried in general appropriation bill, 1951, as reported by Senate committee under Bridges-Byrd amendment—Con.

Agency	Total subject to 10-percent amendment cut	Total exempt from 10-percent amendment cut	Total carried in H. R. 7786 (including reappropriations)	Total available under 10-percent amendment cut
District of Columbia—Federal contribution		\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000
Legislative establishment		79,305,795	79,305,795	79,305,795
State Department	\$192,420,570	19,829,998	212,250,568	193,008,511
Justice Department	16,325,000	127,042,000	143,367,000	141,734,500
Commerce Department	248,014,000	508,885,000	756,899,000	732,097,600
Judiciary		23,478,665	23,478,665	23,478,665
Treasury Department	394,868,000	157,937,360	552,805,360	513,318,560
Post Office Department		526,500,000	526,500,000	526,500,000
Labor Department		178,500,000	208,573,100	205,565,790
Federal Security Agency	104,804,250	1,643,488,760	1,748,293,010	1,737,812,585
Related labor agencies	12,974,200	457,832,724	470,806,924	469,509,504
Agriculture Department	1,366,507,660	134,662,914	1,501,170,574	1,364,519,808
Interior:				
Reclamation	323,564,000	3,540,000	327,104,000	294,747,600
Other	267,383,360	60,348,670	327,732,030	300,993,694
Independent offices:				
Executive Office of the President	3,712,000	3,001,553	6,713,553	6,342,353
General Services Administration	177,109,280	782,043,199	959,152,479	941,441,551
Housing and Home Finance Agency	42,039,000	9,250,000	51,289,000	47,085,100
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	57,225,630	15,000,000	72,225,630	66,503,067
U. S. Maritime Commission	179,167,790	39,999,997	219,167,787	201,251,008
Veterans' Administration	337,556,000	5,774,979,400	5,813,735,000	5,774,979,400
Other	217,407,500	1,300,743,185	1,518,350,685	1,496,609,935
Army, Civil:				
Corps of Engineers	731,546,000		731,546,000	658,391,400
Other	32,198,620		32,198,620	28,978,758
National Security Council		160,000	160,000	160,000
National Security Resources Board		3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense		358,300,000	358,300,000	358,300,000
Army		4,088,377,521	4,088,377,521	4,088,377,521
Navy		4,678,754,300	4,678,754,300	4,678,754,300
Air Force		5,551,275,000	5,551,275,000	5,551,275,000
Economic cooperation		12,726,761,473	2,726,761,473	2,726,761,473
Assistance to Korea	90,000,000		90,000,000	81,000,000
International Children's Welfare Work		12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000
International development (point 4)	26,900,000		26,900,000	24,210,000
Mutual defense assistance		1,678,023,729	1,678,023,729	1,678,023,729
Government and relief in occupied areas	288,000,000		288,000,000	259,200,000
Government in occupied Germany	27,000,000		27,000,000	24,300,000
Aid to Palestine refugees	27,450,000		27,450,000	24,705,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	26,700,000		26,700,000	24,030,000
Export-Import Bank of Washington	965,000	100,000,000	100,965,000	100,868,500
Total	5,271,910,960	30,707,420,843	35,979,331,803	35,452,140,707
Total amount to which cuts apply				

¹ Exempt under the Smith amendment.

² Exempt under McCarran-O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I wanted to make as a speech on the floor, relative to the meat inspection amendment, be placed in the RECORD at this point as a statement.

There being no objection, Mr. WHERRY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Bridges-Byrd amendment reducing appropriations for nondefense items in the general appropriations bill by 10 percent is so written that the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to maintain the full personnel strength of the Meat Inspection Service.

The budget message presented by the President in January requested an appropriation of \$12,959,000 for fiscal year 1951. The House and Senate each voted an appropriation of \$12,800,000, \$159,000 below the budget estimate, but \$223,000 above the appropriation for 1950.

The appropriation of \$12,800,000 is the top amount which the Secretary is authorized to spend in fiscal 1951. He may spend less if he so desires. In the fiscal year 1949, for instance, the Meat Inspection Service spent \$292,234 less than the \$12,555,000 appropriated.

The average number of employees of the Meat Inspection Service was 3,299 in 1949 and is estimated at 3,267 in 1950. If the full budget estimate had been voted by the Senate, 3,220 employees would have been employed in fiscal 1951, according to the budget estimate.

The effect of the Bridges-Byrd amendment is to reduce every appropriation title subject to the reduction formula by 10 percent. Technically, the Meat Inspection Service will reflect this 10 percent reduction.

The necessity for this technical reduction of appropriations arises from the requirement that appropriation figures be clear in the final bill for purposes of Federal budgeting and accounting.

The second section of the Bridges-Byrd amendment, however, authorizes transfers between departmental appropriations up to the amounts appropriated elsewhere in the bill. If the Secretary of Agriculture considers meat inspection to be of such importance, he may transfer from less important appropriations sufficient funds to provide \$12,800,000 for the Meat Inspection Service in fiscal 1951.

The funds appropriated for the Meat Inspection Service represent approximately 1 1/2 percent of the total amount appropriated for the Department of Agriculture. A transfer of slightly more than one-tenth of 1 percent of funds appropriated to the Secretary can keep the meat inspection at the level provided by the appropriation agreed upon in the House and Senate elsewhere in the bill.

While the appropriations bill was on the Senate floor, legislative history was written and appears on page 11899 of the RECORD. Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Senate Appropriations Committee, declared: "We have provided a 10 percent cut in the Department, and left it up to the Secretary of Agriculture to make the cut. The Secretary of Agriculture knows the relative values of the various offices. If he cuts meat inspectors unduly, we can deal with it in the same deficiency bill in which we deal with other items for which it will be necessary for us to make deficiency appropriations."

In this connection, and so that there may be no mistake as to congressional intent, I submit the record of proceedings on this floor yesterday on my amendment to assure maintenance of the meat inspection service

at full program, because of its vital importance to the public health and the production of dressed meat supplies adequate to meet our civilian and military requirements:

"Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read and immediately considered.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

"The CHIEF CLERK. On page 180, before the period in line 9, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: 'Provided, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to reduce or authorize any reduction in this appropriation or in the number of meat inspectors authorized to be paid from this appropriation.'

"Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendment is probably very trivial to be considered along with a \$52,000,000,000 appropriation bill. I think it involves 256 meat inspectors and provides that they shall not be laid off, as a measure of protecting the health of the country.

"Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, was it the intention of the Senator to cut the reduction applicable to the Department of Agriculture, or simply provide that this part of the activities of the Department of Agriculture should not be affected in the adjustment of the cut by the Secretary of Agriculture between various divisions, bureaus, and offices in the Department of Agriculture?

"Mr. WHERRY. The latter part of the Senator's statement is what I intended. The Bridges amendment permits the Secretary to transfer employees to different departments. My amendment would permit the retention of these inspectors without a cut, notwithstanding the Bridges amendment.

"Mr. HOLLAND. And it would not reduce the amount of the reduction accomplished under the Bridges amendment?

"Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

"Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

"Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is no question about the importance of meat inspection, but there are other items in the agricultural chapter of the appropriation bill which are just as important. Some Senator remarked to me a few minutes ago that no sooner would this amendment be agreed to than Senators would be marching down the aisle with amendments on other items.

"Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think the Forest Service employees are just as important as meat inspectors, and if this amendment shall be agreed to, it is my purpose to suggest an amendment providing that the Forest Service employees be exempted.

"Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think we should approach this matter in this way. We have provided a 10-percent cut in the Department, and left it up to the Secretary of Agriculture to make the cut. The Secretary of Agriculture knows the relative values of the various offices. If he cuts meat inspectors unduly, we can deal with it in the same deficiency bill in which we deal with other items for which it will be necessary for us to make deficiency appropriations.

"Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

"Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

"Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say that I voted to reduce appropriations for the Marshall plan. That is now not included in the reduction which has been made. Other departments were cut, including the Department of Agriculture, which will have to take most of the cut. I voted against that cut. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Georgia that we should not start exempting sections of the Agricultural Department appropriations. I voted against cutting the appropriations for the agencies of the Government, but voted to cut the appropriations for the foreign activities.

"Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it would be necessary to offer a number of amendments to other items to exempt them, and if we start on such a practice, Senators will have been able to go on record as voting for a 10-percent cut, and then proceed to vote for amendments which will eliminate any possibility of reducing the appropriation \$1. After we have just voted for a 10-percent cut, we should not start to make exemptions. If that is kept up and similar action is taken on all items all of us would like to exempt, we will have made a great play of publicity in cutting appropriations, and then forestalling the cuts by amendments.

"Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

"Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

"Mr. CORDON. Is it not a fact that under the provisions of the amendment just agreed to the authority rests with the head of the department to make any transfers which may be needed, or advisable, or desirable, to increase the efficiency and protect the essential services of his department?

"Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

"Mr. CORDON. And we do not need any such provision as that now proposed, do we?

"Mr. RUSSELL. No.

"Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

"Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

"Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, now that I have that statement from the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and from the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and before any Senator proposes to modify the amendment or take exception to it, I should like also to ask the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] if he agrees with the statement made by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from

Oregon that the Secretary has power to transfer these funds.

"Mr. BRIDGES. Yes."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, when the Congress convenes next year I think it will seriously consider the repeal of the rule which provides that an appropriation bill may be considered in one package. I am convinced, as the result of the experience we have had this year, that the work we are now going through has saved no money, so far as decreases in appropriations are concerned. I am convinced that we have consumed more time than was necessary in handling this appropriation bill collectively than would have been consumed had we considered the bill in separate categories. I have talked with many Senators and have found none who disagreed with this particular thought.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. With reference to the Senator's last observation, I should like to state that the Senator from Illinois did not talk to me about the matter, and I do not want the RECORD to show that it is the general opinion of Senators. I may be alone, but as a member of the Appropriations Committee, while I agree that the one-package bill can be improved in many ways, I think it gives a broad picture, and I deeply appreciate the so-called one-package appropriation bill. I hope that a future Congress will not repeal it, but will perfect it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I was not consulted by the majority leader, and I want to express my views as being directly opposite to those entertained by him. I feel that both in the Appropriations Committee and on the floor of the Senate, and particularly through the adoption of the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], of which I had the honor to be a sponsor, money has been saved. I feel that that amendment alone has saved a large amount of money. Therefore, I would say that I am wholeheartedly in favor of the omnibus appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerks at the desk be authorized to change sections numbers and any references to sections or chapters to conform to the action taken by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to make another statement. I did not know that anything was to be said about procedure of having a unified, omnibus appropriation bill. I want to say that I think the old plan of division into a number of bills is infinitely better. It is better for the Government, better for the taxpayers, better for those who are in charge of the bill, and better for all of us than having one bill. I hope Senators will not make up their minds too quickly on the sub-

ject. It is a terrible task to handle a one-package appropriation bill. I speak from experience, because I am the first one in the Senate who has had charge of a bill of this kind. So far as I know it is the most terrible experience I have had in my whole life. I hope very much that the Senate and the House will agree to go back to the old plan.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I most respectfully urge that we give very careful consideration before we change to the old plan from the present unified, over-all appropriation bill. I do not say that the present system is the best system, but I believe it is a step in the right direction. It can be improved with experience. As one member of the Committee on Appropriations I sat on six subcommittees, and I feel that I know more about the present appropriation bill than I ever knew about any other bill that has come before the Senate. I think the table printed at page 3 of the report is itself worth more to the Senate, in giving a clear picture of the financial state of the Government than any other statement I have seen in the brief time I have been a Member of the Senate.

I sincerely hope the majority leader will think very carefully and prepare thoughtfully any bill on the subject which he may have in mind to the next session of Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to speak for not more than 2 minutes. I join in the expressions that have been made by my colleagues on this side of the aisle that it would be a great mistake to return to the old system. I have no doubt that a number of improvements could be made in the presentation of this type of bill, perhaps in cutting down the number of subcommittees on which members of the Committee on Appropriations must serve. However, I think that for the first time in the history of the Government, or at least in a great many years, we have had one place where Congress and the American people could focus on what the Federal Government is costing them. I think that is worth-while. I believe that when we throw the white spotlight of publicity on what the cost of Government is, we take a great and constructive step forward in bringing this vast Federal structure under some control.

Mr. CORDON. As another humble worker in the vineyard of appropriations, I wish to join my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and I hope a number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who perhaps do not wish to voice their opinion at this time, in urging that we do not abandon the one-package appropriation procedure. I realize that we are faced with another hurdle, which lies ahead of us. It is one which none of us knows exactly how we shall surmount. I am sure, however, that under the leadership of our distinguished chairman we shall surmount it and come out ultimately with a purged and better over-all appropriation measure than the United States has seen in many years. We have some problems to work out, but they can be met, and we can come out ultimately with a far more constructive,

sound, and logical procedure than we have known in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 7786) was passed.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR McKELLAR

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not intend to submit an amendment, but I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 3 minutes on a subject germane to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the State of Tennessee, throughout the history of the Nation, has contributed great men to public life and to everyday life. Of course, we all know of Andrew Jackson, John Sevier, and Andrew Johnson. We all know of James K. Polk, who obtained more land for this country than any other President of the United States. We all know of the activities of Sam Houston in Tennessee, of Gen. Nathan B. Forrest, of Edward Ward Carmack, of Bob Taylor, of Cordell Hull, and of the late Speaker, Joe Byrns.

I may say to the Senate that, knowing the history of the country—and I pride myself in that—I have never seen a more devoted public servant—barring natural mistakes, probably; yes—but not a more patriotic American, devoting his time to the cause of his Nation, than the President pro tempore of this body, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I thought it only proper that I should pay my respects to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Chair feels sure that the Senator from New Mexico has expressed full well the sentiments of all the Members of the Senate, as evidenced by their applause and also by the expressions on their faces.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if I may have 30 seconds, I may say that, as ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, I have worked for many years with the distinguished chairman of this committee. On behalf of the minority Members of the Senate, I wish to say that we concur in the words of praise spoken by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. [Applause.]

NEED FOR EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

Mr. McFARLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This morning it was my privilege to appear before the Committee on Finance to urge the adoption of an excess-profits-tax amendment which I presented earlier in the week. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a summary of my remarks before the committee.

There being no objection, Mr. O'MAHONEY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:
SEND THE PROFIT DOLLAR TO WAR UNDER AN EXCESS-PROFITS TAX NOW

Unless we are willing to use the profits of the profit system to defend that system in

the present all-out ideological conflict with communism, we had better prepare to confront disaster.

Corporate profits are running at an all-time high and are rapidly increasing. Inflationary pressures which were apparent early in the second quarter of this year have been greatly increased by the Korean crisis, and will be further accelerated as soon as the new defense appropriation bills are enacted.

It is not too much to say that by the passage of a bill appropriating \$10,000,000,000 for immediate military expenditure and \$4,000,000,000 for arming western Europe, as requested by the President, we shall be opening the flood gates of inflation unless we take immediate steps to control this deluge of dollars by new taxes which will prevent private purchasing power from competing with newly created Government purchasing power for the purchase of a short supply of goods and services.

INFLATION BEGAN BEFORE KOREA

The economic facts are plain for all to read. Before Korea consumer credit and bank loans were running at new highs. Government credit, extended by authority of Congress for domestic programs, and Government expenditures in excess of Government receipts, were so increasing the supply of dollars that prices were rising even before the Korean attack began.

Consumer credit outstanding in June 1950 had reached the all-time high of \$19,600,000,000. This was almost \$1,000,000,000 more than in 1949, and thirteen billions in excess of 1945. Total bank loans and investments in June 1950 amounted to \$122,400,000,000, as compared with \$120,200,000,000 for 1949, \$116,300,000,000 for 1947, and \$105,500,000,000 for 1944.

Commodity prices which in 1948 and 1949 were falling from the all-time high of late 1947 and early 1948 began to turn upward early in 1950. In June 1950, the wholesale price index was 157.3 (on the 1926 base), as compared with 155 for 1949, but on July 4 the weekly index had climbed to 159, and 3 weeks later to 163.7. All classes of commodities, industrial and agricultural, have, according to the BLS, been rising more steeply since the outbreak of the war.

On July 21 the BLS reported that the consumer price index which had been relatively stable for 15 months prior to May 20, had begun to rise even before the North Korean attack. By June 15 it had risen nearly 2 percent, to 170.2 on the 1935-39 index. Then came the Korean attack. What has been happening since is evidenced by the fact that new highs were established in July for most commodities, and that, despite some minor declines in a few commodities during the month, the average prices for 28 commodities on spot markets had increased 3.8 percent over the week ended July 25. This meant an increase of 13.6 percent above the prices only a month before.

Thus there can be no disputing the fact that a new and dangerous inflationary trend had appeared before the Korean attack and that it has moved progressively upward since the attack although Government expenditures under the new appropriation bills have not yet begun.

Surely this is warning enough to those of us who will be responsible for the fiscal policies of this Nation that we cannot afford to temporize with this dangerous situation. We must authorize the Government expenditures, but these expenditures can result only in disaster unless at the same time we are willing to curtail civilian spending through a realistic tax program.

It will not be sufficient to rely upon the curtailment of nonessential Government expenditures because even with drastic cuts all along the line on that front the inflationary forces will not be held in check unless we also cut civilian spending.

The military expenditures will have a cumulative effect. Government cash will be laid out for the purchase of military supplies at rising prices. This will generate higher incomes and higher profits and the inflationary snowball will continue to roll.

There can be no doubt that we are in our present dilemma because in the preparation for World War II we did not adopt a sufficiently drastic tax program. We did not have a pay-as-you-go policy then; we were content to pay 45 percent of the current cost out of taxes and to issue IOUs for 55 percent.

There have been other continuing costs flowing directly from the war which the government has had to bear, such as veterans' pensions and benefits, and notably interest upon the national debt. Surely it requires no argument to prove that we should permit nothing to weaken our determination to follow a pay-as-you-go policy now. We cannot think of piling a Korean war debt on top of the unpaid war debt of World War II, and delude ourselves into the belief that we are protecting the profit system.

PAY AS YOU GO OR FACE DISASTER

Unless we are willing, by a rigid tax program now, not only to strike at war profiteering and speculative activity, but to pay as we go, we must be prepared to come face to face with disaster for what we so proudly call the American way of life. The annual interest upon the national debt which now amounts to \$5,500,000,000, and which is more than half of all the expenditures of the Federal Government for all purposes in 1939, cannot be increased by new interest obligations upon a new war debt without endangering not only profits, but the system that produces profits.

Fortunately the profit picture as it now presents itself is sufficient to guarantee the success of a pay-as-you-go system. Corporate profits have reached levels never dreamed possible before the war. In 1940, before we actually became involved, they amounted to \$9,300,000,000. They jumped to a new high of twenty-five and one-tenth billions in 1943 and receded slightly to twenty-four and three-tenths billions in 1944. But corporate profits after taxes in each war year except 1945 were larger than corporate profits before taxes in 1940. They ranged from nine and four-tenths billions in 1941 to ten and eight-tenths billions in 1944 after the tax bill of World War II had been paid.

Obviously, corporate profits throughout World War II could have made a much larger contribution to the current cost of the war than they were called upon to do. Ever since the speedy reconversion of 1945-46, corporate profits in the new fully employed economy have been running at far higher levels than during the war. For 1947, profits before taxes amounted to thirty and five-tenths billions; they rose to thirty-three and nine-tenths billions in 1948; fell off to twenty-seven and six-tenths billions in 1949; jumped again in the first quarter of 1950 to twenty-nine and two-tenths billions. The universal testimony from the most conservative centers of finance in New York tells us that in the second quarter of this year they are going higher still.

CORPORATE PROFITS REACH NEW HIGH

The National City Bank of New York in its Monthly Letter issued on August 2, told its customers that two out of every three corporations had increased their earnings in the first half of 1950 as compared with 1949. The National City Bank surveyed the net income of 500 corporations throughout the American economy and reported that after the deduction of Federal income taxes, at the present 38 percent rate, the net income totaled approximately \$2,568,000,000. This, the National City Bank tells us, is an increase of 27 percent over the first quarter of 1949, making an increase of 20 percent for the first

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 7786

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 4, 1950

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any
4 money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the
5 support of the Government, for the fiscal year ending June
6 30, 1951, namely:

1 CHAPTER I—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

2 For the general fund of the District of Columbia,
3 ~~(1)~~ ~~\$9,800,000~~ ~~\$11,000,000~~, and for the water fund, estab-
4 lished by law (D. C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), \$1,000,000,
5 both amounts to be advanced July 1, 1950.

~~1 prescribed for such appointees by the Capitol Police Board.~~

~~2 *Provided, That* the Capitol Police Board is hereby authorized
3 to detail police from the House Office, Senate Office, and
4 Capitol Buildings for police duty on the Capitol Grounds.~~

~~5 This chapter may be cited as the "Legislative Branch
6 Appropriation Act, 1951".~~

1 CHAPTER III—DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUS-
2 TICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY

3 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses of the Department of State not
6 otherwise provided for, including personal services in the
7 District of Columbia; expenses authorized by the Foreign
8 Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158),
9 not otherwise provided for; expenses of the National Com-
10 mission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooper-
11 ation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the Act of
12 July 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 287o, 287q, 287r) ; expenses
13 of attendance at meetings concerned with activities
14 provided for under this appropriation; hire of passen-
15 ger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation of aircraft
16 outside the continental United States; printing and binding,
17 including printing and binding outside the continental United
18 States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1,

1 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by
2 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
3 not to exceed \$1,000 for payment of tort claims pursuant
4 to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as
5 authorized by law; purchase of uniforms; insurance of official
6 motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law
7 of such countries; dues for library membership in organiza-
8 tions which issue publications to members only, or to mem-
9 bers at a price lower than to others; rental of tie lines and
10 teletype equipment; employment of aliens, by contract, for
11 services abroad; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid
12 for passports; establishment, maintenance, and operation of
13 passport and despatch agencies; examination of estimates of
14 appropriations in the field; ice and drinking water for use
15 abroad; excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; loss
16 by exchange; radio communications; payment in advance
17 for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and
18 similar services abroad; relief, protection, and burial of
19 American seamen, and alien seamen in foreign countries
20 and in the United States Territories and possessions; ex-
21 penses incurred in acknowledging services of officers and
22 crews of foreign vessels and aircraft in rescuing American
23 seamen, airmen, or citizens from shipwreck or other catas-
24 trophe abroad; rent and expenses of maintaining in Egypt,
25 Morocco, and Muscat, institutions for American convicts

1 and persons declared insane by any consular court, and care
2 and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane;
3 expenses, as authorized by law (18 U. S. C. 3192), of
4 bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons
5 charged with crime; and procurement by contract or other-
6 wise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1)
7 translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical infor-
8 mation, (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geo-
9 graphic aids, (4) maintenance, improvement, and repair
10 of diplomatic and consular properties in foreign countries,
11 including minor construction on Government-owned prop-
12 erties, (5) not to exceed \$200,000 for maintenance and
13 operation of commissary and mess services, (6) fuel and
14 utilities for Government-owned or leased property abroad,
15 and (7) rental or lease, for periods not exceeding ten years,
16 of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for the use
17 of the Foreign Service, for which payments may be made
18 in advance; ~~(54)\$77,300,000~~ \$78,300,000: *Provided*, That
19 pursuant to section 8 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
20 118d-1), passenger motor vehicles in possession of the
21 Foreign Service abroad may be exchanged or sold and the
22 exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be
23 available without fiscal year limitation for replacement of
24 an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including
25 the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not

1 exceed \$3,000 in the case of the chief of mission automobile
 2 at each diplomatic mission and \$1,400 in the case of all
 3 other such vehicles except station wagons: *Provided further,*
 4 That of the amount appropriated herein, not to exceed
 5 \$30,000 shall be expended for carrying out the provisions
 6 of the Act of July 31, 1945 (5 U. S. C. 168d).

7 REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

8 For representation allowances as authorized by section
 9 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C.
 10 1131), ~~(55)\$675,000~~ \$900,000.

11 ~~(56)~~FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY 12 FUND

13 For financing the liability of the United States, created
 14 by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 ~~(22 U. S. C. 1061-~~
 15 ~~1116)~~, \$2,233,000, which amount shall be placed to the
 16 credit of the "Foreign Service retirement and disability
 17 fund."

18 BUILDINGS FUND

19 For carrying into effect the Act of July 25, 1946
 20 (22 U. S. C. 295b), including the initial alterations,
 21 repair, and furnishing of buildings acquired under said Act,
 22 ~~(57)\$8,000,000~~ \$5,000,000, which is exclusively for ex-
 23 penditure under the provisions of said Act which relate to

1 payments representing the value of foreign property or
 2 credits: *Provided*, That, when specifically authorized by the
 3 Secretary of State or such Assistant Secretary as he may
 4 designate, section 6 of the Act of May 7, 1926, may be
 5 construed as including leaseholds of not less than ten years.

6 EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR 7 SERVICE

8 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of
 9 State to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Diplo-
 10 matic and Consular Service, to be expended pursuant to
 11 the requirement of section 291 of the Revised Statutes
 12 (31 U. S. C. 107), including personal services in the
 13 District of Columbia, (58)~~\$10,600,000~~ \$9,900,000: *Pro-*
 14 *vided*, That the Secretary of State may delegate to subordi-
 15 nate officials the authority vested in him by section 291 of the
 16 Revised Statutes pertaining to certification of expenditures.

17 CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

18 For expenses necessary to meet annual obligations to
 19 international organizations, the Government of Panama, and
 20 Gorgas Memorial Institute, pursuant to treaties, conventions,
 21 or specific Acts of Congress, (59)~~\$55,178,297~~ \$53,753,067,
 22 together with such additional sums due to increase in rates of
 23 exchange as the Secretary of State may determine and certify
 24 to the Secretary of the Treasury to be necessary to pay, in
 25 foreign currencies, the quotas and contributions required by

1 the several treaties, conventions, or laws establishing the
 2 amount of the obligation: *Provided*, That the Department of
 3 State, when requested by the United Nations, is authorized to
 4 acquire surplus property for the United Nations in accord-
 5 ance with existing surplus property disposal laws and regula-
 6 tions, and the contribution of the United States to the United
 7 Nations shall be reduced by the value of the surplus property
 8 and necessary expenses, including transportation costs, inci-
 9 dental to the acquisition thereof.

10 MISSIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

11 For expenses necessary for permanent representation to
 12 certain international organizations in which the United States
 13 participates pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific Acts
 14 of Congress, including expenses authorized by the pertinent
 15 Acts and Conventions providing for such representation;
 16 attendance at meetings of societies or associations concerned
 17 with the work of the organizations; salaries, expenses, and
 18 allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the
 19 Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C.
 20 801-1158) ; purchase (not to exceed two, for replacement
 21 only, including one at not to exceed \$3,000) and hire of pas-
 22 senger motor vehicles; printing and binding, without regard
 23 to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C.
 24 111) ; and purchase of uniforms for guards and chauffeurs,
 25 ~~(60)\$1,600,000~~ *\$1,500,000: Provided*, That the pro-

visions of section 8 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that Act, shall be applicable to the obligation and expenditure of funds in connection with United States participation in the International Civil Aviation Organization.

INTERNATIONAL CONTINGENCIES

For necessary expenses of participation by the United States upon approval by the Secretary of State, in international activities which arise from time to time in the conduct of foreign affairs and for which specific appropriations have not been provided pursuant to treaties, conventions, or special Acts of Congress, including personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere without regard to civil-service and classification laws; salaries, expenses and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158) ; employment of aliens; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and without regard to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949; transportation of families and effects under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; not to exceed \$15 per diem in lieu of subsistence for persons serving without compensation in an advisory ca-

1 capacity while away from their homes or regular places of
 2 business; stenographic and other services; rent of quarters
 3 by contract or otherwise; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
 4 contributions for the share of the United States in expenses
 5 of international organizations; and printing and binding
 6 without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919
 7 (44 U. S. C. 111) ; (61)~~\$3,000,000~~, \$2,800,000, of which
 8 not to exceed a total of \$100,000 may be expended for repre-
 9 sentation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the
 10 Act of August 13, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131) and for enter-
 11 tainment.

12 INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION,
 13 UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

14 For expenses necessary to enable the United States to
 15 meet its obligations under the treaties of 1884, 1889, 1905,
 16 1906, 1933, and 1944 between the United States and
 17 Mexico, and to comply with the Act approved August 19,
 18 1935, as amended (22 U. S. C. 277-277d), including
 19 operation and maintenance of the Rio Grande rectification,
 20 canalization, flood control, bank protection, boundary fence,
 21 and sanitation projects; examinations, preliminary surveys,
 22 and investigations; detailed plan preparation and construc-
 23 tion (including surveys and operation and maintenance and
 24 protection during construction) ; Rio Grande emergency
 25 flood protection; construction and operation of gaging

1 stations; purchase and exchange of map-reproduction ma-
2 chines and other equipment and machinery; personal services
3 in the District of Columbia; services in accordance with
4 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),
5 at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem;
6 travel expenses, including, in the discretion of the Commis-
7 sioner, expenses (not to exceed \$500) of attendance at
8 meetings of organizations concerned with the activities of
9 the International Boundary and Water Commission which
10 may be necessary for the efficient discharge of the respon-
11 sibilities of the Commission; printing and binding; purchase
12 of ~~(62)~~*four* *eight* passenger motor vehicles ~~(63)~~, *of which six*
13 *shall be* for replacement only; hire, with or without personal
14 services, of work animals, and animal-drawn and motor-
15 propelled vehicles and aircraft and equipment; acquisition
16 by donation, purchase, or condemnation, of real and per-
17 sonal property, including expenses of abstracts and certifi-
18 cates of title; purchase of ice and drinking water; inspec-
19 tion of equipment, supplies, and materials by contract;
20 drilling and testing of foundations and dam sites, by con-
21 tract if deemed necessary, purchase of planographs and
22 lithographs; leasing of private property to remove there-
23 from sand, gravel, stone, and other materials, without regard
24 to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41
25 U. S. C. 5); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28

1 U. S. C. 2672)', and the Act of August 27, 1935, as
 2 amended (22 U. S. C. 277e); and payment of official tele-
 3 phone service in the field in case of official telephones
 4 installed in private houses when authorized under regulations
 5 established by the Commissioner; as follows:

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For salaries and expenses, regular boundary activities,
 8 including examinations, preliminary surveys, and investi-
 9 gations, \$1,000,000.

10 CONSTRUCTION

11 For detail plan preparation and construction of projects
 12 authorized by the Convention concluded February 1, 1933,
 13 between the United States and Mexico, the Acts approved
 14 August 19, 1935, as amended (22 U. S. C. 277-277d),
 15 August 29, 1935 (Public Law 392), June 4, 1936 (Public
 16 Law 648), June 28, 1941 (22 U. S. C. 277f), and the
 17 projects stipulated in the treaty between the United States
 18 and Mexico signed at Washington on February 3, 1944,
 19 ~~(64)\$5,035,000~~ \$3,000,000, to remain available until ex-
 20 pended: *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made for
 21 the lower Rio Grande flood-control project for construction on
 22 any land, site, or easement in connection with this project ex-
 23 cept such as has been acquired by donation and the title thereto
 24 has been approved by the Attorney General of the United

1 States: *Provided further*, That expenditures for the Rio
2 Grande bank-protection project shall be subject to the pro-
3 visions and conditions contained in the appropriation for said
4 project as provided by the Act approved April 25,
5 1945 (59 Stat. 89): *Provided further*, That unex-
6 pended balances of appropriations for construction under
7 the International Boundary and Water Commission available
8 for the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with this
9 appropriation and shall continue available until expended.

10 RIO GRANDE EMERGENCY FLOOD PROTECTION

11 For emergency flood-control work, including protection,
12 reconstruction, and repair of all structures under the juris-
13 diction of the International Boundary and Water Commis-
14 sion, United States and Mexico, threatened or damaged by
15 floodwaters of the Rio Grande, which have heretofore been
16 authorized and erected under the provisions of treaties be-
17 tween the United States and Mexico, or in pursuance of
18 Federal laws authorizing improvements on the Rio Grande,
19 \$30,000, to be merged with the unobligated balance of the
20 appropriation for this purpose for the next preceding fiscal
21 year, and to remain available until expended.

22 AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

23 For expenses necessary to enable the President to per-
24 form the obligations of the United States pursuant to con-
25 ventions between the United States and Canada signed May

1 26, 1980 (50 Stat. 1355) and January 29, 1987 [(50
 2 Stat. 1351), and treaties between the United States and
 3 Great Britain, in respect to Canada, signed January 11,
 4 1909 (36 Stat. 2448) and February 24, 1925 (44 Stat.
 5 2102), including personal services in the District of Colum-
 6 bia; stenographic reporting services by contract; printing and
 7 binding; hire of passenger motor vehicles; the United States
 8 share of the expenses of the International Pacific Salmon
 9 Fisheries Commission and the International Fisheries Com-
 10 mission, which except for the expenses of the members, may
 11 be advanced to the respective Commissions; (65)\$500,000
 12 \$600,000, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secre-
 13 tary of State and to be available also for additional expenses
 14 of the American Sections, International Commissions, as
 15 hereinafter set forth (66), *except that \$92,000 of such*
 16 *amount shall be available upon the enactment of this Act and*
 17 *until expended only for the examination and survey of the*
 18 *Red River of the North and its tributaries for the purpose of*
 19 *determining what action should be taken to control floods*
 20 *and provide proper drainage in the areas through which*
 21 *such river and tributaries flow:*

22 International Joint Commission, United States and
 23 Canada, the salary of one Commissioner on the part of the
 24 United States who shall serve at the pleasure of the Presi-
 25 dent (the other Commissioners to serve in that capacity with-

1 out compensation therefor) ; salaries of clerks and other em-
2 ployees appointed by the Commissioners on the part of the
3 United States with the approval solely of the Secretary of
4 State; travel expenses and compensation of witnesses in
5 attending hearings of the Commission at such places in the
6 United States and Canada as the Commission or the Amer-
7 ican Commissioners shall determine to be necessary; and
8 special and technical investigations in connection with mat-
9 ters falling within the Commission's jurisdiction, including
10 purchase for replacement only of two passenger automo-
11 biles: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State is authorized to
12 transfer to any department or independent establishment of
13 the Government, with the consent of the head thereof, funds
14 from this appropriation for direct expenditure by such de-
15 partment or establishment for such investigations.

16 International Boundary Commission, United States,
17 Alaska, and Canada, the completion of such remaining work
18 as may be required under the award of the Alaskan Bound-
19 ary Tribunal and the existing treaties between the United
20 States and Great Britain; commutation of subsistence to
21 employees while on field duty, not to exceed \$6 per day each
22 (but not to exceed \$3 per day each when a member of a field
23 party and subsisting in camp) ; hire of freight and passenger
24 motor vehicles from temporary field employees; and payment
25 for timber necessarily cut in keeping the boundary line clear.

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL

ACTIVITIES

3 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
4 State to carry out international information and educational
5 activities as authorized by the United States Information
6 and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U. S. C. 1431-
7 1479) and the Act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 501),
8 and to administer the program authorized by section 32 (b)
9 (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50
10 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b)) and the program authorized
11 by the Act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 265), includ-
12 ing personal services in the District of Columbia; employ-
13 ment, without regard to the civil-service and classification
14 laws, of persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed
15 \$60,000) and aliens within the United States; salaries,
16 expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as
17 authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C.
18 801-1158); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned
19 with activities provided for under this appropriation (not
20 to exceed \$11,000); printing and binding; entertainment
21 within the United States (not to exceed \$5,000); hire of
22 passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by sec-
23 tion 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
24 advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Re-
25 vised Statutes as amended; actual expenses of preparing

1 and transporting to their former homes the remains of
2 persons, not United States Government employees, who
3 may die away from their homes while participating in
4 activities authorized under this appropriation; establishment
5 and operation of agricultural and other experiment and dem-
6 onstration stations in other American countries, on land
7 acquired by gift or lease, and construction of necessary build-
8 ings thereon; radio activities and acquisition and production
9 of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or
10 rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, narration
11 and script-writing, by contract or otherwise; and purchase
12 of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools,
13 or organizations; ~~(67)\$34,000,000~~ \$32,700,000 ~~(68)~~, of
14 *which sum \$200,000 shall be used for the purpose of pre-*
15 *serving friendships with the peoples of western European*
16 *countries by means of radio broadcasts, said programs to be*
17 *created and produced under the supervision and control of*
18 *the Department of State by experienced private international*
19 *broadcasting organizations; and of which not to exceed*
20 ~~(69)\$3,000,000~~ \$2,875,000 may be transferred to other ap-
21 propriations of the Department of State: *Provided, That, not-*
22 *withstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised*
23 *Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Department of State is*
24 *authorized in making contracts for the use of the international*
25 *short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf*

1 of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators
 2 of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may
 3 be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or
 4 damage on account of injury to persons or property arising
 5 from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Pro-*
 6 *vided further*, That in the acquisition of leasehold interests
 7 payments may be made in advance for the entire term
 8 or any part thereof: *Provided further*, That funds herein
 9 appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75
 10 per centum of the effective daily broadcasting time from
 11 any person or corporation holding an international short-
 12 wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communica-
 13 tions Commission without the consent of such licensee: *Pro-*
 14 *vided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be
 15 available for payment to private organizations abroad in
 16 pursuance of contracts entered into for the processing and
 17 distribution of motion-picture films.

18 PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION

19 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to au-
 20 thority granted under this head in the Department of State
 21 Appropriation Act, 1949, (70)~~\$13,000,000~~ \$10,000,000,
 22 to be consolidated with appropriations heretofore made under
 23 said head; and the unobligated balance of such consolidated
 24 appropriation shall remain available during the current fiscal
 25 year upon the terms and conditions specified under this head

1 in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1950, for
 2 carrying out the purposes of sections 302 (a) and 303 (a)
 3 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended
 4 (50 U. S. C. App. 1782. 1783), as authorized by the Act of
 5 September 7, 1949 (Public Law 295), and for carrying
 6 out the purposes of section 311 of the Philippine Rehabilita-
 7 tion Act of 1946, as authorized by section 3 of the Act of
 8 July 2, 1948 (Public Law 882).

9 THE INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

10 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of
 11 the Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act of August 5,
 12 1947 (22 U. S. C. 281-2811), as amended by the Act of
 13 September 3, 1949 (Public Law 283), including purchase
 14 (not to exceed eighteen for replacement only) and hire of
 15 passenger motor vehicles, ~~(71)\$5,500,000~~ \$5,000,000, to
 16 remain available until expended ~~(72)~~, and in addition, the
 17 *Institute is authorized, prior to June 30, 1953, to enter into*
 18 *contracts for the purposes of such Act, as amended, in an*
 19 *amount not to exceed \$7,000,000.*

20 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

21 SEC. 102. Contracts entered into in foreign countries
 22 involving expenditures from any of the appropriations under
 23 this title shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3741
 24 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22).

1 SEC. 103. The provision of law prescribing the use of
2 vessels of United States registry by any officer or employee
3 of the United States (46 U. S. C. 1241) shall not apply to
4 any travel or transportation of effects payable from funds
5 appropriated, allocated, or transferred to the Secretary of
6 State or the Department of State.

7 SEC. 104. The exchange of funds for payment of ex-
8 penses in connection with the operation of diplomatic and
9 consular establishments abroad shall not be subject to the
10 provisions of section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31
11 U. S. C. 543).

12 SEC. 105. Appropriations under this title available
13 for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside
14 the continental United States, including travel of de-
15 pendants and transportation of personal effects, household
16 goods, or automobiles of such personnel, shall be available
17 for such expenses when any part of such travel or transpor-
18 tation begins in the current fiscal year pursuant to travel
19 orders issued in that year, notwithstanding the fact that such
20 travel or transportation may not be completed during the
21 current fiscal year.

22 SEC. 106. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 16a
23 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78 (a)),
24 Government-owned vehicles may be used in foreign coun-
25 tries for transportation of United States Government em-

1 ployees from their residence to the office and return when
 2 public transportation facilities are unsafe or are not available:
 3 *Provided*, That each Chief of Mission shall have prior au-
 4 thority from the Secretary of State to approve such trans-
 5 portation.

6 SEC. 107. Appropriations under this title for "Salaries
 7 and expenses", "International contingencies", and "Missions
 8 to international organizations" are available for reimburse-
 9 ment of the General Services Administration for security
 10 guard services for protection of confidential files.

11 This title may be cited as the "Department of State
 12 Appropriation Act, 1951".

13 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

14 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION 15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

16 For expenses necessary for the administration of the
 17 Department of Justice and for investigation of the official
 18 acts, records, and accounts of officers and offices of United
 19 States and territorial courts, including personal services in
 20 the District of Columbia; purchase of one passenger motor
 21 vehicle at not to exceed \$4,000, for replacement only; serv-
 22 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
 23 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; miscellaneous and emergency expenses
 24 authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his Ad-
 25 ministrative Assistant; special attorneys and special assistants

1 to the Attorney General; and examination of estimates of
 2 appropriations in the field; ~~(73)\$2,175,000~~ \$2,125,000.

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

4 For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the
 5 Department of Justice not otherwise provided for, including
 6 personal services in the District of Columbia; services as
 7 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
 8 U. S. C. 55a) ; miscellaneous and emergency expenses au-
 9 thorized or approved by the Attorney General or his Admin-
 10 istrative Assistant; and advances of public moneys pursuant
 11 to law (31 U. S. C. 529) ; ~~(74)\$7,300,000~~ \$7,475,000.

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

13 For expenses necessary for the enforcement of anti-
 14 trust and kindred laws, including personal services in the
 15 District of Columbia and services as authorized by section
 16 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),
 17 ~~(75)\$3,850,000~~ \$3,750,000, of which \$125,000 shall be
 18 available exclusively for activities in connection with railroad
 19 reparations cases: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation
 20 shall be expended for the establishment and maintenance of
 21 permanent regional offices of the Antitrust Division.

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

23 AND MARSHALS

24 For necessary expenses of the offices of United States
 25 attorneys and marshals and United States district attorneys

1 in Alaska, including purchase of not to exceed six passenger
 2 motor vehicles (including four for Alaska at not to exceed
 3 \$2,200 each, one van for replacement only at not to exceed
 4 \$2,500, and one bus for replacement only at not to exceed
 5 \$15,000) ; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
 6 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; expenses incident to
 7 the transfer of prisoners in the custody of United States
 8 marshals to narcotic farms; services in Alaska in collecting
 9 by the Attorney General; meals and lodging for deputy mar-
 10 shals in attendance upon juries when ordered by the court;
 11 notarial fees or like services; and firearms and ammunition;
 12 ~~(76)\$12,600,000~~ \$12,847,000, of which not to exceed
 13 \$50,000 shall be available for the employment of temporary
 14 deputy marshals in lieu of bailiffs at a rate not to exceed
 15 \$10 per day.

16 FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

17 For expenses, mileage, and per diems of witnesses and
 18 for per diems in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law;
 19 and not to exceed \$115,000 for such compensation and
 20 expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses) or in-
 21 formants as may be authorized or approved by the At-
 22 torney General or his Administrative Assistant, which
 23 approval shall be conclusive; ~~(77)\$1,000,000~~ \$1,250,000:
 24 *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall
 25 be used to pay any witness more than one attendance fee for
 26 any one calendar day.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF
JAPANESE ANCESTRY

For expenses necessary for payment of claims of persons of Japanese ancestry, pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U. S. C. 1981-1987), including personal services in the District of Columbia, ~~(78)\$4,000,000~~ \$1,300,000, of which not to exceed ~~(79)\$250,000~~ \$300,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States; protection of the person of the President of the United States; acquisition, collection, classification and preservation of identification and other records and their exchange with the duly authorized officials of the Federal Government, of States, cities, and other institutions; and such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice and the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed five hundred for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase at not to exceed \$10,000,

1 for replacement only, of one armored motor vehicle; firearms
2 and ammunition; not to exceed \$10,000 for taxicab hire to
3 be used exclusively for the purposes set forth in this para-
4 graph; not to exceed \$4,500 for expenses of attend-
5 ance at meetings of organizations concerned with the
6 purposes of this appropriation; not to exceed \$3,000
7 for membership in the International Commission of
8 Criminal Police; payment of rewards when specifically au-
9 thorized by the Attorney General for information leading
10 to the apprehension of fugitives from justice; and not to
11 exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a con-
12 fidential character, to be expended under the direction of
13 the Attorney General and to be accounted for solely on his
14 certificate; \$57,400,000: *Provided*, That of the amount
15 herein appropriated \$100,000 is to be held as a reserve for
16 emergencies arising in connection with kidnaping, extortion,
17 and bank robbery, to be released for expenditure in such
18 amounts and at such times as the Attorney General may
19 determine: *Provided further*, That the compensation of the
20 Director of the Bureau shall be \$20,000 per annum so long
21 as the position is held by the present incumbent.

22 None of the funds appropriated for the Federal Bureau
23 of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of
24 any civil-service employee.

1 IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary
4 for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating
5 to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, includ-
6 ing personal services in the District of Columbia; advance
7 of cash to aliens for meals and lodging while en route; pay-
8 ment of allowances (at a rate not in excess of \$1 per day)
9 to aliens, while held in custody under the immigration laws,
10 for work performed; payment of rewards for information
11 leading to the apprehension or conviction of violators of
12 the immigration laws; not to exceed \$20,000 to meet
13 unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be
14 expended under the direction of the Attorney General and
15 accounted for solely on his certificate; not to exceed
16 \$5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organiza-
17 tions concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; pur-
18 chase (not to exceed one hundred and fifty, for replacement
19 only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not
20 to exceed four for replacement only) and maintenance and
21 operation of aircraft; firearms and ammunition; free distribu-
22 tion of citizenship textbooks; refunds of head tax, main-
23 tenance bills, immigration fines, and other items properly
24 returnable, except deposits of aliens who become public
25 charges and deposits to secure payment of fines and passage

1 money; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
2 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; operation, maintenance,
3 remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of
4 equipment incident thereto; reimbursement of the General
5 Services Administration for security guard services for pro-
6 tection of confidential files; and maintenance, care, detention,
7 surveillance, parole, and transportation of alien enemies and
8 their wives and dependent children, including return of such
9 persons to place of bona fide residence or to such other place
10 as may be authorized by the Attorney General; \$31,400,000:
11 *Provided*, That the Commissioner of Immigration and
12 Naturalization may contract with officers and employees for
13 the use, on official business, of privately owned horses:
14 *Provided further*, That provisions of law prohibiting or re-
15 stricting the employment of aliens in the Government serv-
16 ice shall not apply to the employment of interpreters in the
17 Immigration and Naturalization Service (not to exceed ten
18 permanent and such temporary employees as are required
19 from time to time) where competent citizen interpreters are
20 not available.

21 FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

23 For expenses necessary for the administration, opera-
24 tion, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional
25 institutions, including not to exceed \$425,000 for depart-

1 mental personal services; not to exceed \$13,500 for expenses
2 of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with
3 the purposes of this appropriation; purchase of not to ex-
4 ceed nineteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only,
5 including two busses at not to exceed \$20,000 each; services
6 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
7 (5 U. S. C. 55a); compilation of statistics relating to
8 prisoners in Federal and non-Federal penal and correc-
9 tional institutions; furnishing of insignia, uniforms, and
10 other distinctive wearing apparel necessary for employees
11 in the performance of their official duties; payment pursuant
12 to law of claims of employees for loss, damage, or destruc-
13 tion of personal property (63 Stat. 167); firearms and
14 ammunition; payment of rewards for the apprehension, or
15 for information leading to the recapture, of escaped prison-
16 ers; purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock;
17 construction of buildings at prison camps; and not to exceed
18 \$35,000 for acquisition of land adjacent to any Federal
19 penal or correctional institution when in the opinion of the
20 Attorney General the additional land is essential for health
21 or safety; \$21,730,000: *Provided*, That collections in cash
22 for meals, laundry, barber service, uniform equipment, and
23 any other items for which payment is made originally from

1 appropriated funds may be deposited in the Treasury to the
 2 credit of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That there
 3 may be transferred to the Public Health Service such
 4 amounts as may be necessary, in the discretion of the At-
 5 torney General, for direct expenditure by that Service for
 6 medical relief for inmates of Federal penal and correctional
 7 institutions.

8 BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

9 For constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary
 10 buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional
 11 institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto,
 12 by contract or force account, ~~(80)\$900,000~~ \$800,000, of
 13 which \$540,000 is for liquidation of authority granted under
 14 this head in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act,
 15 1950, to enter into contracts for replacement of a power plant
 16 at the United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas, and
 17 of which ~~(81)\$270,000~~ \$170,000 is for replacement of a
 18 power plant at the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta,
 19 Georgia; and in addition, the Attorney General is authorized
 20 to enter into contracts and incur obligations in an amount
 21 not to exceed \$700,000 for completion of the latter project
 22 at a total cost not to exceed ~~(82)\$970,000~~ \$870,000: *Pro-*
 23 *vided*, That labor of United States prisoners may be used
 24 for work performed under this appropriation.

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For support of United States prisoners in non-Federal institutions and in the Territory of Alaska, including necessary clothing and medical aid, and payment of rewards for the apprehension, or for information leading to the recapture, of escaped prisoners; \$1,875,000.

OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Attorney General, or such officer as he may designate, is hereby authorized to pay out of any funds or other property or interest vested in him or transferred to him pursuant to or with respect to the Trading with the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.), necessary expenses incurred in carrying out the powers and duties conferred on the Attorney General pursuant to said Act: *Provided*, That not to exceed ~~(83)\$4,240,000~~ \$4,150,000 shall be available in the current fiscal year for the general administrative expenses of the Office of Alien Property, including rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia; purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; personal services in the District of Columbia; and expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this authorization: *Provided further*, That on or before

1 November 1 of the current fiscal year, the Attorney General
2 shall make a report to the Appropriations Committees of
3 the Senate and the House of Representatives giving detailed
4 information on all administrative and nonadministrative ex-
5 penses incurred during the next preceding fiscal year in
6 connection with the activities of the Office of Alien Property:
7 *Provided further*, That of the total amount herein author-
8 ized the amount of \$100,000 is to be transferred to the
9 appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, general adminis-
10 tration", Department of Justice.

11 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

12 SEC. 202. Not to exceed \$350,000 in the aggregate
13 from the appropriations made in this title for general ad-
14 ministration, general legal activities, and United States
15 attorneys and marshals shall be available, without regard
16 to the Classification Act of 1949, for compensation (not to
17 exceed \$11,000 per annum) of special attorneys and special
18 assistants to the Attorney General and to United States
19 attorneys not otherwise provided for: *Provided*, That reports
20 be submitted to the Congress on the 1st of July and January
21 showing the names of the persons employed under the fore-
22 going limitation, the annual rate of compensation or amount
23 of any fee paid to each, together with a description of their
24 duties.

25 SEC. 203. None of the funds appropriated by this

1 title may be used to pay the compensation of any person
2 hereafter employed as an attorney (except foreign counsel
3 employed in special cases) unless such person shall be duly
4 licensed and authorized to practice as an attorney under the
5 laws of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

6 SEC. 204. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for
7 the offices of the United States attorney and the United
8 States marshal for the District of Columbia from all appro-
9 priations in this title shall be reimbursed to the United
10 States from any funds in the Treasury of the United States
11 to the credit of the District of Columbia.

12 SEC. 205. Appropriations and authorizations made in
13 this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for pay-
14 ment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

15 SEC. 206. Appropriations and authorizations made in
16 this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for a
17 health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C.
18 150).

19 SEC. 207. Appropriations and authorizations made in
20 this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for
21 printing and binding.

22 SEC. 208. Appropriations and authorizations made in
23 this title which are available for expenses of attendance at
24 meetings shall be expended for such purposes in accordance
25 with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General.

1 This title may be cited as the "Department of Justice
2 Appropriation Act, 1951".

3 TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

4 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

5 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the
6 Office of the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this title
7 referred to as the Secretary) including personal services in
8 the District of Columbia; printing and binding; services as
9 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
10 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50
11 per diem; and teletype news service (not exceeding \$1,000) ;
12 ~~(84)\$1,300,000~~ \$1,400,000.

13 Technical and scientific services: For necessary
14 expenses in the performance of activities and services relating
15 to the collection, compilation, and dissemination of tech-
16 nological information as an aid to business in the develop-
17 ment of foreign and domestic commerce, including personal
18 services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed \$2,000
19 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
20 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and printing and bind-
21 ing, \$225,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized,
22 upon request of any public or private organization or indi-
23 vidual, to reproduce by appropriate process, independently
24 or through any other agency of the Government, any
25 scientific or technical report, document, or descriptive

1 material, foreign or domestic, which has been released for
2 public dissemination, and to sell such reproductions at a
3 price not less than the estimated total cost of reproducing
4 and disseminating same as may be determined by the Secre-
5 tary, the moneys received from such sale to be deposited
6 in a special account in the Treasury, such account to be
7 available for reimbursing any appropriation which may have
8 borne the expense of such reproduction and dissemination
9 and making refunds to organizations and individuals when
10 entitled thereto.

11 BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

12 Salaries and expenses, age and citizenship certification:
13 For expenses necessary for searching census records and
14 supplying information incident to carrying out the provisions
15 of the Social Security Act, and other statutory requirements
16 with respect to age and citizenship certification, including
17 personal services at the seat of government, travel, micro-
18 film, printing and binding, and photographic supplies,
19 \$109,000: *Provided*, That the procedure hereunder for the
20 furnishing from census records of evidence for the establish-
21 ment of age of individuals shall be pursuant to regulations
22 approved jointly by the Secretary and the Social Security
23 Administration.

24 Current census statistics: For expenses necessary for
25 collecting, compiling, and publishing current census statistics

1 provided for by law; enumerators at rates to be fixed with-
 2 out regard to the Classification Act; printing and binding;
 3 the cost of obtaining State, municipal, and other records;
 4 preparation of monographs on census subjects and other
 5 work of specialized character by contract; and purchase,
 6 construction, repair, and rental of mechanical and electrical
 7 tabulating equipment and other labor-saving devices;
 8 \$6,000,000, of which \$100,000 shall be available exclusively
 9 for vessel shipping statistics.

10 Seventeenth decennial census: For expenses necessary
 11 for taking, compiling, and publishing the seventeenth decen-
 12 nial census including the census of housing as authorized by
 13 law (13 U. S. C. 201-219; Public Law 171, approved July
 14 15, 1949), including personal services at the seat of govern-
 15 ment and elsewhere at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of
 16 Commerce without regard to the Classification Act of 1949
 17 and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended;
 18 printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of
 19 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); health service
 20 program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and compen-
 21 sation of employees of the Department of Commerce and other
 22 departments and independent establishments of the Govern-
 23 ment who may be detailed for field work; ~~(85)\$29,-~~
 24 ~~500,000~~ \$28,500,000, to remain available until Decem-

ber 31, 1952, and to be merged with the appropriation made under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1950.

General administration, Bureau of the Census: For expenses necessary for general administration, and printing and binding, \$898,000.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), and other Acts incident to the enforcement of safety regulations; maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities and air traffic control; furnishing advisory service to States and other public and private agencies in connection with the construction or improvement of airports and landing areas; and the disposal of surplus airports; including personal services in the District of Columbia; hire of aircraft (not exceeding \$420,000); the operation and maintenance of eighty-five aircraft; printing and binding; contract stenographic reporting services; fees and mileage of expert and other witnesses; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; purchase (not to exceed ten, for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; and salaries and traveling expenses, together

1 with tuition (not to exceed \$20,000) and other con-
2 tractual expenses in connection therewith, of employees
3 detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the
4 Government or other organizations serving aviation;
5 (86)~~\$97,000,000~~ \$99,775,000, and the Departments of the
6 Air Force, Army and Navy, are authorized to transfer to the
7 Civil Aeronautics Administration without charge, subject
8 to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for
9 replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, flight equipment,
10 and hangar, line, and shop equipment surplus to the needs of
11 such Departments: *Provided*, That there may be credited
12 to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties,
13 municipalities, and other public authorities for expenses
14 incurred in the maintenance and operation of airport traffic
15 control towers.

16 Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For the acqui-
17 sition and establishment by contract or purchase and hire
18 of air-navigation facilities, including the equipment of addi-
19 tional civil airways for day and night flying; the construction
20 of additional necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling
21 and communicating structures and apparatus; the alteration
22 and modernization of existing air-navigation facilities; the
23 acquisition of the necessary sites by lease, condemnation or
24 grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related
25 accommodations for officers and employees of the Civil Aero-

1 nautics Administration and the Weather Bureau stationed at
2 remote localities not on foreign soil where such accommoda-
3 tions are not otherwise available; personal services in the
4 District of Columbia; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
5 printing and binding; and not to exceed \$200,000 for emer-
6 gency repairs and replacement of facilities damaged by
7 fire, flood, or storm; ~~(87)\$32,000,000~~ \$27,500,000, of which
8 ~~(88)\$26,500,000~~ \$22,000,000 is for liquidation of obliga-
9 tions incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into
10 contracts for the foregoing purposes; and, in addition, the
11 Civil Aeronautics Administration is authorized to enter into
12 contracts and incur obligations for purposes contained in this
13 paragraph in an amount not exceeding ~~(89)\$13,461,500~~
14 \$20,000,000: *Provided*, That authority heretofore granted
15 under this head to enter into contracts for such purposes
16 may be exercised until June 30, 1951: *Provided further*,
17 That the consolidated appropriation under this head for
18 the next preceding fiscal year is hereby consolidated with
19 and made a part of this appropriation to be disbursed
20 and accounted for as one fund: *Provided further*, That
21 transfers may be made from this appropriation to the
22 appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Ad-
23 ministration," for costs of maintenance and operation of
24 aircraft for initial flight checking of facilities established under
25 this appropriation (not to exceed \$171,000) ; for necessary

1 expenses in connection with the transportation by air to and
2 from and within the Territories of the United States of
3 materials and equipment secured under this appropriation
4 (not to exceed \$115,000) ; and for necessary administra-
5 tive costs (not to exceed \$389,000) : *Provided further*, That
6 the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are
7 authorized during the current fiscal year to transfer without
8 charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,
9 air-navigation and communication facilities, including appur-
10 tenances thereto, to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

11 Technical development and evaluation: For expenses
12 necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aero-
13 nautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), rela-
14 tive to such developmental work and service testing as
15 tends to the creation of improved air-navigation facilities,
16 including landing areas, aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers,
17 appliances, personnel, and operation methods, and personal
18 services in the District of Columbia; acquisition of neces-
19 sary sites by lease or grant; operation and maintenance of
20 five aircraft, which shall be in addition to the number
21 authorized herein under the appropriation for "Salaries and
22 expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration"; and printing
23 and binding; \$1,375,000.

24 Maintenance and operation, Washington National Air-
25 port: For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-

1 nance, and protection of the Washington National Airport,
 2 including purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replace-
 3 ment only; printing and binding; not to exceed \$3,380 for
 4 the purchase, cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms
 5 and ammunition; \$1,300,000.

6 Construction, Washington National Airport: For an
 7 additional amount for construction at the Washington Na-
 8 tional Airport, including acquisition of an existing fuel sys-
 9 tem and necessary related facilities, \$540,000, to remain
 10 available until expended.

11 Federal-aid airport program. Federal Airport Act: For
 12 carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of
 13 May 13, 1946 (except section 5 (a)), to be available until
 14 June 30, 1953, ~~(90)\$45,000,000~~ \$37,000,000, of which
 15 ~~(91)\$42,000,000~~ \$34,000,000 is for liquidation of obliga-
 16 tions incurred under authority heretofore granted to
 17 enter into contract for the foregoing purposes; and in
 18 addition, the Civil Aeronautics Administration is author-
 19 ized until June 30, 1953, to enter into contracts and
 20 incur obligations for purposes of this paragraph in an amount
 21 not exceeding \$36,700,000, of which \$36,000,000 shall be
 22 for projects in the States in accordance with section 6 of
 23 said Act, \$500,000 for projects in Puerto Rico, \$150,000
 24 for projects in the Territory of Hawaii, and \$50,000 for
 25 projects in the Virgin Islands: *Provided*, That of the amount

1 appropriated herein, \$3,000,000 shall be available as one
2 fund for necessary planning, research, and administrative
3 expenses; including personal services in the District of
4 Columbia; purchase (not to exceed twenty-five for replace-
5 ment only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and print-
6 ing and binding; of which \$3,000,000 not to exceed
7 \$600,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries
8 and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration", to provide
9 for necessary administrative expenses, including the main-
10 tenance and operation of aircraft and printing and binding:
11 *Provided further*, That the appropriation under this head for
12 the next preceding fiscal year is hereby merged with this
13 appropriation.

14 Construction of public airports, Territory of Alaska:
15 For an additional amount for construction of public airports,
16 Territory of Alaska, \$3,200,000, to remain available until
17 expended for liquidation of obligations incurred under au-
18 thority granted in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act,
19 1948, to enter into contracts for such purpose.

20 Air navigation development: For expenses necessary
21 for planning and developing a national system of aids
22 to air navigation and air traffic control common to
23 military and civil air navigation, including research, ex-
24 perimental investigations, purchase, and development, by
25 contract or otherwise, of new types of air navigation aids

1 (including plans, specifications, and drawings); personal
2 services in the District of Columbia; hire of passenger motor
3 vehicles and aircraft; printing and binding; services as
4 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
5 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess
6 of \$50 per diem; acquisition of necessary sites by lease or
7 grant; payments in advance under contracts for research or
8 development work; and not to exceed \$130,000 for admin-
9 istrative expenses (92), of which \$35,000 may be trans-
10 ferred to the appropriation "*Salaries and expenses, Civil*
11 *Aeronautics Administration*" for such expenses, including the
12 maintenance and operation of aircraft; \$6,000,000, of which
13 \$2,885,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under
14 authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the
15 foregoing purposes, and, in addition, the Civil Aeronautics
16 Administration is authorized to enter into contracts and incur
17 obligations for the purposes contained in this paragraph in
18 an amount not exceeding \$2,250,000.

19 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

20 Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses: For
21 necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including
22 personal services in the District of Columbia; contract steno-
23 graphic reporting services; employment of temporary guards
24 on a contract or fee basis; salaries and traveling expenses of
25 employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted

1 by the Government or industries serving aviation; expenses
 2 of examination of estimates of appropriations in the field;
 3 hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, operation, maintenance,
 4 and repair of aircraft; and printing and binding;
 5 (93)\$3,400,000 \$4,000,000 (94): *Provided, That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized*
 6 *to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Board without charge,*
 7 *subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft*
 8 *(for replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, and accessories surplus to the needs of such Departments.*

11 COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

12 Salaries and expenses, departmental: For expenses
 13 necessary to carry out in the District of Columbia the provisions of the Act of August 6, 1947 (33 U. S. C. 883a-
 14 883i), including personal services; purchase of maps
 15 and nautical and aeronautical charts; maintenance of an
 16 instrument shop and procurement or exchange of metalworking and woodworking supplies and equipment; chart
 17 paper, drafting, photographic, photolithographic, and printing supplies and equipment; printing and binding; instruments (except surveying instruments); and stationery for
 18 field use; \$3,800,000.

23 Salaries and expenses, field: For expenses necessary
 24 to carry out in the field the provisions of the Act of August
 25 6, 1947 (33 U. S. C. 883a-883i), including the operation

1 and maintenance of ships and other field units; replacement
2 of observatories and auxiliary buildings where necessary;
3 purchase of plans and specifications of vessels; lease of sites
4 where necessary and the erection of temporary magnetic
5 and seismological buildings; hire of aircraft; operation,
6 maintenance and repair of an airplane for photographic sur-
7 veys; packing, crating, and transporting personal household
8 effects of commissioned officers when transferred from one
9 official station to another, and of commissioned officers who
10 die on active duty, and funeral expenses of commissioned
11 officers, as authorized by law; and extra compensation at
12 not to exceed \$15 per month to each member of the crew
13 of a vessel when assigned duties as bomber or fathometer
14 reader or duties of a similar nature, and at not to exceed \$1
15 per day for each station to employees of other Federal agen-
16 cies while observing tides or currents or tending seismo-
17 graphs; \$6,200,000: *Provided*, That the Departments of
18 the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized during the
19 current fiscal year to transfer to the Coast and Geodetic
20 Survey, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,
21 landing craft, launches, marine engines, electronic equip-
22 ment, automotive vehicles, parts, equipment, and supplies,
23 excess to the needs of such Departments, which will serve to
24 expedite surveys in Alaska for the national defense.

25 Pay, commissioned officers: For pay and allowances

1 prescribed by law for not to exceed one hundred and sev-
 2 enty-one commissioned officers on the active list and of
 3 officers retired in accordance with existing law, including
 4 payment of six months' death gratuity as authorized by law,
 5 \$1,515,000.

6 The foregoing appropriations for the Coast and Geodetic
 7 Survey shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed
 8 five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and
 9 (not to exceed \$25,000) for services as authorized by
 10 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

11 BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

12 Departmental salaries and expenses: For personal ser-
 13 vices and other necessary expenses of the Bureau of Foreign
 14 and Domestic Commerce at the seat of government, includ-
 15 ing printing and binding, the purchase of commercial and
 16 trade reports, and not to exceed \$50,000 for services as
 17 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
 18 U. S. C. 55a), ~~(95)\$5,000,000~~ \$5,300,000: *Provided*, That
 19 expenses of field studies or surveys conducted by depart-
 20 mental personnel of the Bureau shall be payable from the
 21 amount herein appropriated.

22 Field office service: For expenses necessary to operate
 23 and maintain regional, district, and cooperative branch offices
 24 for the collection and dissemination of information useful in
 25 the development and improvement of commerce throughout

1 the United States and its possessions, including not to exceed
 2 \$90,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia,
 3 and printing and binding, (96)\$2,050,000 \$2,155,000.

4 Export control: For expenses necessary for carrying out
 5 the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949 (Public
 6 Law 11, approved February 26, 1949), relating to export
 7 controls, including personal services in the District of
 8 Columbia and services as authorized by section 15 of the
 9 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to
 10 exceed \$50 per diem for individuals, and printing and
 11 binding, \$2,000,000, of which not to exceed \$828,000
 12 may be transferred to the Bureau of Customs, Treasury
 13 Department, for enforcement of the export control pro-
 14 gram, and of which not to exceed \$40,000 may be trans-
 15 ferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses"
 16 under the Office of the Secretary.

17 PATENT OFFICE

18 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
 19 ing personal services in the District of Columbia; services
 20 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
 21 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$75
 22 per diem (not to exceed \$25,000); expenses of transporting
 23 to foreign governments publications of patents issued by the
 24 Patent Office; defense of suits instituted against the Com-
 25 missioner of Patents; travel; printing and binding; and other

1 contingent expenses of the Patent Office: *Provided*, That
2 the headings of the drawings for patented cases may be
3 multigraphed in the Patent Office for the purpose of photo-
4 lithography, (97)\$~~11,300,000~~ \$11,530,000.

5 BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

6 General administrative expenses: For the employment
7 of persons and means, including rent, advertising (including
8 advertising in the city of Washington for work to be per-
9 formed in areas adjacent thereto), printing and binding,
10 purchase of periodicals, purchase of one hundred passenger
11 motor vehicles for replacement only, health service program
12 as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), and the preparation,
13 distribution, and display of exhibits, in the city of Washing-
14 ton and elsewhere for the purpose of conducting research
15 and investigational studies, either independently or in co-
16 operation with State highway departments, or other agencies,
17 including studies of highway administration, legislation,
18 finance, economics, transport, construction, operation, main-
19 tenance, utilization, and safety, and of street and highway
20 traffic control; investigations and experiments in the best
21 methods of road making, especially by the use of local
22 materials; studies of types of mechanical plants and appli-
23 ances used for road building and maintenance, and of methods
24 of road repair and maintenance suited to the needs of dif-
25 ferent localities; for maintenance and repairs of experimental

1 highways; for furnishing expert advice on these subjects;
2 for collating, reporting, and illustrating the results of same;
3 and for preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins and
4 reports; to be paid from any moneys available from the
5 administrative funds provided under the Act of July 11,
6 1916, as amended (23 U. S. C. 21), or as otherwise
7 provided.

8 In carrying out the provisions of "An Act to provide
9 that the United States shall aid the States in the con-
10 struction of rural post roads, and for other purposes", as
11 amended and supplemented (23 U. S. C. 1-117), none
12 of the money appropriated for the work of the Bureau of
13 Public Roads during the current fiscal year shall be paid
14 to any State on account of any project on which con-
15 vict labor shall be employed, except this provision shall
16 not apply to convict labor performed by convicts on parole
17 or probation: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year,
18 whenever performing authorized engineering or other serv-
19 ices in connection with the survey, construction, and mainte-
20 nance, or improvement of roads for other Government agen-
21 cies, cooperating foreign countries and State cooperating
22 agencies the charge for such services may include depre-
23 ciation on engineering and road-building equipment used,
24 and the amounts received on account of such charges shall
25 be credited to the appropriation concerned: *Provided*

1 *further*, That during the current fiscal year the appropria-
2 tions for the work of the Bureau of Public Roads shall be
3 available for meeting the expenses of warehouse mainte-
4 nance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies,
5 materials, and equipment stored therein for distribution to
6 projects under the supervision of the Bureau of Public Roads,
7 and for sale and for distribution to other Government activi-
8 ties, cooperating foreign countries and State cooperating
9 agencies, the cost of such supplies and materials or the
10 value of such equipment (including the cost of transporta-
11 tion and handling) to be reimbursed to appropriations cur-
12 rent at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment
13 are procured, from the appropriation chargeable with the
14 cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment: *Pro-*
15 *vided further*, That the appropriations available to the Bu-
16 reau of Public Roads may be used in emergency for medical
17 supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the
18 immediate relief of employees engaged on hazardous work
19 under that Bureau, and for temporary services as author-
20 ized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
21 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem
22 (98): ~~*Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,000,000,~~
23 ~~to be derived from the administrative funds provided under~~
24 ~~the Act of July 11, 1916, as amended or supplemented~~
25 ~~(23 U. S. C. 21), shall be available until expended for~~

1 continuing the construction of a laboratory, on a site al-
 2 ready acquired, for permanent quarters for the testing and
 3 research work of the Bureau of Public Roads.

4 For all necessary expenses to enable the President
 5 to utilize the services of the Bureau of Public Roads
 6 in fulfilling the obligations of the United States under
 7 the Convention on the Pan-American Highway Between
 8 the United States and Other American Republics, signed
 9 at Buenos Aires, December 23, 1936, and proclaimed
 10 September 16, 1937 (51 Stat. 152), for the continuation
 11 of cooperation with several governments, members of the
 12 Pan American Union, in connection with the survey and
 13 construction of the Inter-American Highway as provided in
 14 public resolution, approved March 4, 1929 (Public Resolu-
 15 tion 104), as amended or supplemented, and for performing
 16 engineering service in pan-American countries for and upon
 17 the request of any agency or governmental corporation of the
 18 United States, \$100,000 to be derived from the administrative
 19 funds provided under the Act of July 11, 1916, as amended
 20 or supplemented (23 U. S. C. 21), or as otherwise provided.

21 Federal-aid postwar highways: For carrying out the
 22 provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1944 and
 23 1948 (58 Stat. 838; 62 Stat. 1105), to remain available
 24 until expended, ~~(99)\$405,000,000~~ \$385,000,000, which sum
 25 is composed of \$263,491,000, the remainder of the amount

1 authorized to be appropriated for the third postwar fiscal
2 year by section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944,
3 ~~(100)\$135,509,000~~ \$115,509,000, a part of the amount
4 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1950
5 by section 1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948,
6 and \$1,828,050 and \$4,171,950, the latter sums being
7 for reimbursement of the sums expended for the repair
8 or reconstruction of highways and bridges which have
9 been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, or land-
10 slides, as provided by section 3 of the Act approved June
11 18, 1934, and section 7 of the Act approved July 13, 1943
12 (23 U. S. C. 13a and 13b).

13 Elimination of grade crossings: For the elimination of
14 hazards to life at railroad grade crossings, including the
15 separation or protection of grades at crossings, the recon-
16 struction of existing railroad grade-crossing structures, and
17 the relocation of highways to eliminate grade crossings, to
18 remain available until expended, \$4,600,000, which sum is
19 a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the
20 fiscal year 1943 by section 5 of the Act approved Septem-
21 ber 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 869).

22 Forest highways: For expenses necessary for carrying
23 out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act
24 of November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a),
25 in accordance with section 3a of the Federal-Aid Highway

1 Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1105), to remain available until
2 expended, \$22,500,000, which sum is composed of \$4,900,-
3 000, the remainder of the amount authorized by section 9
4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 842),
5 to be appropriated for the second postwar fiscal year and
6 \$17,600,000, a part of the amount authorized by section 3
7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, to be appropriated
8 for the fiscal year 1950: *Provided*, That this appropriation
9 shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or
10 alteration of buildings and sites necessary for the storage and
11 repair of equipment and supplies used for road construction
12 and maintenance, but the total cost of any such item under
13 this authorization shall not exceed \$15,000.

14 Access roads: During the current fiscal year, not to
15 exceed \$70,000 of funds remaining unexpended upon com-
16 pletion of access road projects authorized to be constructed
17 under the provisions of the Defense Highway Act of 1941,
18 as amended by the Act of July 2, 1942 (23 U. S. C. 106),
19 shall be available for the maintenance of roads and bridges
20 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Public Roads on
21 Government-owned land in Arlington County, Virginia.

22 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

23 For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions
24 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (5 U. S. C. 591, 597;
25 15 U. S. C. 271-278), and Acts supplementary thereto

1 affecting the functions of the Bureau and the functions set
2 forth under the Bureau of Standards in the "Department of
3 Commerce Appropriation Act, 1935", including personal
4 services in the District of Columbia; rental of laboratories
5 in the field; repairs and alterations to buildings and other
6 plant facilities, and not to exceed ~~(101)\$540,000~~ \$700,000
7 for improvements to buildings, grounds, and other plant
8 facilities including construction of minor buildings and other
9 facilities in the District of Columbia and in the field to house
10 special apparatus or material which must be isolated from
11 other activities; building of temporary experimental struc-
12 tures; expenses of the visiting committee; demonstration of
13 the results of the Bureau's work by exhibits or otherwise
14 as may be deemed most effective; purchase, repair, and
15 cleaning of uniforms for guards; printing and binding; not
16 to exceed \$100,000 for services as authorized by section
17 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and
18 purchase of reprints from trade journals or other periodicals
19 of articles prepared officially by Government employees, as
20 follows:

21 Operation and administration: For the general operation
22 and administration of the Bureau; improvement and care
23 of the grounds; plant equipment; maintenance and protection
24 of buildings, including repairs and alterations thereto;
25 ~~(102)\$1,270,000~~ \$1,430,000.

1 Research and testing: For calibrating and certifying
2 measuring instruments, apparatus, and standards in terms
3 of the national standards; the preparation and distribution
4 of standard materials; the testing of equipment, materials,
5 and supplies in connection with Government purchases; the
6 improvement of methods of testing; advisory services to
7 governmental agencies on scientific and technical matters;
8 the maintenance and development of national standards of
9 measurement; the development of improved methods of
10 measurement; the determination of physical constants and
11 the properties of materials; the investigation of mechanisms
12 and structures, including their economy, efficiency, and
13 safety; the study of fluid resistance and the flow of fluids
14 and heat; the investigation of radiation, radioactive sub-
15 stances, and X-rays; the development of methods of
16 chemical analysis and synthesis, and the investi-
17 gation of the properties of rare substances; investigations
18 relating to the utilization of materials, including lubricants
19 and liquid fuels; the study of new processes and methods
20 of fabrication; the solutions of problems arising in connec-
21 tion with standards; cooperation with Government purchas-
22 ing agencies, industries, and national organizations in
23 developing specifications and facilitating their use; encour-
24 agement of the application of the latest developments in the
25 utilization and standardization of building materials; the

1 development of engineering and safety codes, simplified
2 practice recommendations, and commercial standards of
3 quality and performance; and the compilation of and dis-
4 semination of scientific and technical data; \$4,300,000.

5 Radio propagation and standards: For development and
6 maintenance of primary standards of measurement of elec-
7 trical quantities at radio frequencies; calibrating and certify-
8 ing radio measuring instruments, apparatus, and standards
9 in terms of the national primary standards; investigation of
10 the phenomena affecting the propagation of radio waves;
11 the broadcasting of radio signals of standard frequency; the
12 compilation and dissemination of scientific and technical data
13 relating to the propagation of radio waves, and measurement
14 of electrical quantities at radio frequencies: *Provided, That*
15 for employees conducting observations on radio propagation
16 phenomena in the Arctic region, the funds appropriated and
17 the funds transferred or advanced from other Government
18 agencies to the National Bureau of Standards shall be avail-
19 able for the appointment of such employees at base rates
20 not in excess of \$5,000 per annum without regard to the civil
21 service and classification laws and titles II and III of the
22 Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945; and for the furnishing
23 of food, shelter, and protective clothing and equipment,
24 without repayment therefor, to employees of the Govern-
25 ment assigned to Arctic stations; and the Departments of

1 the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized, subject to the
 2 approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to transfer without
 3 charge to the National Bureau of Standards materials, equip-
 4 ment, and supplies, surplus to their needs and necessary
 5 for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of Arctic
 6 ionosphere observation stations, ~~(103)\$3,100,000~~ \$3,000,-
 7 000.

8 Construction of laboratories: For the acquisition of sites,
 9 the preparation of drawings and specifications, and the con-
 10 struction and equipping of a radio laboratory building and
 11 a guided missile laboratory building, together with necessary
 12 utilities and appurtenances, as authorized by Acts of October
 13 25, 1949 (Public Laws 366 and 386), ~~(104)\$500,000~~
 14 \$268,000, to remain available until expended; and, in addi-
 15 tion, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to enter into
 16 contracts and to incur obligations for the purposes of this
 17 appropriation in an amount not to exceed ~~(105)\$5,675,000~~
 18 \$3,000,000.

19 WEATHER BUREAU

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 21 Weather Bureau, including personal services in the District of
 22 Columbia; maintenance and operation of aircraft; printing
 23 and binding; not to exceed \$25,000 for services as authorized
 24 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
 25 and not to exceed \$10,000 for maintenance of a printing of-

1 fice in the City of Washington, as authorized by law; not to
2 exceed \$10,000 for the United States contribution to the cost
3 of the secretariat of the International Meteorological Com-
4 mittee; ~~(106)\$24,447,000~~ \$24,927,000: *Provided*, That
5 during the current fiscal year, the maximum amount author-
6 ized under section 3 (a) of the Act of June 2, 1948 (Public
7 Law 573), for extra compensation to employees of other
8 Government agencies for taking and transmitting meteoro-
9 logical observations, shall be \$5 per day; and the maximum
10 base rate of pay authorized under section 3 (b) of said Act,
11 for employees conducting meteorological investigations in
12 the Arctic region, shall be \$5,000 per annum, except that
13 not more than five of such employees at any one time may
14 receive a base rate of \$7,500 per annum (107), *and such*
15 *employees may be appointed without regard to the Classifica-*
16 *tion Act of 1949.*

17 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

18 SEC. 302. During the current fiscal year applicable ap-
19 propriations and funds available to the Department of Com-
20 merce shall be available for the activities specified in the
21 Act of October 26, 1949 (Public Law 390), to the extent
22 and in the manner prescribed by said Act.

23 SEC. 303. The appropriations of the Department of
24 Commerce available for salaries and expenses shall be avail-

1 able for health programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C.
2 150), and for the payment of tort claims pursuant to law
3 (28 U. S. C. 2672).

4 SEC. 304. Appropriations of the Department of Com-
5 merce available for salaries and expenses shall be available
6 for attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with
7 the activities for which the appropriations are made.

8 This title may be cited as the "Department of Com-
9 merce Appropriation Act, 1951".

10 TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

11 SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

12 SALARIES

13 For the Chief Justice and eight Associate Justices,
14 and all other officers and employees, whose compensation
15 shall be fixed by the Court, except as otherwise provided
16 by law, and who may be employed and assigned by the
17 Chief Justice to any office or work of the Court, \$915,000.

18 PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS

19 For printing and binding the advance opinions, pre-
20 liminary prints, and bound reports of the Court, \$91,200.

21 MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

22 For miscellaneous expenses to be expended as the Chief
23 Justice may approve, \$52,100.

1 CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS

2 For such expenditures as may be necessary to enable the
3 Architect of the Capitol to carry out the duties imposed
4 upon him by the Act approved May 7, 1934 (40 U. S. C.
5 13a-13d), including improvements, maintenance, repairs,
6 equipment, supplies, materials, and appurtenances; special
7 clothing for workmen; and personal and other services (in-
8 cluding temporary labor without reference to the Classifica-
9 tion and Retirement Acts, as amended), and for snow
10 removal by hire of men and equipment or under contract
11 without compliance with sections 3709, as amended, and
12 3744 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5, 16);
13 \$159,200.

14 COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges,
17 and all other officers and employees of the court, and neces-
18 sary expenses of the court, including exchange of books,
19 traveling expenses, and printing and binding, as may be
20 approved by the chief judge, \$192,200.

21 CUSTOMS COURT

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For salaries of the chief judge, eight judges, and all
24 other officers and employees of the court, and necessary
25 expenses of the court, including exchange of books, traveling

1 expenses, and printing and binding, as may be approved
 2 by the chief judge, (108)~~\$417,465~~ \$411,465: *Provided*,
 3 That traveling expenses of judges of the Customs Court shall
 4 be paid upon the written certificate of the judge.

5 COURT OF CLAIMS

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges,
 8 seven regular and six additional commissioners, and all other
 9 officers and employees of the court, and for other necessary
 10 expenses, including stenographic and other fees and charges
 11 necessary in the taking of testimony, travel, and printing
 12 and binding, (109)~~\$587,000~~ \$575,000.

13 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS

14 For necessary repairs and improvements to the Court
 15 of Claims buildings, to be expended under the supervision
 16 of the Architect of the Capitol, (110)~~\$10,700~~ \$140,700.

17 OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

18 HAWAII

19 For salaries of the chief justice and two associate
 20 justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii,
 21 of judges of the circuit courts in Hawaii, and of judges re-
 22 tired under title 28, United States Code, section 373,
 23 \$106,500.

1

SALARIES OF JUDGES

2

For salaries of circuit judges; district judges (including
 3 judges of the district courts of Alaska, the Virgin Islands,
 4 and the Panama Canal Zone) ; and justices and judges re-
 5 tired or resigned under title 28, United States Code, sections
 6 371, 372, and 373; \$5,095,000.

7

SALARIES OF CLERKS OF COURTS

8

For salaries of clerks of United States courts of appeals
 9 and United States district courts, their deputies, and other
 10 assistants, (111) ~~\$4,500,000~~ \$4,470,000.

11

PROBATION SYSTEM

12

For salaries of probation officers and their clerical assist-
 13 ants, as authorized by title 18, United States Code, sections
 14 3654 and 3656, \$2,145,000: *Provided*, That nothing
 15 herein contained shall be construed to abridge the right
 16 of the district judges to appoint probation officers, or to
 17 make such orders as may be necessary to govern probation
 18 officers in their own courts: *Provided further*, That no part
 19 of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary or ex-
 20 penses of any probation officer who, in the judgment of the
 21 chief or presiding judge certified to the Attorney General,
 22 fails to carry out the official orders of the Attorney General
 23 with respect to supervising or furnishing information con-

cerning any prisoner released conditionally or on parole from
any Federal penal or correctional institution.

SALARIES OF CRIERS

For salaries of criers as authorized by title 28, United
States Code, sections 713 (a) and 755, ~~(112)~~\$540,000
\$520,000.

FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

For fees of the United States commissioners and other
committing magistrates acting under title 18, United States
Code, section 3041, including fees and expenses of concili-
ation commissioners, United States courts, including the
objects and subject to the conditions specified for such fees
and expenses of conciliation commissioners in the Depart-
ment of Justice Appropriation Act, 1937, \$475,000.

FEES OF JURORS

For fees, expenses, and costs of jurors; meals and lodg-
ing for jurors in Alaska, as provided by section 193, title II,
of the Act of June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 362); and compensa-
tion for jury commissioners; \$2,700,000: *Provided*, That
the compensation of jury commissioners for the District of
Columbia shall conform to the provisions of section 1401,
title 11 of the District of Columbia Code, but such com-
pensation shall not exceed \$250 each per annum.

MISCELLANEOUS SALARIES

For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal
judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, \$2,600,-

1 000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and
2 law clerks of circuit and district judges shall be fixed by
3 the Director of the Administrative Office without regard
4 to the Classification Act of 1949, except that the salary of
5 a secretary shall conform with that of the General Schedule
6 grades (GS) 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, as the appointing judge shall
7 determine, and the salary of a law clerk shall conform with
8 that of the General Schedule grades (GS) 5, 7, 9, 11, or 12,
9 as the appointing judge shall determine, subject to review
10 by the judicial council of the circuit if requested by the
11 Director, such determination by the judge otherwise to be
12 final: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of step-increases
13 corresponding with those provided for by title VII of the
14 Classification Act of 1949 and of compensation paid for
15 temporary assistance needed because of an emergency) the
16 aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed
17 by one judge shall not exceed \$9,600 per annum, except in
18 the case of the chief judge of each circuit and the chief judge
19 of each district court having five or more district judges, in
20 which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed \$13,050
21 per annum.

22 MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

23 For miscellaneous expenses of the United States courts
24 and their officers; rent in the District of Columbia; printing

1 and binding; purchase of firearms and ammunition; and
 2 purchase of envelopes without regard to the Act of June 26,
 3 1906 (34 Stat. 476) ; ~~(113)\$725,000~~ \$675,000: *Provided*,
 4 That this appropriation shall be available for payment of the
 5 cost of contract statistical services for the Office of Register of
 6 Wills of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That not
 7 to exceed \$1,000 of this appropriation shall be available for
 8 the payment of fees to attorneys appointed in accordance
 9 with the Act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 625) , not exceeding
 10 \$25 in any one case.

11 TRAVEL EXPENSES

12 For necessary traveling expenses, not otherwise pro-
 13 vided for, incurred by the Judiciary, including traveling
 14 expenses of probation officers and their clerks, ~~(114)\$725,000~~
 15 \$650,000: *Provided*, That this sum shall be available, in an
 16 amount not to exceed \$8,500, for expenses of attendance at
 17 meetings concerned with the work of Federal probation
 18 when incurred on the written authorization of the Director
 19 of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

20 SALARIES OF COURT REPORTERS

21 For salaries of court reporters for the district courts of
 22 the United States, as authorized by title 28, United States
 23 Code, section 753, \$972,000.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

2 For necessary expenses of the Administrative Office of
 3 the United States Courts, including personal services in the
 4 District of Columbia, travel, printing and binding, adver-
 5 tising, rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and
 6 examination of estimates for appropriations in the field,
 7 (115)~~\$530,000~~ \$520,000.

8 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, DISTRICT COURT OF THE

9 UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

10 For repairs and improvements to the courthouse, includ-
 11 ing repair and maintenance of the mechanical equipment,
 12 and for labor and material and every item incident thereto,
 13 (116)~~\$15,600~~ \$7,100, to be expended under the direction
 14 of the Architect of the Capitol.

15 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, UNITED STATES COURT OF

16 APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

17 For repairs and improvements to the United States
 18 Court of Appeals Building, including repair and mainte-
 19 nance of the mechanical equipment and for labor and ma-
 20 terial and every item incident thereto, \$6,200, to be ex-
 21 pended under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol.

SALARIES OF REFEREES

For salaries of referees as authorized by the Act of June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68), \$879,000 to be derived from the referees' salary fund established in pursuance of said Act.

EXPENSES OF REFEREES

For miscellaneous expenses of referees, United States courts, including the salaries of their clerical assistants, travel, printing and binding, purchase of envelopes without regard to the Act of June 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 476), ~~(117)\$960,000~~ \$1,035,400 to be derived from the referees' expense fund established in pursuance of the Act of June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68 (c) (4)).

Any surplus arising in the referees' salary and expense funds for the fiscal years 1949 and 1950 shall remain available until June 30, 1951, for the payment of salaries and expenses of referees within the limitations prescribed hereinbefore.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE JUDICIARY

SEC. 402. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia from all appropriations under this title and 30 per centum of the expenditures for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia from all appropriations under this title shall be reimbursed to the United States

1 from any funds in the Treasury to the credit of the District
2 of Columbia.

3 SEC. 403. The reports of the United States Court of
4 Appeals for the District of Columbia shall not be sold for
5 a price exceeding that approved by the court and for not
6 more than \$6.50 per volume.

7 This title may be cited as the "Judiciary Appropriation
8 Act, 1951".

9 TITLE V—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

10 The following corporations, respectively, are hereby au-
11 thorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds
12 and borrowing authority available to each such corporation
13 and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and com-
14 mitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided
15 by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act,
16 as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the pro-
17 grams set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for
18 each such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

19 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

20 Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated: Not to exceed
21 \$327,000 of the funds of the Corporation shall be avail-
22 able for its administrative expenses, and not to exceed
23 \$388,000 for the expenses of vocational training of
24 prisoners, both amounts to be computed on an accrual
25 basis and to be determined in accordance with the Cor-

1 poration's prescribed accounting system in effect on July 1,
2 1946, and shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of
3 claims, expenditures which the said accounting system re-
4 quires to be capitalized or charged to cost of commodities
5 acquired or produced, including selling and shipping ex-
6 penses, and expenses in connection with acquisition, con-
7 struction, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection,
8 or disposition of facilities and other property belonging to
9 the Corporation or in which it has an interest.

10 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

11 The Institute of Inter-American Affairs: Not to exceed
12 (118) ~~\$600,000~~ \$767,500 of the funds available to the Cor-
13 poration shall be available during the current fiscal year for
14 its administrative expenses, including administrative serv-
15 ices performed for the Corporation by other Government
16 agencies.

17 This title may be cited as "Federal Prison Industries,
18 Incorporated, and The Institute of Inter-American Affairs
19 Appropriation Act, 1951".

20 This chapter may be cited as the "Departments of
21 State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation
22 Act, 1951".

1 CHAPTER IV—TREASURY AND POST OFFICE
2 DEPARTMENTS

3 TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

4 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

5 SALARIES

6 For personal services in the District of Columbia,
7 \$940,000.

8 DAMAGE CLAIMS

9 For payment of claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C.
10 2672), \$30,000.

11 HEALTH SERVICE PROGRAMS

12 For health service programs, as authorized by law, in
13 the District of Columbia, \$80,000: *Provided*, That other
14 appropriations in this title shall be available for such pro-
15 grams in the field.

16 OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

17 SALARIES

18 For personal services in the District of Columbia,
19 \$340,000.

1 tive offices: *Provided further*, That the limiting amount
2 heretofore stated for administrative expenses shall be
3 increased by an amount which does not exceed the aggre-
4 gate cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses
5 of persons employed outside the continental United
6 States; the expenses of services performed on a contract
7 or fee basis in connection with termination of contracts
8 or in the performance of legal services; and all administra-
9 tive expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies:
10 *Provided further*, That the distribution of administrative
11 expenses to the accounts of the Corporation shall be made
12 in accordance with generally recognized accounting
13 principles and practices.

14 This chapter may be cited as the "Treasury-Post Office
15 Departments Appropriation Act, 1951".

1 CHAPTER V—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND
2 FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY
3 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

4 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
6 Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title re-
7 ferred to as the Secretary), including personal services in
8 the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section
9 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; health
10 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ;
11 purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for
12 replacement only; teletype news service; and payment in
13 advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees
14 for library membership in organizations whose publications
15 are available to members only or to members at a price lower
16 than to the general public; \$1,382,000.

17 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor: For ex-
18 penses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, including per-
19 sonal services in the District of Columbia, \$1,861,000.

1 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards: For
2 expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety,
3 employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations
4 for labor and industry; performance of the functions
5 vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Manage-
6 ment Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and
7 (g)) ; and not to exceed \$75,000 for the work of the
8 President's Committee on National Employ the Physically
9 Handicapped Week, as authorized by the Act of July 11,
10 1949 (63 Stat. 409), including personal services in the Dis-
11 trict of Columbia; purchase of reports and of material for
12 informational exhibits; \$714,000.

13 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemploy-
14 ment Rights: For expenses necessary to render assistance in
15 connection with the exercise of reemployment rights of vet-
16 erans under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service
17 Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 308), the Serv-
18 ice Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army Reserve
19 and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as amended,
20 and section 9 (h) of title I of the Selective Service Act of
21 1948 (50 U. S. C., App. 459 (h)), and, under the Act
22 of June 23, 1943, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 1472),
23 of persons who have performed service in the Merchant

1 Marine, including personal services in the District of
2 Columbia, \$281,000.

3 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

4 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable
5 the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging appren-
6 tice training, as authorized by the Act of August 16, 1937
7 (29 U. S. C. 50), including personal services in the District
8 of Columbia, \$2,788,000.

9 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
11 general administration of the employment service and unem-
12 ployment compensation programs, including personal serv-
13 ices in the District of Columbia; temporary employment of
14 persons, without regard to the civil service laws, for the
15 farm placement migratory labor program; for cooperation
16 with the United States Immigration and Naturalization
17 Service and the Secretary of State in negotiating and carry-
18 ing out agreements relating to the employment of foreign
19 agricultural workers, subject to the immigration laws and
20 when necessary to supplement the domestic labor force;
21 and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by
22 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
23 \$5,531,000, of which \$1,587,000 shall be for carrying into
24 effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the
25 Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

1 Grants to States for unemployment compensation and
2 employment service administration: For grants to the several
3 States (including Alaska and Hawaii) in accordance with
4 the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29
5 U. S. C. 49-491), for carrying into effect section 602 of the
6 Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants to
7 the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security
8 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon
9 the request of any State, the purchase of equipment and the
10 payment of rental for space made available to such State in
11 lieu of grants for such purpose, and for necessary expenses
12 in connection with the operation of employment office
13 facilities and services in the District of Columbia and for
14 use in carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's
15 Readjustment Act of 1944 in Puerto Rico, \$178,500,000,
16 of which \$8,500,000 shall be available only to the extent
17 that the Secretary finds necessary to meet increased costs
18 of administration resulting from changes in a State law or
19 increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or
20 salary costs over those upon which the State's basic grant
21 (or the allocation for the District of Columbia or Puerto
22 Rico) was based, which increased costs of administration
23 cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments:
24 *Provided*, That no State shall be required to make
25 any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of said

1 Act of June 6, 1933, prior to July 1, 1952: *Provided*
2 *further*, That, notwithstanding any provision to the contrary
3 in section 5 (a) or section 6 of the Act of June 6, 1933, or
4 in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended,
5 the Secretary of Labor shall from time to time certify to
6 the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State
7 found to be in compliance with the requirements of the
8 Act of June 6, 1933, and with the provisions of section
9 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts
10 as he determines to be necessary for the proper and effi-
11 cient administration of its unemployment compensation law
12 and of its public employment offices: *Provided further*,
13 That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Depart-
14 ment of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be
15 used for the payment, in such manner as said parties may
16 jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official
17 mail matter in connection with the administration of unem-
18 ployment compensation systems and employment services
19 by States receiving grants herefrom.

20 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,
21 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social
22 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and
23 maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall
24 apply.

25 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the

1 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State
2 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation
3 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of
4 officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld
5 from the said agencies of any States which have established
6 by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit
7 system and classification and compensation plan covering
8 the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their
9 employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel
10 or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said
11 States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

12 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For
13 making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year payments
14 to States under title III of the Social Security Act, as
15 amended, and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended,
16 for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such
17 sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the
18 expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title
19 and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to
20 the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

21 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

22 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
23 work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement to
24 State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for
25 services rendered; personal services in the District of Colum-

1 bia; and not to exceed \$15,000 for services as authorized
2 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ;
3 \$5,720,700.

4 Revision of consumers' price index: For expenses neces-
5 sary to enable the Bureau to revise the Consumers' Price
6 Index, including personal services in the District of Columbia;
7 temporary employees at rates to be fixed by the Secretary
8 without regard to the civil service and classification laws
9 and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended;
10 and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
11 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$2,000,000.

12 WOMEN'S BUREAU

13 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
14 work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of
15 June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including personal
16 services in the District of Columbia and purchase of reports
17 and material for informational exhibits; \$399,000.

18 WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

19 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for per-
20 forming the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards
21 Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions
22 for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by
23 the United States, approved June 30, 1936 (41 U. S. C.
24 38), including personal services in the District of Columbia;
25 reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their

1 employees for inspection services rendered; and expenses of
2 attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at con-
3 ferences concerned with the work of the Wage and Hour
4 Division; \$9,396,400.

5 GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available
7 for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses
8 of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or
9 activity for which any such appropriation is made.

10 SEC. 103. Appropriations under this title available
11 for salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic
12 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
13 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

14 SEC. 104. Appropriations under this title available
15 for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment
16 of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

17 SEC. 105. Appropriations under this title available
18 for salaries and expenses shall be available for printing and
19 binding.

20 SEC. 106. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appro-
21 priation in this title may be transferred to any other
22 such appropriation but no such appropriation shall be in-
23 creased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfer:
24 *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for creation
25 of new functions within the Department.

1 This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor
2 Appropriation Act, 1951".

8 TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

4 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

5 Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of
6 August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$115,000.

7 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

8 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative
9 expenses, including personal services in the District of
10 Columbia and not to exceed \$49,600 for the Employees'
11 Compensation Board of Appeals; \$1,935,000, together
12 with not to exceed \$119,000 to be derived from the War
13 Claims Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims
14 Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

15 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of
16 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except ad-
17 ministrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing
18 during the current or any prior fiscal year, including pay-
19 ments to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital
20 services pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of
21 Employees' Compensation; continuation of payment of
22 benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Bene-
23 fits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act,
24 1947; the advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries

1 in third-party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital
2 services and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial
3 expenses, including transportation and other expenses inci-
4 dental to such services, treatment, and burial, for such
5 enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified
6 by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital services
7 and treatment at Government expense on June 30, 1943,
8 and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian em-
9 ployees of the United States, and the limitations and au-
10 thority of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5
11 U. S. C. 796), shall apply in providing such services, treat-
12 ment, and expenses in such cases; \$25,000,000, together
13 with not to exceed \$5,000,000 to be derived from the War
14 Claims Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims
15 Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012) and to be available for
16 payments pursuant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of such Act,
17 which amounts may be accounted for as one fund.

18 COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

19 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Co-
20 lumbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal services
21 and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements,
22 \$368,200.

23 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

24 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for
25 carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act,

1 as amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392) ; the Tea Importation
2 Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50) ; the Import Milk
3 Act (21 U. S. C. 141-149) ; the Federal Caustic Poison
4 Act (15 U. S. C. 401-411) ; and the Filled Milk Act, as
5 amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64) ; including personal services
6 in the District of Columbia; purchase of not to exceed
7 ~~(135)seventeen passenger motor vehicles for replacement~~
8 *only; sixty-five passenger motor vehicles, of which seventeen*
9 *shall be for replacement only*; reporting and illustrating the
10 results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, apparatus,
11 and scientific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for payment
12 in advance for special tests and analyses by contract; and
13 payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection with
14 studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug
15 enforcement operations; ~~(136)\$5,066,700~~ \$5,666,700.

16 Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection serv-
17 ices: For expenses necessary for the certification or inspec-
18 tion of certain products in accordance with sections 406,
19 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food,
20 Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346,
21 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of the
22 advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover
23 payment of fees by applicants for certification or inspection
24 of such products, to remain available until expended. The
25 total amount herein appropriated shall be available for per-

1 sonal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere;
 2 purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment;
 3 and the refund of advance deposits for which no service has
 4 been rendered.

5 FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

6 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for
 7 operation and maintenance, including repairs; purchase of one
 8 passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; furnish-
 9 ing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by
 10 employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer
 11 of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses,
 12 Howard University" for salaries of technical and profes-
 13 sional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the
 14 appropriation of Howard University for instruction of nurses
 15 and actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such
 16 university; \$2,600,000: *Provided*, That no intern or resident
 17 physician receiving compensation from this appropriation
 18 on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form
 19 of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title.

20 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

21 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of
 22 Howard University, including personal services and miscel-
 23 laneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds,
 24 \$2,500,000.

25 Plans and specifications: For the preparation of plans

1 and specifications for construction, under the supervision of
2 the General Services Administration, on the grounds of
3 Howard University of a preclinical medical building, includ-
4 ing engineering and architectural services, printing and
5 binding, advertising, and travel, \$100,000, which amount,
6 except such part as may be necessary for the incidental
7 expenses of the University, may be transferred to the Gen-
8 eral Services Administration for the above purposes, to
9 remain available until expended.

10 Construction of buildings: For construction of buildings
11 on the grounds of Howard University, under the supervision
12 of the General Services Administration, to remain avail-
13 able until expended, as follows:

14 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
15 provided under this head in the Federal Security Agency
16 Appropriation Act, 1950, for construction of a law school
17 building, biology building and greenhouse, administration
18 building, and men's dormitory units, \$1,250,000;

19 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
20 provided under this head in the First Deficiency Appropria-
21 tion Act, 1948, as amended by the Second Deficiency Appro-
22 priation Act, 1949, to enter into contracts for construction
23 of an engineering building and women's dormitory units,
24 \$412,000.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION.

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), and section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), (137)~~\$19,977,760~~ \$23,435,000: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under the Vocational Educational Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$19,842,760 for the current fiscal year.

Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 329), \$2,480,000.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of public and school library service; coordination of library service on the national level with other forms of adult education; developing library participation in Federal projects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and the development of library service throughout the country; personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and

1 cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles
 2 of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative
 3 of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education,
 4 and repairing the same; (138) ~~\$1,900,000~~ \$2,023,420, of
 5 which not less than \$533,700 shall be available for the Divi-
 6 sion of Vocational Education as authorized: *Provided*, That
 7 all receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reim-
 8 bursement for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of
 9 Education performing advisory functions to said agencies
 10 shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the
 11 credit of this appropriation.

12 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

13 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
 14 Puerto Rico) : For payments to States (including Alaska,
 15 Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Voca-
 16 tional Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C. ch. 4),
 17 including payments, in accordance with regulations of the
 18 Administrator, for one-half of necessary expenditures for
 19 the acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in
 20 accordance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for
 21 the use of blind persons, such stands or other equipment
 22 to be controlled by the State agency, \$20,600,000, of
 23 which not to exceed \$170,000 shall be available to
 24 the Federal Security Administrator for providing re-
 25 habilitation services to disabled residents of the District

1 of Columbia, as authorized by section 6 of said Act, which
2 latter amount shall be available for administrative expenses
3 in connection with providing such services in the District
4 of Columbia, printing and binding, including the purchase
5 of reprints, and travel: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15
6 per centum of the appropriation shall be used for adminis-
7 trative purposes.

8 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
9 Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after
10 May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States in
11 accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as
12 amended (including the objects specified in the preceding
13 paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal
14 year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred
15 and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the
16 appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That
17 the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not
18 exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter
19 of the current fiscal year.

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carry-
21 ing out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,
22 as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20
23 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including personal services in the District
24 of Columbia and not to exceed \$3,000 for production, pur-
25 chase, and distribution of educational films; \$705,000.

1 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

2 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public
3 Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A)
4 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and other Acts, in-
5 cluding (with the exception of the appropriation "Pay, and
6 so forth, commissioned officers, Public Health Service")
7 personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of
8 reports, documents, and other material for publication;
9 preparation and display of posters and exhibits by con-
10 tract or otherwise; packing, unpacking, crating, uncrating,
11 drayage, and transportation of personal effects of commis-
12 sioned officers and transportation of their dependents on
13 change of station; and increased allowances to Reserve
14 Officers for foreign service; as follows:

15 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections
16 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases,
17 including the operation and maintenance of centers for the
18 diagnosis, treatment, support, and clothing of persons afflicted
19 with venereal diseases; transportation and subsistence of such
20 persons and their attendants to and from the place of treat-
21 ment or allowance in lieu thereof; diagnosis and treatment
22 (including emergency treatment for other illnesses) of such
23 persons through contracts with physicians and hospitals and
24 other appropriate institutions; fees for case finding
25 and referral to such centers of voluntary patients;

1 reasonable expenses of preparing remains or burial of de-
 2 ceased patients; recreational supplies and equipment; leasing
 3 of facilities and repair and alteration of leased facilities; the
 4 purchase of not to exceed twenty passenger motor
 5 vehicles for replacement only, and for grants of money, serv-
 6 ices, supplies, equipment, and use of facilities to States, as
 7 defined in the Act, and with the approval of the respective
 8 State health authorities, to counties, health districts, and
 9 other political subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing
 10 purposes, in such amounts and upon such terms and condi-
 11 tions as the Surgeon General may determine; ~~¶(139)\$14,-~~
 12 ~~900,000~~ \$14,500,000.

13 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314
 14 (b) of the Act, including the purchase of not to exceed two
 15 passenger motor vehicles, ~~¶(140)\$10,000,000~~ \$9,600,000.

16 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes
 17 of section 314 (c) of the Act; to provide consultative serv-
 18 ices to States pursuant to section 311 of the Act; to make
 19 field investigations and demonstrations pursuant to section
 20 301 of the Act; and to provide for collecting and compiling
 21 mortality, morbidity, and vital statistics (including procure-
 22 ment by contract of transcripts of State, municipal, and other
 23 records), including the purchase of not to exceed fourteen
 24 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$16,915,000.

1 Communicable diseases: To carry out those provisions
2 of sections 301, 311, 361, and 704 of the Act relating to the
3 prevention and suppression of communicable diseases, and
4 the interstate transmission and spread thereof, including the
5 purchase of not to exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles
6 for replacement only; and hire, maintenance, and operation
7 of aircraft; \$6,415,000.

8 Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For
9 expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out
10 those provisions of sections 301, 311, and 361 of the Act
11 relating to sanitation and other aspects of environmental
12 health, including enforcement of applicable quarantine laws
13 and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carrying out
14 the functions of the Surgeon General under the Water
15 Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466-466 (j)), including
16 purchase of not to exceed twenty-one passenger motor
17 vehicles, of which seven shall be for replacement only;
18 \$3,670,030.

19 Grants, water pollution control: For grants to carry out
20 section 8 (a) of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S.
21 C. 466-466 (j)), \$1,000,000, to remain available until
22 expended.

23 Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Terri-
24 tory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct,
25 in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory

1 of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the in-
2 vestigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases,
3 and the establishment and maintenance of health and sani-
4 tation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in
5 sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of
6 subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set
7 forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361, 363, and 704
8 of the Act, including the purchase of one passenger motor
9 vehicle, and hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft,
10 \$1,259,000: *Provided*, That property of the Public Health
11 Service located in Alaska and used in carrying out the
12 activities herein authorized may be transferred, without
13 reimbursement, to the Territory of Alaska at the discretion
14 of the Surgeon General.

15 Grants for hospital construction: For liquidation of
16 contractual obligations authorized by the Congress to be
17 incurred during the fiscal year 1948 or any subsequent fiscal
18 year for construction grants under part C, title VI, of the
19 Act, as amended, \$100,000,000, to remain available until
20 expended. Allotments under such part C to the several
21 States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis
22 of \$150,000,000. Whenever the Surgeon General shall have
23 approved an application for a construction project in ac-
24 cordance with section 625 of the Act, subject to the amount
25 of the allotments available to the States for such purposes,

1 the Federal share of the cost of such project, as provided
2 by the Act, shall constitute a contractual obligation of the
3 Federal Government.

4 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:
5 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI
6 of the Act, as amended, including the purchase of not to
7 exceed four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only,
8 ~~(141)\$1,357,000~~ \$2,107,000.

9 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the pur-
10 poses of sections 321, 322, 324, 326, 331, 332, 341, 343,
11 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the Act, and Executive Order
12 9079 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and ex-
13 change of farm products and livestock; purchase of not to
14 exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles, including ten am-
15 bulances, for replacement only; and firearms and ammuni-
16 tion; \$29,000,000.

17 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-
18 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to preventing
19 the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign
20 countries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance
21 with section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment
22 of quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the
23 Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of
24 the Public Health Service are not available, including in-

1 surance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when
2 required by law of such countries; and the purchase of not
3 to exceed ten passenger motor vehicles for replacement
4 only, \$3,104,000.

5 Employee health service programs: For carrying out
6 the functions of the Public Health Service under the Act of
7 August 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), \$50,000: *Provided,*
8 That when the Public Health Service, at the request of
9 any department or agency of the Government, establishes
10 or operates a health service program for such department
11 or agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made
12 in advance by check for deposit to the credit of this
13 appropriation.

14 National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For
15 the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not other-
16 wise provided for, including research fellowships and grants
17 for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; the
18 regulation and preparation of biologic products; the purchase
19 of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles for replace-
20 ment only; not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visit-
21 ing scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon
22 General; and erection of temporary structures for storage
23 of equipment and supplies and housing of animals,
24 \$15,750,000, of which not less than \$3,600,000 shall be
25 available exclusively for grants for studies with adreno-

1 corticotropic hormone (ACTH) and cortisone (compound
 2 E), including (142) *grants of adrenocorticotripic hormone*
 3 *(ACTH), cortisone, and other chemical substances, and for*
 4 *development of other related compounds for treatment of*
 5 *arthritis, rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, neurological and*
 6 *metabolic diseases, and including studies in the basic sciences*
 7 *related to such diseases (143) and including not to exceed*
 8 *\$200,000 for transfer to the Department of Agriculture for*
 9 *research into utilization of plant material and vegetable*
 10 *sources of cortisone.*

11 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon Gen-
 12 eral, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory
 13 Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and train-
 14 ing projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State
 15 health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit
 16 institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of
 17 cancer by providing consultative services, demonstrations,
 18 and grants-in-aid; for the purchase of not to exceed six
 19 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and to
 20 otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of
 21 the Act, (144) ~~\$20,086,000~~ \$20,686,000, of which not less
 22 than \$5,000,000 shall be available exclusively for payment of
 23 obligations for research and training grants incurred under
 24 authority heretofore granted under this head.

25 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for

1 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311,
 2 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental dis-
 3 eases, ~~(145)\$9,944,000~~ \$10,000,000, of which not less than
 4 \$2,375,000 shall be available exclusively for payment of
 5 obligations for research and training grants incurred under
 6 authority heretofore granted under this head.

7 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to
 8 carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act, including
 9 the purchase of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles,
 10 ~~(146)\$14,150,000~~ \$14,750,000, of which \$5,350,000 shall
 11 be available exclusively for payment of obligations for re-
 12 search and training grants incurred under authority heretofore
 13 granted under this head.

14 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise pro-
 15 vided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry
 16 out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental diseases and
 17 conditions, including the purchase of twelve passenger motor
 18 vehicles for replacement only, ~~(147)\$2,040,000~~ \$2,140,000.

19 Construction of research facilities: For construction of
 20 research facilities, to be transferred (except such part as may
 21 be necessary for incidental expenses and purchase of equip-
 22 ment by the Public Health Service) to the General Services
 23 Administration, and to remain available until expended, as
 24 follows:

25 For payment of obligations incurred under authority

1 heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction
2 of a combined hospital and research building as authorized
3 under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropria-
4 tion Acts of 1949 and 1950, \$7,500,000.

5 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
6 heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction of
7 auxiliary service area structures, as authorized under this
8 head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act,
9 1950, \$3,600,000.

10 For construction of additional auxiliary structures to
11 provide station quarters for personnel and a grounds main-
12 tenance building, including necessary distribution facilities
13 and roads and walks, \$1,025,000; and in addition, contracts
14 may be entered into an amount not to exceed \$350,000
15 toward completion of such construction at a cost not to exceed
16 \$1,375,000 (148): *Provided, That the Surgeon General*
17 *is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed upon such terms*
18 *and conditions as he may prescribe not to exceed twenty-five*
19 *thousand square feet of land presently included in the site of*
20 *the National Institutes of Health to the Bethesda Fire De-*
21 *partment, a body corporate of the State of Maryland, for*
22 *the purpose of erecting and maintaining a fire station to*
23 *provide protection for the facilities of the National Institutes*
24 *of Health and for the adjacent community: Provided fur-*
25 *ther, That such terms and conditions may include an agree-*

1 *ment by the Surgeon General to pay to such department on*
2 *behalf of the United States 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per centum of the cost of*
3 *the construction of the station but not to exceed \$20,000,*
4 *to be charged to the maximum limits of costs set out in this*
5 *paragraph.*

6 For purchase and installation of additional equipment
7 and furnishings to partially equip and furnish structures
8 heretofore or herein provided under this head (except struc-
9 tures for station quarters), \$3,000,000.

10 Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth: For pay, uni-
11 forms and subsistence allowances, increased allowances for
12 foreign service and commutation of quarters for not to exceed
13 one thousand five hundred regular active commissioned
14 officers; for medals, decorations, and retired pay of regular
15 and reserve commissioned officers; for payment of claims
16 for private property lost, destroyed, captured, abandoned,
17 or damaged in the military service of the United States, as
18 authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 222c, h; 42 U. S. C. 213);
19 and for six months' death gratuity pay and burial payments
20 for regular commissioned officers; \$1,790,000, and the
21 Surgeon General is authorized to advance to this appro-
22 priation from appropriations made available to the Public
23 Health Service for the current fiscal year such additional
24 amounts as may be necessary for pay and allowances of the
25 officers herein authorized.

1 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of
 2 the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous ex-
 3 penses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for
 4 elsewhere, including conducting research on technical nursing
 5 standards and furnishing consultative nursing services; pre-
 6 paring information, articles, and publications related to public
 7 health; conducting studies and demonstrations in public
 8 health methods; carrying on international health activities,
 9 including not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of officials
 10 of other countries when specifically authorized by the Sur-
 11 geon General; and purchase of not to exceed two passenger
 12 motor vehicles for replacement only; \$2,918,000.

13 SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

14 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 15 maintenance and operation of the hospital, including pur-
 16 chase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles, includ-
 17 ing one bus-ambulance, for replacement only, clothing for
 18 patients and cooperation with organizations or individuals
 19 in scientific research into the nature, causes, prevention, and
 20 treatment of mental illness, (149)\$1,948,000 \$2,005,000.

21 Construction and equipment, building for the housing,
 22 care, and treatment of mentally sick patients: For payment
 23 of obligations incurred under authority provided in the Fed-
 24 eral Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1949, for comple-
 25 tion of a building for the housing, care, and treatment of

1 mentally sick patients, Saint Elizabeths Hospital, \$100,000,
2 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any
3 part of this amount may be transferred to the General Serv-
4 ices Administration.

5 Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds:
6 For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and
7 equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including prep-
8 aration of plans and specifications, advertising, and super-
9 vision of construction, \$406,000, to remain available until
10 expended: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be
11 transferred to the General Services Administration.

12 Construction and equipment of treatment building: For
13 construction and equipment, including administrative ex-
14 penses, of a treatment building (providing separate male
15 and female facilities), and demolition and removal of those
16 buildings designated as Oaks and Toner Buildings with
17 their appurtenances and attachments, within the grounds
18 of Saint Elizabeths Hospital, \$1,500,000, to remain avail-
19 able until expended; and, in addition, contracts may be
20 entered into in an amount not to exceed \$3,938,000
21 toward completion of such work at a total cost not to ex-
22 ceed \$5,588,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation in
23 the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1950, for
24 preparation of plans and specifications for two treatment
25 buildings, shall be consolidated with this appropriation, to

1 be disbursed and accounted for as one fund which shall be
 2 available for all of the foregoing purposes, and any part of
 3 such consolidated appropriation may be transferred to the
 4 General Services Administration.

5 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

6 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions:
 7 For expenses necessary for the supervision of Federal credit
 8 unions, including personal services in the District of Colum-
 9 bia, (150)\$200,000 \$300,000, together with the aggregate
 10 of amounts received from certificate, supervision, and exami-
 11 nation fees collected from Federal credit unions as authorized
 12 by law.

13 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors
 14 Insurance: For necessary expenses, including personal serv-
 15 ices in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and furnish-
 16 ing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equip-
 17 ment used by building guards; not more than \$45,988,000
 18 may be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors
 19 insurance trust fund (151), *of which not more than \$404 shall*
 20 *be available for payment in advance when authorized by the*
 21 *Federal Security Administrator for dues or fees for library*
 22 *membership in organizations whose publications are avail-*
 23 *able to members only or to members at a price lower than*
 24 *to the general public: Provided, That any sums received by*
 25 *the Administrator as payment for services performed for*

1 any department or agency of the Government by persons
2 whose salaries are paid from the amount made available
3 under this paragraph shall be deposited to the credit of
4 this appropriation for the fiscal year in which such sums
5 are received, and shall be available for the same purposes.

6 Reimbursement to Federal old-age and survivors insur-
7 ance trust fund: For reimbursement to the Federal old-age
8 and survivors insurance trust fund for benefits paid during
9 the fiscal year 1949 to the survivors of veterans of World
10 War II eligible for benefits as provided under section 210
11 of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 410),
12 \$3,694,000.

13 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to
14 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and
15 aid to the blind as authorized in titles I, IV, and X of the
16 Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch.
17 I, IV, and X), \$1,200,000,000, of which such amount as
18 may be necessary shall be available for grants for any
19 period in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that
20 year.

21 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For
22 expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance, in-
23 cluding personal services in the District of Columbia,
24 \$1,413,400.

25 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For neces-

1 sary expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as
2 amended (29 U. S. C. 18a), and title V of the Social
3 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
4 including personal services in the District of Columbia
5 and purchase of reports and material for the publications
6 of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution,
7 ~~(152)\$1,500,000~~ \$1,510,000: *Provided*, That no part of any
8 appropriation contained in this title shall be used to promul-
9 gate or carry out any instruction, order, or regulation relating
10 to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminate between
11 persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics:
12 *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so
13 construed as to prevent any patient from having the services
14 of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this
15 fund, so long as State laws are complied with: *Provided*
16 *further*, That any State plan which provides standards for
17 professional obstetrical services in accordance with the laws
18 of the State shall be approved.

19 Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For
20 grants to States for maternal and child-health services, serv-
21 ices for crippled children, and child-welfare services as
22 authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security
23 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), \$22,000,-
24 000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to
25 section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not be included

1 in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of
2 sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or
3 estimated to be expended by the State.

4 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For
5 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner for
6 Social Security, including personal services in the District of
7 Columbia, \$223,000, together with not to exceed \$112,000
8 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors
9 insurance trust fund.

10 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For
11 making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments
12 to States under titles I, IV, V, and X, respectively, of the
13 Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter of the
14 next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary,
15 the obligations incurred and the expenditures made there-
16 under for payments under each of such titles to be charged
17 to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

18 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, and X, respec-
19 tively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, payments to
20 a State under any of such titles for any quarter in the
21 period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending
22 June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect
23 to a State plan approved under such title prior to or during
24 such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect

1 to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which
2 such plan was submitted for approval.

3 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

4 Salaries, Office of the Administrator: Salaries, Office
5 of the Administrator, including personal services in the
6 District of Columbia, \$2,383,100, together with not to
7 exceed \$334,900 to be transferred from the Federal old-age
8 and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That the
9 Administrator may advance to this appropriation from appro-
10 priations of constituent organizations of the Federal Security
11 Agency such sums as may be necessary to finance the
12 regional office activities of such constituent organizations.

13 Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations:
14 For expenses necessary for the Office of the Administrator,
15 including personal services in the District of Columbia for
16 the Division of Service Operations, \$1,090,000, together
17 with not to exceed \$165,600 to be transferred from the
18 Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund: *Pro-*
19 *vided*, That the Administrator may advance to this appro-
20 priation from appropriations of constituent organizations of
21 the Federal Security Agency such sums as may be nec-
22 essary to cover the charges for services, supplies, equip-
23 ment and materials furnished.

24 Salaries, Office of the General Counsel: Salaries, Office
25 of the General Counsel, including personal services in the

1 District of Columbia, ~~(153)\$511,100~~ \$535,100, together
 2 with not to exceed \$22,950 to be transferred from the appro-
 3 priation "Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection
 4 services", and not to exceed \$321,100 to be transferred from
 5 the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

6 Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for
 7 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k)
 8 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of
 9 1949, relating to disposal of real and personal excess property
 10 for educational purposes and protection of public health,
 11 including personal services in the District of Columbia,
 12 \$333,300.

13 GENERAL PROVISIONS

14 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for
 15 salaries and expenses shall be available for payment of tort
 16 claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

17 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for
 18 salaries and expenses shall be available for examination of
 19 estimates of appropriations in the field, for exchange of books.

20 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for
 21 salaries and expenses shall be available for health service
 22 programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), and such
 23 amounts as may be necessary may be transferred to the

1 appropriations of the organizational units operating such
2 programs.

3 SEC. 205. Appropriations under this title available for
4 salaries and expenses shall be available for printing and bind-
5 ing, including the purchase of reprints.

6 SEC. 206. Appropriations under this title available for
7 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as author-
8 ized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
9 55a).

10 ~~(154)~~SEC. 207. *Appropriations under this title available for*
11 *salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses*
12 *and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with*
13 *the function or activity for which any such appropriation*
14 *is made.*

15 SEC. ~~(155)~~207 208. None of the funds appropriated by
16 this title to the Social Security Administration for grants in
17 aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost
18 of operation of said agencies including the salaries and ex-
19 penses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be
20 withheld from the said agencies of any States which have
21 established by legislative enactment and have in operation
22 a merit system and classification and compensation plan
23 covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of
24 their employees, because of any disapproval of their per-

1 sonnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the
2 said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

3 This title may be cited as the "Federal Security Agency
4 Appropriation Act, 1951".

5 TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

6 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary
7 for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out
8 the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management
9 Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and
10 other laws, including personal services in the District of
11 Columbia; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned
12 with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by
13 the Chairman or the General Counsel; printing and binding;
14 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
15 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant
16 to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); and a health service program
17 as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); ~~(156)\$8,550,000~~
18 \$8,615,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation
19 shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricul-
20 tural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hear-
21 ings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units
22 composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2
23 (3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as
24 amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947,

1 and as defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938
2 (52 Stat. 1060).

3 This title may be cited as the "National Labor Relations
4 Board Appropriation Act, 1951".

5 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

6 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
7 National Mediation Board, including personal services in the
8 District of Columbia, printing and binding, and stenographic
9 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
10 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$412,200.

11 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses neces-
12 sary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of the
13 Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157), and
14 emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant to
15 section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including printing
16 and binding, and stenographic reporting services as author-
17 ized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
18 55a), \$150,000.

19 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
21 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including printing
22 and binding, and stenographic reporting services as author-
23 ized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S.
24 C. 55a), \$797,300, of which not less than \$296,700, shall

1 be available for compensation (at rates not in excess of
2 \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees appointed pursuant
3 to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

4 This title may be cited as the "National Mediation Board
5 Appropriation Act, 1951".

6 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

7 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust
8 fund) : For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement
9 Board, including personal services in the District of Colum-
10 bia; not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attendance at
11 meetings concerned with the work of the Board when
12 specifically authorized by the Board; printing and binding;
13 stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15
14 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; payment
15 of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) ; a health
16 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ;
17 \$5,446,000, to be derived from the railroad retirement
18 account.

19 Railroad retirement account: For an amount sufficient
20 as an annual premium for the payments required under the
21 Railroad Retirement Acts of August 29, 1935, and June
22 24, 1937, and authorized to be appropriated to the railroad
23 retirement account established under section 15 (a) of the
24 latter Act, \$457,832,724: *Provided*, That such total
25 amount shall be available until expended for making

1 payments required under said retirement Acts, and the
2 amount not required for current payments shall be invested
3 by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the
4 provisions of said Railroad Retirement Act of June 24,
5 1937.

6 This title may be cited as the "Railroad Retirement
7 Board Appropriation Act, 1951".

8 TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND
9 CONCILIATION SERVICE

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
11 Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-
12 Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171-180,
13 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel
14 as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employ-
15 ment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor rela-
16 tions at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses
17 of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and indus-
18 trial relations; printing and binding; services as authorized
19 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
20 55a); health service program as authorized by law (5
21 U. S. C. 150); and payment of tort claims pursuant to law
22 (28 U. S. C. 2672); \$2,949,700.

23 Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay neces-
24 sary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the President
25 pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations

1 Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176-180, 182), including printing
2 and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
3 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and rent in the District
4 of Columbia, \$50,000.

5 This title may be cited as the "Federal Mediation and
6 Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1951".

7 This chapter may be cited as the "Labor-Federal Security
8 Appropriation Act, 1951".

1 CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

2 TITLE I

3 RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

4 (157) To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provi-
5 sions of section 9 of title I and title II of the Act of August
6 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 427, 427h, 427j, 1621—
7 1629), as follows:

8 For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico
9 for agricultural experiment stations pursuant to section 9 of
10 the Bankhead-Jones Act approved June 29, 1935, as
11 amended by the Act of August 14, 1946, \$5,000,000;

12 For the improvement and development, independently
13 or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies,
14 and others, of a sound and efficient system for the distribution
15 and marketing of agricultural products pursuant to the “Agri-
16 cultural Marketing Act of 1946” (title II of the Act of Au-
17 gust 14, 1946, as amended), including the objects for which
18 funds are available for titles II and III of such Act of August

1 14, 1946, \$6,000,000: *Provided*, That not less than
2 \$650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in
3 accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act:
4 *Provided further*, That the Secretary may make available
5 to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such
6 amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to
7 carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts
8 made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the
9 Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those
10 which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon
11 with representatives of the Department, shall determine),
12 and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts trans-
13 ferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation
14 items of the Department: *Provided further*, That no part
15 of this appropriation shall be available for work relating
16 to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the
17 support of equitable transportation rates before Federal
18 agencies concerned with such rates and for development of
19 foreign markets.

20 In all, \$11,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this
21 appropriation shall be used for beginning construction of
22 any building costing in excess of \$15,000, except that a poul-
23 try breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University
24 at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed \$29,000.

25 *To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, inde-*

1 pendently or through cooperation among Federal and State
2 agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for the
3 distribution and marketing of agricultural products under
4 the provisions of title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as
5 amended (7 U. S. C. 1621-1629), including the objects
6 for which funds are available for titles II and III of such
7 Act of August 14, 1946, \$6,000,000: Provided, That not
8 less than \$650,000 of this amount shall be available for con-
9 tracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said
10 Act: Provided further, That the Secretary may make avail-
11 able to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such
12 amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to
13 carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts
14 made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the
15 Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those
16 which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon
17 with representatives of the Department, shall determine),
18 and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts
19 transferred or otherwise made available to other appro-
20 priation items of the Department: Provided further, That
21 no part of this appropriation shall be available for work
22 relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, ex-
23 cept for the support of equitable transportation rates before
24 Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for develop-
25 ment of foreign markets.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act establishing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (5 U. S. C. 673) and related Acts, as follows:

Economic investigations: For conducting investigations and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, (158) ~~farm structures~~, costs, prices and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, (159) ~~\$2,600,000~~ \$2,720,000:

Provided, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Economic investigations" shall be used for State and county land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices.

Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton,

1 stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and
 2 value of livestock and livestock products on farms, produc-
 3 tion, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin
 4 pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b),
 5 and for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts
 6 as provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended
 7 May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951-957, (160)and data on
 8 farm construction as provided by title V of the Housing Act
 9 of 1949 (Public Law 171), (161)\$2,725,000 \$2,904,000:
 10 *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall
 11 be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating,
 12 or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to
 13 the acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple
 14 production for other than the commercial crop.

15 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

16 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

17 For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator,
 18 including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, travel
 19 and subsistence expenses of (162)Advisory Committee ad-
 20 visory committees authorized by title III of the Act of August
 21 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1628-1629), and the maintenance,
 22 operation, and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agri-
 23 cultural Research Center, \$600,000: *Provided*, That the
 24 appropriation current at the time services are rendered
 25 may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements

1 based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appro-
2 priations, to cover the charges, including handling and
3 other related services, for equipment rentals (including
4 depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, sup-
5 plies, equipment, and material furnished: *Provided further,*
6 That of the several appropriations of the Agricultural
7 Research Administration, not to exceed \$15,000 shall
8 be available for employment pursuant to the second sen-
9 tence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5
10 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of Au-
11 gust 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) : *Provided further,* That the
12 several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Adminis-
13 tration shall be available for the construction, alteration, and
14 repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided, however,*
15 That unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any
16 one building (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses)
17 shall not exceed \$5,000, the total amount for construction of
18 buildings costing more than \$2,500 each shall be within the
19 limits of the estimates submitted and approved therefor, and
20 the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year
21 shall not exceed \$2,500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the
22 building as certified by the Research Administrator, which-
23 ever is greater.

1 (163) WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
2 CENTER

3 For the establishment of a working capital fund, to be
4 available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses neces-
5 sary for furnishing facilities and services by the Agricultural
6 Research Center to Government agencies, \$300,000. Said
7 fund shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations or
8 other funds to cover the charges for such facilities and
9 services, including handling and related charges, for equip-
10 ment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and
11 repairs), for supplies, equipment and materials, stores of
12 which may be maintained at the Center, and for building
13 construction, alterations, and repair, and applicable appro-
14 priations or other funds may also be charged their propor-
15 tionate share of the necessary general expenses of the Center
16 not covered by the annual appropriation.

17 RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL
18 MATERIALS

19 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry
20 out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic
21 and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946
22 [(50 U. S. C. 98f)], \$399,000, including not to exceed
23 \$30,000 for alterations at the Eastern Regional Research

1 Laboratory, Wyndmoor, Pennsylvania, to provide pilot plant
2 facilities for tannin extraction, and such amount shall be in
3 addition to amounts otherwise available for alterations.

4 RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

5 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to
6 conduct research into the basic agricultural needs and prob-
7 lems of the Territory of Alaska, through such agencies of
8 the Department as he may designate, independently or in
9 cooperation with appropriate agencies of the Territory of
10 Alaska, ~~(164)\$260,000~~ \$280,000.

11 OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

12 Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico

13 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
14 Rico to be paid quarterly in advance ~~(165)~~ *where applicable*,
15 to carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts
16 relating to agricultural experiment stations:

17 Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related
18 Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7
19 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377-379), \$720,000; Adams
20 Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369),
21 \$720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24,
22 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373-376, 380, 382),
23 \$2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved
24 June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427-427g), ~~(166)\$2,863,-~~
25 ~~708~~ *Sections 3 and 5, \$2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11*

1 of said Act as added by the Act of August 14, 1946 (7
 2 U. S. C. 427h, 427j), including administration by the Office
 3 of Experiment Stations in the United States Department of
 4 Agriculture, \$5,000,000, no part of which latter amount
 5 shall be used for beginning construction of any building
 6 costing in excess of \$15,000, except that a poultry breeding
 7 house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to
 8 this appropriation of not to exceed \$29,000; Hawaii, the
 9 Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386-386b),
 10 extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to
 11 the Territory of Hawaii, \$90,000; Alaska, the Act
 12 approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c),
 13 extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of
 14 Alaska, \$15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act
 15 approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending
 16 the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Terri-
 17 tory of Alaska, ~~(167)\$27,500~~ \$37,500; Puerto Rico, the
 18 Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d-
 19 386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress
 20 to Puerto Rico, \$90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii,
 21 Alaska, and Puerto Rico, ~~(168)\$7,406,208~~ \$12,416,208.

22 Salaries and Expenses

23 For necessary expenses in connection with adminis-
 24 tration of grants and coordination of research with States,
 25 to carry out the provisions of the Acts approved March 2,

1 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928,
 2 February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936,
 3 and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361-363, 365-
 4 383, 386-386f), and title I of the Act approved June 29,
 5 1935, as amended by the Act of ~~(169)~~*December September*
 6 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 427-427g), relative to their adminis-
 7 tration and for the administration of an agricultural experi-
 8 ment station in Puerto Rico, ~~(170)\$237,500~~ *\$252,500*; and
 9 the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial
 10 statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether
 11 the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, co-
 12 ordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges
 13 and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts
 14 with research of the Department in similar lines, and make
 15 report thereon to Congress.

16 Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico

17 For expenses necessary to establish and maintain an
 18 agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, including
 19 the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and
 20 bulletins, and not to exceed \$24,950 to replace water supply
 21 line and increase capacity of reservoir, \$175,000.

22 BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

23 For necessary expenses in connection with conducting
 24 investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricul-

1 tural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the
 2 home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for
 3 the more effective utilization of such products for these pur-
 4 poses, and such economic investigations, including housing
 5 and household buying, as have for their purpose the improve-
 6 ment of the rural home, for coordinating nutrition services
 7 made available by Federal, State, and other agencies, and
 8 for disseminating useful information on these subjects,
 9 **(171)**~~\$1,500,000~~ \$1,763,200.

10 BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

11 Salaries and Expenses

12 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the
 13 Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry,
 14 and related Acts, and for investigations concerned with the
 15 livestock and meat industries and the domestic raising of
 16 fur-bearing animals, as follows:

17 Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments
 18 in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and
 19 breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101
 20 (b) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authoriz-
 21 ing cooperation with State authorities in the administration
 22 of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry prod-
 23 ucts, and hatcheries, **(172)**~~\$2,250,000~~ \$2,319,000.

24 Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of
 25 diseases of animals, and for investigations of tuberculin,

1 serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, ~~(173)\$1,300,-~~
 2 ~~000~~ \$1,350,000, including not to exceed \$8,000 for the
 3 purchase of land and appurtenances near Ames, Iowa, for
 4 continuation of a hog cholera experiment station.

5 Animal disease control and eradication: For the control
 6 and eradication, including inspections and quarantines, of tuber-
 7 culosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis,
 8 Bang's disease of cattle, scabies in sheep and cattle, southern
 9 cattle ticks, hog cholera and related swine diseases, and dourine
 10 in horses, and inspection and quarantine work; for supervision
 11 of the transportation of livestock, including administration of
 12 the twenty-eight-hour law; for inspection of vessels; and for
 13 carrying out the provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913 (21
 14 U. S. C. 151-158), relating to veterinary biological prod-
 15 ucts, ~~(174)\$7,950,000~~ \$7,952,500 ~~(175), including not to~~
 16 ~~exceed \$30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction~~
 17 ~~of four buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian~~
 18 ~~border ports of entry: Provided, That no payment hereunder~~
 19 ~~as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter for~~
 20 ~~tuberculosis, paratuberculosis, or Bang's disease shall exceed~~
 21 (1) \$25 for any grade animal or \$50 for any purebred
 22 animal, (2) one-third of the difference between the appraised
 23 value and the value of salvage thereof, or (3) the amount
 24 paid or to be paid by the State or other cooperating agency,
 25 and no payment hereunder shall be made for any animal if

1 at the time of test or condemnation it shall belong to or be
2 upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to
3 which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for slaughter:
4 *Provided further*, That inspection service shall be maintained
5 at all stockyards having such service during the current fiscal
6 year.

7 Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of
8 laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food
9 products, \$12,800,000.

10 Marketing Agreements, Hog Cholera Virus and Serum

11 The sum of \$49,300 of the appropriation made by
12 section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, ap-
13 proved May 12, 1933 (7 U. S. C. 612), is hereby made
14 available during the fiscal year for which appropriations are
15 herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive,
16 of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851-855).

17 Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth and Other Contagious

18 Diseases of Animals

19 For expenses necessary in the arrest and eradication of
20 foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneu-
21 monia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals,
22 or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry,
23 including the payment of claims growing out of past and
24 future purchases and destruction of animals (including
25 poultry) affected by or exposed to, or of materials contami-

1 nated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found
2 and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially
3 similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with
4 all lawful quarantine regulations; and for foot-and-mouth
5 disease and rinderpest programs undertaken pursuant to the
6 provisions of the Act of February 28, 1947 (21 U. S. C.
7 Supp. II, 114b-114d), and the Act of May 29, 1884,
8 as amended (7 U. S. C., 391; 21 U. S. C., 111-122),
9 including expenses in accordance with section 2 of said Act
10 of February 28, 1947, the Secretary may transfer from other
11 appropriations or funds available to the bureaus, corpora-
12 tions, or agencies of the Department such sums as he may
13 deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency which
14 threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the country,
15 and any unexpended balances of funds transferred under
16 this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged
17 with such transferred amounts: *Provided*, That, except for
18 payments made pursuant to said Act of February 28, 1947,
19 the payment for such animals hereafter purchased may be
20 made on appraisement based on the meat, egg-production,
21 dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisement based
22 on breeding value no appraisement of any such animal shall
23 exceed three times its meat, egg-production, or dairy value,
24 and, except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be
25 determined by the Secretary, the payment by the United

1 States Government for any such animals shall not exceed
 2 one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further*, That
 3 poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for
 4 appraisal is the same for each bird.

5 BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

6 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions
 7 of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401-404),
 8 including investigations, experiments, and demonstrations
 9 in dairy industry, for carrying out the applicable provisions
 10 of the Act of May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)),
 11 relating to process or renovated butter, as amended, and the
 12 Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it
 13 relates to the exportation of process or renovated butter,
 14 ~~(176)~~not to exceed \$100,000 for construction of ten or more
 15 housing units for employees, ~~(177)~~~~\$1,600,000~~ \$1,735,000.

16 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

17 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
 18 and demonstrations established under the provisions of sec-
 19 tion 202 (a) to 202 (e) , inclusive, of title II of the Agri-
 20 cultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292) ; for
 21 the development of new and extended food, feed, and in-
 22 dustrial uses for agricultural commodities, both plant and
 23 animal, and potential replacement crops, and processing,
 24 biological, chemical, physical, pharmacological, toxicological,
 25 and technological investigation thereof, ~~(178)~~~~\$7,750,000~~

1 \$8,500,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$20,000 shall be
 2 available for the alteration to buildings of the Naval Stores
 3 Station at Olustee, Florida.

4 BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL
 5 ENGINEERING

6 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
 7 and demonstrations in connection with the production and
 8 improvement of farm crops and other plants and plant
 9 industries; soils and soil-plant relationships, and the appli-
 10 cation of engineering principles to agriculture; plant diseases,
 11 including nematodes, and methods for their prevention and
 12 control; plant and plant-disease collections, and surveys; the
 13 distribution of weeds and means for their control; methods
 14 of handling, processing, transportation, and storage of agri-
 15 cultural products; and plants in foreign countries and our
 16 possessions for introduction into the United States, including
 17 explorations and surveys, and propagation and testing in
 18 this country; and for the operation and maintenance of
 19 airplanes, as follows:

20 Field crops: For investigations on the production, im-
 21 provement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn, cotton,
 22 flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums, soybeans,
 23 sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other field crops,
 24 (179)\$3,400,000 \$3,475,000.

25 Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: For investiga-

1 tions on the production, improvement, and diseases of fruit,
 2 vegetable, nut, ornamental, and related crops and plants,
 3 (180)~~\$2,950,000~~ \$3,075,000.

4 Forest diseases: For investigations of diseases of forest
 5 and shade trees and forest products, and methods for their
 6 control, (181)~~\$450,000~~ \$455,000.

7 Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: For investigations of
 8 soil management methods to increase and maintain produc-
 9 tivity, including fertilization, liming, crop rotations, tillage
 10 practices, and other means of improving soils; fertilizers,
 11 fertilizer ingredients, and their improvement for agricul-
 12 tural use; soil management and crop production on dry
 13 and irrigated lands, and the quality of irrigation water and
 14 its use by crops; and for the classification of soils in a na-
 15 tional system and indication of their extent and distribution
 16 on maps, and determination of their potential productivity
 17 under adapted cropping and improved soil management,
 18 (182)~~\$2,680,000~~ \$2,767,500, including not to exceed
 19 \$100,000 for construction or acquisition of buildings, facili-
 20 ties, and equipment for the station at Brawley, California.

21 Agricultural engineering: For investigations involving
 22 the application of engineering principles to agriculture,
 23 including farm power and equipment, rural water supply
 24 and sanitation, and rural electrification; farm buildings and

1 their appurtenances and buildings for processing and storing
 2 farm products, and the preparation and distribution of build-
 3 ing plans and specifications; cotton ginning, and other engi-
 4 neering problems relating to the production, processing,
 5 transportation, and storage of agricultural products;
 6 (183) ~~\$1,120,000~~ \$1,140,000.

7 National Arboretum: For the maintenance and develop-
 8 ment of the National Arboretum established under the pro-
 9 visions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C.
 10 191-194), \$152,700.

11 BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

12 Salaries and Expenses

13 For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments,
 14 demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic
 15 entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best
 16 means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to
 17 agriculture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and
 18 bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related
 19 pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of
 20 destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best
 21 ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect
 22 the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20,
 23 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151-167), the Honey Bee
 24 Act (7 U. S. C. 281-283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C.
 25 141-144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149),

1 and the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), as amended,
2 authorizing the eradication, control, and prevention of spread
3 of injurious insects and plant pests; including the operation
4 and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to
5 exceed two, as follows:

6 Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects
7 affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest
8 products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range
9 crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other
10 plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and
11 man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management;
12 for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to
13 determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for
14 investigations in connection with introduction of natural
15 enemies of injurious insects and related pests and for the
16 exchange with other countries of useful and beneficial insects
17 and other arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and
18 apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the
19 eradication and control of insect pests and plant diseases;
20 and for investigations of insecticides and fungicides, includ-
21 ing methods of their manufacture and use and the effects
22 of their application, (184)~~\$4,100,000~~ \$4,165,000: *Pro-*
23 *vided*, That of the amount allotted for oriental fruitfly, not
24 to exceed \$250,000 may be used for contracts with public or
25 private agencies for research without regard to provisions of

1 existing law, and the amounts obligated for contract research
2 shall remain available until expended (185):*Provided fur-*
3 *ther,* That \$50,000 shall be transferred to applicable appro-
4 priations of the Public Health Service for investigations and
5 studies of effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on
6 human health.

7 Insect and plant-disease control: For carrying out opera-
8 tions or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to pre-
9 vent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato
10 weevil, Mexican fruitflies, phony peach and peach mosaic,
11 cereal rusts, pink bollworm and *Thurberia* weevil, golden
12 nematode, citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, and the
13 Hall scale, including the enforcement of quarantine regu-
14 lations and cooperation with States to enforce plant quaran-
15 tines as authorized by the Plant Quarantine Act of August
16 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151-167), and including
17 the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be neces-
18 sary to stamp out any infestation of the pink bollworm as
19 authorized by the Act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67),
20 and for cooperation with States in the compensation of grow-
21 ers for losses resulting from the destruction of or for not plant-
22 ing potatoes and tomatoes on lands infested or exposed to
23 infestations of the golden nematode for the purpose author-
24 ized by the Golden Nematode Act (Public Law 645,
25 approved June 15, 1948), and for the enforcement

1 of domestic plant quarantines through inspection in
2 transit, including the interception and disposition of ma-
3 terials found to have been transported interstate in violation
4 of Federal plant quarantine laws or regulations, and opera-
5 tions under the Terminal Inspection Act (7 U. S. C. 166),
6 (186)~~\$4,185,900~~ \$4,651,000: *Provided*, That no part of this
7 appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees,
8 farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or de-
9 stroyed, except potatoes and tomatoes as authorized under
10 the Golden Nematode Act: *Provided further*, That, in the
11 discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation
12 shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in
13 any State until such State has provided cooperation necessary
14 to accomplish this purpose, or for barberry eradication until
15 a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have
16 been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, coun-
17 ties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for
18 the accomplishment of this purpose, or with respect to the
19 golden nematode except as prescribed in section 4 of the
20 Golden Nematode Act.

21 Foreign plant quarantines: For operations against the
22 introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United
23 States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quaran-
24 tines and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7
25 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended

(7 U. S. C. 151-167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7 U. S. C. 141-144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7 U. S. C. 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quarantines as they pertain to Territories of the United States and enforcement of regulations governing the movement of plants into and from the District of Columbia promulgated under section 15 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended, and for inspection and certification of plants and plant products to meet the sanitary requirements of foreign countries, as authorized in section 102 of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), ~~(187)\$2,325,000~~ \$2,384,400.

Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insects and Plant Diseases

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148-148e), including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed two, and surveys and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian citizens, ~~(188)\$850,000~~ \$2,350,000 (189), of which \$1,500,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said joint resolution only to the extent that the

1 *Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,*
 2 *finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.*

3 CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS

4 For expenses necessary for carrying out operations,
 5 measures, or surveys necessary to eradicate, suppress, con-
 6 trol, or to prevent or retard the spread of insects or diseases
 7 which endanger forest trees on any lands in the United
 8 States, and for such quarantine measures relating thereto as
 9 may be necessary pursuant to the Plant Quarantine Act
 10 of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151-167),
 11 including the purchase (not to exceed three) and operation
 12 and maintenance of airplanes, construction and alteration
 13 of necessary buildings, not to exceed \$23,500 for the pur-
 14 chase of one building at Greenfield, Massachusetts: *Pro-*
 15 *vided*, That the cost of constructing or altering any one build-
 16 ing during the fiscal year shall not exceed \$2,500, as follows:

17 Gypsy and brown-tail moths: Gypsy and brown-tail
 18 moths, pursuant to section 102 of the Act of September 21,
 19 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), ~~(190)\$539,500~~ \$590,000.

20 Forest Pest Control Act: For carrying out the provisions
 21 of the Act approved June 25, 1947 (16 U. S. C., Supp. I,
 22 594-1—594-5), ~~(191)\$900,000~~ \$1,900,000 (192), of which
 23 \$1,000,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section
 24 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said Act

1 *only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of*
 2 *the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency*
 3 *conditions.*

4 White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pursuant
 5 to the Act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a),
 6 ~~(193)\$3,280,000~~ \$3,700,000, of which amount ~~(194)\$508,-~~
 7 ~~750~~ \$565,350 shall be available to the Department of the In-
 8 terior for the control of white pine blister rust on or en-
 9 dangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of that De-
 10 partment or lands of Indian tribes which are under the juris-
 11 diction of or retained under restrictions of the United States;
 12 ~~(195)\$1,727,800~~ \$1,947,150 of said amount to the Forest
 13 Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endan-
 14 gering lands under its jurisdiction; and ~~(196)\$1,043,450~~
 15 \$1,187,500 of said amount to the Bureau of Entomology and
 16 Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordination of
 17 the entire program, method development, and for operations
 18 conducted under its direction for such control, including, but
 19 not confined to, the control of white pine blister rust on or
 20 endangering State and privately owned lands.

21 FOREST SERVICE

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For expenses necessary including not to exceed \$10,000
 24 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section
 25 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as

1 amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
2 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; to experiment and make investigations
3 and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and
4 lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used
5 for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction
6 of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands
7 as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test
8 American timber and timber trees and their uses, and
9 methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek,
10 through investigations and the planting of native and foreign
11 species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect neces-
12 sary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building
13 purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost
14 (not to exceed \$1,000) of constructing a water-supply
15 shall be placed in reserve pending determination by the Sec-
16 such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower
17 upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not
18 exceed \$15,000, with the exception that any building
19 erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was
20 \$15,000 or more, may be improved out of the appropria-
21 tions made under this chapter for the Forest Service by an
22 amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such
23 building as certified by the Chief of the Forest Service, and
24 that not to exceed \$8,000 may be expended for the installa-
25 tion of an elevator in the Yeon Avenue warehouse in Port-

1 land, Oregon; to protect, administer, and improve the
2 national forests, including tree planting and other measures to
3 prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the forma-
4 tion of floods, and to conserve water; to ascertain the natural
5 conditions upon and utilize the national forests, to transport
6 and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national
7 forests or the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and
8 illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made
9 by the Forest Service, as follows:

10 General administrative expenses: For general adminis-
11 tration, including expenses of the National Forest Reserva-
12 tion Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of
13 March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), \$665,000.

14 National forest protection and management: For the
15 administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement,
16 and development of the national forests, including the estab-
17 lishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including
18 the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase,
19 production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the
20 care of plantations and young growth; the operation and
21 maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to ex-
22 ceed three; the maintenance of roads and trails and the
23 construction and maintenance of all other improvements
24 necessary for the proper and economical administration, pro-

1 tection, development, and use of the national forests, includ-
2 ing experimental areas under Forest Service administration,
3 except that where direct purchases will be more economical
4 than construction, improvements may be purchased; the
5 construction (not to exceed \$15,000 for any one structure),
6 equipment, and maintenance of sanitary and recreational
7 facilities; timber cultural operations; development and appli-
8 cation of fish and game management plans; propagation
9 and transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semiarid
10 portions of the national forests; estimating and appraising of
11 timber and other resources and development and application
12 of plans for their effective management, sale, and use; ex-
13 amination, classification, surveying, and appraisal of land
14 incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law and of
15 lands within the boundaries of the national forests that may
16 be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the Act
17 of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16
18 U. S. C. 506-509), as provided by the Act of March 4,
19 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment
20 of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or
21 interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of
22 water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the
23 administration and public use of the national forests; and
24 all expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improve-
25 ment, protection, and general administration of the national

1 forests, ~~(197)\$26,890,000~~ \$29,320,500, of which not to
 2 exceed \$75,000 shall be available for the purchase of three
 3 nursery sites, and not to exceed \$5,000 shall be available for
 4 the purchase of administrative sites.

5 ~~(198)~~ *Cooperative range improvements: For artificial revege-*
 6 *tation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements,*
 7 *control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious*
 8 *plants on national forest lands, pursuant to section 12 of the*
 9 *Act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law Numbered 478),*
 10 *\$750,000, to remain available until expended.*

11 Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest
 12 fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service adminis-
 13 tration, including lands under contract for purchase or in
 14 process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and
 15 for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal
 16 year for such purpose, \$6,000,000, of which \$2,500,000
 17 shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of
 18 the Revised Statutes, as amended, only to the extent that
 19 the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,
 20 finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

21 Forest research: For forest research in accordance with
 22 the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act
 23 approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581,
 24 581a, 581f-581i), including the construction and mainte-
 25 nance of improvements, as follows:

26 Forest and range management investigations: Fire, silvi-

1 cultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and experi-
 2 ments under said section 2, as amended, and investigations and
 3 experiments to develop improved methods of management of
 4 forest and other ranges under section 7, at forest or range ex-
 5 periment stations or elsewhere, **(199)**~~\$2,995,000~~ \$3,030,-
 6 000 **(200)**, of which \$55,000 shall be available for such
 7 investigations and experiments at Bartlett Experimental Forest
 8 only.

9 Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests
 10 of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products
 11 Laboratory, or elsewhere, \$1,300,000 **(201)**, of which
 12 \$30,000 shall be made available for the establishment of a
 13 forest utilization service unit in the Southwest.

14 Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest
 15 survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics
 16 under section 10, **(202)**~~\$880,000~~ \$1,000,000.

17 FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

18 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions
 19 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved Novem-
 20 ber 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), relating
 21 to forest development roads and trails, including the con-
 22 struction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails
 23 on experimental areas under Forest Service Administration,
 24 **(203)**~~\$10,348,000~~ \$12,000,000, which sum is authorized
 25 to be appropriated by the Act of June 29, 1948 (Public Law
 26 834), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this

1 appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase,
 2 construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the storage
 3 and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail
 4 construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such
 5 building purchased, altered, or constructed under this author-
 6 ization shall not exceed \$15,000 with the exception that any
 7 building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was
 8 \$15,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year
 9 by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such
 10 buildings certified by the Chief of the Forest Service.

11 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

12 Weeks Act: For the acquisition of forest lands under the
 13 provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended
 14 (16 U. S. C. 513-519, 521), ~~(204)\$100,000~~ \$401,000, to
 15 be available only for payment toward the purchase price of
 16 any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection
 17 with such acquisition: *Provided*, That no part of such funds
 18 shall be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair,
 19 Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, with-
 20 out the specific approval of the Board of County Commis-
 21 sioners of the county in which such lands are situated.

22 Superior National Forest: For the acquisition of forest
 23 land within the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, under
 24 the provisions of the Act approved June 22, 1948 (Public
 25 Law 733), \$150,000, to remain available until expended.

1 Special Acts: For the acquisition of land to facilitate
2 the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating with-
3 in the exterior boundaries of the following national forests,
4 in accordance with the provisions of the following Acts au-
5 thorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such
6 purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from
7 such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah,
8 Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended,
9 \$40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11,
10 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, \$10,000; San Ber-
11 nardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County,
12 California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as
13 amended, \$22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests,
14 Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as
15 amended, \$10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act
16 of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), \$20,000; Cleveland
17 National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of June
18 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), \$5,000; Sequoia National
19 Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637),
20 \$35,000; in all \$142,000.

21 FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

22 For cooperation with the various States or other appro-
23 priate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression and
24 the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accordance
25 with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act ap-

1 proved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564-566),
 2 \$9,500,000.

3 FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

4 To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to
 5 advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using in-
 6 dustries or other appropriate agencies in the application of
 7 forest management principles to federally owned lands
 8 leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain
 9 sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber
 10 resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabiliza-
 11 tion of employment and economic continuance of forest indus-
 12 tries, and to carry into effect, through such agencies of the
 13 Department as he may designate, the provisions of the
 14 Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16
 15 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed ~~(205)\$490,382~~ \$785,034)
 16 and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed ~~(206)\$671,-~~
 17 ~~392~~ \$449,200) and 5 (not to exceed ~~(207)\$138,226~~
 18 \$65,766) of the Act approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C.
 19 567-568), and Acts supplementary thereto; \$1,300,000.

20 FLOOD CONTROL

21 For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood
 22 Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738),
 23 as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary exam-
 24 inations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement,
 25 and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of
 26 the Columbia Basin area in accordance with the provisions of

1 laws relating to the activities of the Department, to remain
 2 available until expended, ~~(208)\$10,750,000~~ \$9,880,000,
 3 with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of
 4 funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Depart-
 5 ment for flood-control purposes: *Provided*, That no part of
 6 such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the
 7 Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific
 8 approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in
 9 which such lands are situated, nor shall any part of such
 10 funds be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of
 11 Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma,
 12 without the specific approval of the Board of County Com-
 13 missioners of the county in which such lands are situated
 14 ~~(209)~~: *Provided further, That of the funds available herein,*
 15 *not in excess of \$7,880,000 may be expended in watersheds*
 16 *heretofore authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act*
 17 *of December 22, 1944, for necessary gulley control, floodwater*
 18 *detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those*
 19 *over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and*
 20 *responsibility.*

21 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

22 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the
 23 Act approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a-590f),
 24 which provides for a national program of erosion control
 25 and soil and water conservation, furnishing of subsistence to
 26 employees, operation and maintenance of aircraft, and the

1 purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings:
 2 *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected,
 3 or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water
 4 supply or sanitary system and connecting the same with
 5 any such building, shall not exceed \$2,500 except where
 6 buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being pur-
 7 chased for other purposes and except for eight buildings
 8 to be constructed at a cost not to exceed \$15,000 per
 9 building: *Provided further*, That no money appropriated
 10 in this chapter shall be available for the construction of
 11 any such building on land not owned by the Government:
 12 *Provided further*, That in the State of Missouri where the
 13 State has established a central State agency authorized
 14 to enter into agreements with the United States or any of
 15 its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving
 16 of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conserva-
 17 tion district in such State, the agreements made by or on
 18 behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation
 19 district shall have the prior approval of such central State
 20 agency before they shall become effective as to such district,
 21 as follows:

22 (210) ~~SALARIES AND EXPENSES~~

23 Soil conservation research: For research and investiga-
 24 tions into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of
 25 erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil and
 26 water conservation (including the construction and hydro-

logic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and water regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not in excess of funds made available for such work by the State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof) ; and for construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, \$1,500,000.

Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive measures to conserve soil and water, including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information, (211)~~\$52,900,000~~ \$52,400,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL

LAND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved

1 July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010-1012), and the provisions
 2 of the Act approved August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011
 3 note), ~~(212)\$1,490,000~~ \$1,665,175.

4 WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

5 For expenses necessary to carry into effect the functions
 6 of the Department under the Acts of May 10, 1939 (53
 7 Stat. 685, 719), October 14, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 590y-z-
 8 10), as amended and supplemented, and June 28, 1949
 9 (Public Law 132), relating to the construction, operation,
 10 and maintenance of water conservation and utilization proj-
 11 ects, to remain available until expended, ~~(213)\$400,000~~
 12 \$500,000, which sum shall be merged with the unexpended
 13 balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to
 14 said Department for the purposes of said Act.

15 PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

16 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND

17 RESOURCES

18 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provi-
 19 sions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation
 20 and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as
 21 amended (16 U. S. C. 590g 590q), including not to exceed
 22 \$6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including
 23 such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs
 24 within the United States; ~~(214)\$282,500,000~~ \$283,000,000,
 25 to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding
 26 fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building

1 practices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized
2 under this head in the Department of Agriculture Approp-
3 priation Act, 1950, carried out during the period July 1,
4 1949, to December 31, 1950, inclusive: *Provided*, That not
5 to exceed \$25,500,000 of the total sum provided under this
6 head shall be available during the current fiscal year for
7 salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out
8 such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however,
9 not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than
10 \$5,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account,
11 "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjust-
12 ment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to
13 claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of
14 the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the
15 Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the con-
16 servation practice or practices and has complied with all
17 other requirements as conditions for such payments and that
18 the statements and information contained in the application
19 for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowl-
20 edge and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States
21 Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein
22 appropriated or made available for the functions assigned
23 to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the
24 Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942,
25 shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional

1 information employees or any State information employees,
2 but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or
3 supplying of information at the county level to individual
4 farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be avail-
5 able for salaries and other administrative expenses in con-
6 nection with the formulation and administration of the
7 1951 program of soil-building practices and soil- and
8 water-conserving practices, under the Act of February 29,
9 1936, as amended (amounting to \$285,000,000, including
10 administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution
11 of the funds available for payments and grants among the
12 several States in accordance with their conservation needs
13 as determined by the Secretary, except that the proportion
14 allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per
15 centum from the distribution for the next preceding
16 program year, and no participant shall receive more than
17 \$2,500) ; but the payments or grants under such programs
18 shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect
19 to which such payments or grants are to be made in con-
20 formity with farming practices which will encourage and
21 provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving
22 practices in the most practical and effective manner and
23 adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined
24 and approved by the State committees appointed pursuant
25 to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic

1 Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h (b)),
2 for the respective States (215): *Provided further*, That not
3 to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the agricultural
4 conservation program for any county may be allotted to the
5 Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in
6 formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation
7 program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by
8 the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than
9 technical and other assistance in such county: *Provided*
10 *further*, That such amounts shall be available for the pur-
11 chase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming
12 materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants
13 thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out
14 farming practices approved by the Secretary under pro-
15 grams provided for herein: *Provided further*, That no part
16 of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau,
17 office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of
18 such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year
19 for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person
20 who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An
21 Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved
22 August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in
23 accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States
24 Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate
25 such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropria-

1 tions for the payment of personal services or other expenses
 2 designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress
 3 to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Con-
 4 gress except upon request of any Member or through the
 5 proper official channels.

6 ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

7 To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acre-
 8 age allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to
 9 the provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment
 10 Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301-1393),
 11 \$32,300,000, of which not more than \$5,500,000 shall be
 12 transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative
 13 expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of
 14 1938": *Provided*, That \$4,000,000 of this appropriation
 15 shall be placed in reserve pending determination by the Sec-
 16 retary as to necessity of marketing quotas on the 1951 crops
 17 of wheat, corn, and rice, to be released in such amounts and
 18 at such times as determined by the Bureau of the Budget
 19 to be necessary in connection with such marketing quotas.

20 SUGAR ACT

21 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
 22 visions of the Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1101-1160),
 23 ~~(216)\$60,000,000~~ \$63,750,000, to remain available until
 24 June 30 of the next succeeding fiscal year: *Provided*, That
 25 expenditures (including transfers) from this appropriation

1 for other than payments to sugar producers shall not exceed
2 \$1,500,000.

3 NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

4 To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of
5 the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751-1760),
6 \$83,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation
7 shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said
8 Act.

9 MARKETING SERVICES

10 For expenses necessary in conducting investigations,
11 experiments, and demonstrations, as follows:

12 Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and
13 distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely infor-
14 mation on the market supply and demand, commercial move-
15 ment, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market
16 prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy
17 and poultry products (including broilers), fruits and vege-
18 tables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds,
19 cottonseed, and seeds, and other agricultural products,
20 (217) ~~\$2,050,000~~ \$2,187,000.

21 Market inspection of farm products: For the investiga-
22 tion and certification, in one or more jurisdictions, to ship-
23 pers and other interested parties of the class, quality, and
24 condition of any agricultural commodity or food product,
25 whether raw, dried, canned, or otherwise processed, and any

1 product containing an agricultural commodity or derivative
2 thereof when offered for interstate shipment or when received
3 at such important central markets as the Secretary may
4 from time to time designate, or at points which may be
5 conveniently reached therefrom under such rules and regu-
6 lations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees
7 as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the
8 cost for the service rendered, \$780,000.

9 Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing
10 among the people of the United States useful information
11 relative to the needed supplies, standardization, classification,
12 grading, preparation for market, handling, transportation,
13 storage, and marketing of farm and food products, including
14 the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform
15 standards of classification of American farm and food products
16 throughout the world, for making analyses of cotton fiber
17 as provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d),
18 for carrying out the provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d),
19 inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of
20 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), including not to exceed \$25,000
21 for employment at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem, pur-
22 suant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the
23 Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by
24 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),
25 and not to exceed \$20,000 for transportation and other

1 necessary expenses including not to exceed \$10 per diem
2 of persons serving without compensation while away from
3 their homes or regular places of business, \$1,260,000:
4 *Provided*, That the Secretary may make available to any
5 bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts
6 from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out
7 the functions for which this appropriation is made, and
8 any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts trans-
9 ferred or otherwise made available to appropriation items
10 in this Act.

11 Tobacco Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the
12 Act to establish and promote the use of standards of classi-
13 fication for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official
14 tobacco-inspection service, approved August 23, 1935 (7
15 U. S. C. 511-511q), the Act to provide for the collection
16 and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department,
17 approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501-508), as
18 amended, and the Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco
19 seed and plants, approved June 5, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 516),
20 \$1,660,500.

21 Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts:
22 To carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing
23 the Secretary to collect and publish statistics of the grade
24 and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as
25 amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471-

1 476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by
 2 chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton
 3 futures (26 U. S. C. 1920-1935), and to carry into effect
 4 the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act,
 5 approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51-65),
 6 \$1,675,000.

7 Marketing regulatory Acts: For expenses necessary to
 8 carry into effect the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural
 9 Commodities Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a-499r),
 10 the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping of farm prod-
 11 uce (7 U. S. C. 491-497), the Act to provide standards
 12 for baskets and containers for fruits and vegetables, as
 13 amended (15 U. S. C. 251-256), the Act to fix standards
 14 for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for
 15 fruits and vegetables (15 U. S. C. 257-257i), the Act to
 16 provide export standards for apples and pears (7 U. S. C.
 17 581-589), the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U. S.
 18 C. 71-87), the United States Warehouse Act (7 U. S. C.
 19 241-273), the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1551-1610),
 20 the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended (7 U. S. C.
 21 181-229), the Naval Stores Act (7 U. S. C. 91-99), and
 22 the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act
 23 (7 U. S. C. 135-135k), **(218)**~~\$3,550,000~~ \$3,495,000.

1 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

2 To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the pro-
3 visions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7
4 U. S. C. 1-17a), \$650,000.

5 FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

6 For operating and administrative expenses, (219)\$6,-
7 ~~854,000~~ \$7,204,000.

8 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

9 To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electri-
10 fication Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901-915),
11 as follows:

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For administrative expenses, including not to exceed \$500
14 for financial and credit reports, (220)\$8,150,000, \$8,750,000.

15 LOAN AUTHORIZATION

16 For loans in accordance with said Act, and for carrying
17 out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed from
18 the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the pro-
19 visions of section 3 (a) of said Act as follows: Rural electrifi-
20 cation program, \$350,000,000; and rural telephone program,
21 (221)\$25,000,000 \$40,000,000; and additional amounts, not
22 to exceed a total of \$150,000,000 (including the uncommitted
23 balance available as a carry-over from the fiscal year 1950),

1 may be borrowed for the rural electrification program
2 under the same terms and conditions if and to the
3 extent that the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify, from
4 time to time, to the Secretary of the Treasury that such
5 additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1951,
6 under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and
7 orderly development of the program.

8 FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

9 To carry into effect the provisions of titles I, II, and
10 the related provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones
11 Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1000-1031),
12 the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (7 U. S. C.
13 1001, note; 31 U. S. C. 82h; 12 U. S. C. 371; 35 D. C.
14 Code 535; 60 Stat. 1062-1080) ; the Act of July 30, 1946
15 (40 U. S. C. 436-439) ; the Act of October 19, 1949
16 (Public Law 361) ; the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended
17 (16 U. S. C. 590r-590x, 590z-5), for the development of
18 facilities for water storage and utilization in the arid and
19 semiarid areas of the United States; and the provisions of
20 title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating to financial
21 assistance for farm housing (Public Law 171, approved July
22 15, 1949) , as follows:

23 LOAN AUTHORIZATION

24 For loans (including payments in lieu of taxes and
25 taxes under section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant

1 Act, as amended, and advances incident to the acquisition
2 and preservation of security of obligations under the fore-
3 going several authorities) : Title I and section 43 of title IV
4 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended and
5 title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (except grants under 504
6 (a)) **(222)**~~\$56,350,000~~ *\$71,350,000* **(223)**, of which not
7 to exceed \$3,500,000 of the amount available for the purposes
8 of title I and section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant
9 Act, as amended, may be distributed to States and Territories
10 without regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy,
11 in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto, for
12 loans in reclamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented
13 public land (sums available for loans under title V of
14 the Housing Act of 1949 to remain available until
15 expended) ; title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant
16 Act, as amended, \$85,000,000; the Act of August
17 28, 1937, as amended, \$4,000,000: *Provided*, That not
18 to exceed the foregoing several amounts shall be borrowed
19 in one account from the Secretary of the Treasury on the
20 request of the Secretary of Agriculture at such rate of
21 interest as may be determined by the Secretary of the
22 Treasury, but not in excess of 3 per centum per annum;
23 and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized
24 and directed to lend such sums to the Secretary upon the
25 security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secre-

1 tary under the provisions of said Acts: *Provided further,*
2 That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments
3 of principal and interest under such Acts to repay the
4 Secretary of the Treasury the amounts borrowed therefrom
5 for the purposes of such Acts (224): *Provided further, That*
6 *for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing*
7 *authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use*
8 *as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any*
9 *securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as*
10 *amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued*
11 *under that Act are extended to include such loans to the*
12 *Secretary: Provided further, That repayments to the Secretary*
13 *of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-*
14 *debt transaction.*

15 GRANTS

16 For grants and for the grant portion of combination
17 loans and grants for the purpose of section 504 (a) of the
18 Housing Act of 1949, \$650,000, to remain available until
19 expended.

20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For the making, servicing, and collecting of loans and
22 insured mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made
23 under prior authority, the liquidation of assets transferred to
24 Farmers Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers
25 Home Administration Act of 1946, and the extension of

1 financial assistance under the Housing Act of 1949,
2 ~~(225)\$27,700,000~~ \$29,000,000, together with a transfer to
3 this appropriation item of not to exceed \$80,000 of the fees
4 and administrative expense charges made available by sub-
5 sections (d) and (e) of section 12 of the Bankhead-Jones
6 Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

7 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

8 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed \$5,000
9 for attendance at meetings or conventions of members of or-
10 ganizations at which matters of importance to the work of the
11 Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or trans-
12 acted; library membership fees or dues in organizations which
13 issue publications to members only or to members at a lower
14 price than to others, payment for which may be made in
15 advance; not to exceed \$20,000 for expenditures authorized
16 by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C.
17 833) ; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (for replace-
18 ment only) for use in the District of Columbia and else-
19 where; garage rental in the District of Columbia; payment
20 of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and
21 not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons
22 serving, while away from their homes, without other com-
23 pensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity
24 to the Farm Credit Administration, except that such expend-
25 itures shall not exceed \$10,000; examination of corporations,

1 banks, associations, and institutions operated, supervised, or
 2 regulated by the Farm Credit Administration \$585,000,
 3 together with not to exceed \$2,325,000 of collections from
 4 Federal Farm Credit agencies of assessments and charges,
 5 to be advanced by transfer and counter warrant to this
 6 appropriation, to cover the cost of Farm Credit Administra-
 7 tion facilities, examinations, and other services rendered to
 8 such agencies; \$2,910,000.

9 EXTENSION SERVICE

10 PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO

11 RICO

12 For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto
 13 Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:

14 Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts:

15 Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7
 16 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), \$1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
 17 section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935,
 18 (7 U. S. C. 343c), \$12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act,
 19 section 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as
 20 amended by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d-1),
 21 \$12,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved
 22 April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c-1), \$555,-
 23 000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S.
 24 C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act
 25 to the Territory of Alaska, \$13,950, and (226)section

1 ~~3~~ of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e);
 2 extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the
 3 Territory of ~~Alaska~~, ~~\$10,000~~ the Act approved October 27,
 4 1949 (Public Law 417), extending to the Territory of
 5 Alaska the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act and sections
 6 21 and 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act, \$42,150;
 7 Puerto Rico, section 3 of the Act of March 4, 1931 (7
 8 U. S. C. 386f), authorizing extension of the Capper-
 9 Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico, \$31,348; the Act approved
 10 August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f-343g), extending the
 11 benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto
 12 Rico, ~~\$408,000~~ (227), and the Act approved October 26,
 13 1949 (Public Law 406), extending the benefits of section 23 of
 14 title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, \$40,000;
 15 and section 506a of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (Pub-
 16 lic Law 171), \$33,050; in all, payments to States, Hawaii,
 17 Alaska, and Puerto Rico, (228)~~\$27,000,000~~ \$27,103,498.

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of
 20 the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C.
 21 341-348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto,
 22 and to coordinate the extension work of the Department
 23 and the several States, Territories, and insular possessions,
 24 (229)~~\$900,000~~ \$915,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, (230)\$2,143,300 \$2,179,300, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary not exceeding a total of \$109,280, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are

1 appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reduc-
 2 tions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

3 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

4 For necessary expenses, including payment of fees or
 5 dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field
 6 service, ~~(231)\$2,450,000~~ \$2,675,000 (232), together with
 7 such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as
 8 are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current
 9 fiscal year for such expenses which several amounts not ex-
 10 ceeding a total of \$207,000 shall be transferred to and made
 11 a part of this appropriation.

12 OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

13 For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agri-
 14 cultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordi-
 15 nate and integrate activities of the Department in connection
 16 with foreign agricultural work, \$600,000.

17 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

18 For necessary expenses in connection with the publica-
 19 tion, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins,
 20 documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and
 21 display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and ex-
 22 hibits, and the coordination of informational work (233)and
 23 programs authorized by Congress in the Department, \$1,265,-
 24 800, together with such amounts from other appropriations or
 25 authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget

1 for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several
2 amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Sec-
3 retary, not exceeding a total of \$16,200, shall be transferred to
4 and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropria-
5 tion amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the
6 purposes enumerated as follows: For preparation and display
7 of exhibits, \$109,959; for preparation, distribution, and display
8 of motion and sound pictures, \$58,700; for farmers' bulletins,
9 which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the differ-
10 ent sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths
11 of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the
12 addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representa-
13 tives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7
14 U. S. C. 417) and not less than two hundred thirty thousand
15 eight hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and
16 House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of
17 the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture), as
18 authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895
19 (44 U. S. C. 241), \$611,128 (234): *Provided, That when*
20 *and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary*
21 *agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relat-*
22 *ing to the programs of the various agencies of the Depart-*
23 *ment authorized by Congress can be more advantageously pre-*
24 *pared, displayed, or distributed by the Office of Information,*
25 *as the central agency of the Department therefor, additional*

1 *funds not exceeding \$300,000 for these purposes may be trans-*
 2 *ferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds*
 3 *applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified*
 4 *herein: Provided further, That in the preparation of motion*
 5 *pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a*
 6 *total of \$10,000 may be used for employment pursuant to*
 7 *the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act*
 8 *of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of*
 9 *the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): Provided*
 10 *further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used*
 11 *for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State*
 12 *field offices, or for the compensation of employees in such*
 13 *offices except that not to exceed \$10,000 may be used to*
 14 *maintain the San Francisco radio office.*

15 LIBRARY

16 For necessary expenses, including dues, for library mem-
 17 bership in societies or associations which issue publications
 18 to members only or at a price to members lower than to
 19 subscribers who are not members; \$713,293.

20 ~~(235)~~Not to exceed \$12,000,000 of the funds appropriated
 21 in this title shall be available for travel expenses. Amounts
 22 available from appropriations contained in this title are
 23 hereby reduced by the total sum of \$645,496, such amount
 24 to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the
 25 Treasury immediately upon approval of this chapter.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this chapter shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided*, That not to exceed ~~(236)\$16,000,000~~ \$16,350,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative

1 expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That
2 the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and
3 directed to discharge (237)~~\$170,515,131~~ \$66,698,457 of
4 the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the
5 Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes in such amount
6 issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury
7 pursuant to section 4 of the Act of March 8, 1938, as
8 amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-4).

9 Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Not to exceed
10 \$1,280,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of
11 the funds of the Corporation shall be available for
12 administrative expenses, including employment on a contract
13 or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the per-
14 formance of special services, including legal services, and the
15 use of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, na-
16 tional farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and
17 agencies of the Government as authorized by the Act of
18 January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020-1020h); and said
19 total sum shall be exclusive of services and facilities furnished
20 and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration
21 central office, interest expense, and expenses in connection
22 with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement,
23 protection, or disposition of real or personal property be-
24 longing to the Corporation or in which it has an interest:
25 *Provided*, That promptly after June 30 of each fiscal year

1 all cash funds in excess of the estimated operating require-
2 ments for the current fiscal year shall be declared as divi-
3 dends and paid into the general fund of the Treasury: *Pro-*
4 *vided further*, That the aggregate amount of bonds the Cor-
5 poration may issue and have outstanding at any one time
6 shall not exceed \$500,000,000.

7 Federal intermediate credit banks: Not to exceed
8 \$1,496,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the
9 funds of the banks shall be available for administrative
10 expenses and services performed for the banks by other Gov-
11 ernment agencies (except services and facilities furnished and
12 examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration cen-
13 tral office, and services performed by any Federal Reserve
14 bank and by the United States Treasury in connection with
15 the financial transactions of the banks) ; and said total sum
16 shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special ser-
17 vices performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses in
18 connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, im-
19 provement, protection, or disposition of real or personal
20 property belonging to the banks or in which they have an
21 interest.

22 Production credit corporations: Not to exceed \$1,358,-
23 000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the
24 corporations shall be available for administrative expenses and
25 services performed for the corporations by other Govern-

1 ment agencies (except services and facilities furnished and
2 examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration
3 central office) ; and said total sum shall be exclusive of
4 interest expense, legal and special services performed on a
5 contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the
6 acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, pro-
7 tection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging
8 to the corporations or in which they have an interest.

9 TITLE III—REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

10 Amounts available from appropriations are hereby re-
11 duced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be
12 carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury
13 immediately upon the approval of this Chapter:

14 An amount of \$199,990,000 in the revolving fund held
15 in the Treasury available to the Governor, Farm Credit
16 Administration, as authorized by the Federal Farm Mortgage
17 Corporation Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1020b), for
18 resubscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal Farm
19 Mortgage Corporation.

20 The total amount of \$125,000,000 in the revolving
21 fund appropriated to the Office of the Secretary, Treasury
22 Department, as authorized by the Federal Farm Loan Act,
23 as amended (12 U. S. C. 698), for subscriptions to the
24 capital stock of the Federal land banks.

1 TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

2 SEC. 401. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law,
3 the lump-sum appropriations and authorizations made for
4 the Department under this chapter shall be available for
5 the purchase of not to exceed 497 passenger motor vehicles
6 for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles,
7 necessary in the conduct of the work of the Department
8 outside the District of Columbia.

9 SEC. 402. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting
10 the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the tem-
11 porary employment of translators when competent citizen
12 translators are not available; (2) employment in cases of
13 emergency of persons in the field service of the Department
14 for periods of not more than sixty days; and (3) employ-
15 ment under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agri-
16 cultural Relations.

17 SEC. 403. Appropriations and authorizations made in
18 this chapter shall be available for health service programs as
19 authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) .

20 SEC. 404. Funds available to the Department during the
21 current fiscal year shall be available for the payment of tort
22 claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) .

23 SEC. 405. Funds available to the Department of Agri-
24 culture during the current fiscal year may be expended for
25 personal services in the District of Columbia.

1 SEC. 406. Funds available to the Department of Agri-
2 culture may be used for printing and binding, including the
3 purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles.

4 SEC. 407. Of appropriations herein made which are
5 available for the purchase of lands, not to exceed \$1 may
6 be expended for each option to purchase any particular tract
7 or tracts of land.

8 SEC. 408. No part of the funds appropriated by this
9 chapter shall be used for the payment of any officer or
10 employee of the Department who, as such officer or em-
11 ployee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, com-
12 mission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued,
13 any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to
14 damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with
15 respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

16 SEC. 409. Except to provide materials required in or
17 incident to research or experimental work where no suitable
18 domestic product is available, no part of the funds appro-
19 priated by this chapter shall be expended in the purchase
20 of twine manufactured from commodities or materials pro-
21 duced outside of the United States.

22 SEC. 410. Not less than \$575,000 shall be available for
23 contracts in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of
24 August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i) from appropriations
25 herein made for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics;

1 Bureau of Animal Industry; Bureau of Dairy Industry;
2 Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineer-
3 ing; Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine; Bureau
4 of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry; Bureau of Human
5 Nutrition and Home Economics; and the Forest Service.

6 (238)SEC. 411. *Of the funds appropriated in this chapter for*
7 *travel expenses, \$791,888 shall be carried to the surplus fund*
8 *and covered into the Treasury on or before August 1, 1950;*
9 *but such amount shall be credited toward any other reduction*
10 *in amounts available for such travel expenses resulting from*
11 *decreases in appropriations made by this Act below the*
12 *budget estimates.*

13 This chapter may be cited as the "Department of Agri-
14 culture Appropriation Act, 1951".

1 CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

2 TITLE I

3 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary
 6 of the Interior (hereafter in this chapter referred to as the
 7 Secretary), including personal services in the District of
 8 Columbia and elsewhere; for purchase of one passenger motor
 9 vehicle for replacement only at not to exceed \$4,500; print-
 10 ing and binding; employment of a Director of the Oil and
 11 Gas Division without regard to the civil service laws; and
 12 teletype rentals and service; ~~(239)\$2,315,000~~ \$2,100,000.

13 (240)STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

14 *For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions*
 15 *of the Act of July 25, 1947 (43 U. S. C. 364), including*
 16 *personal services in the District of Columbia and printing*
 17 *and binding, \$14,000.*

18 ENFORCEMENT OF THE CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

19 For expenses necessary for controlling the interstate
 20 shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U. S. C.

1 715), including personal services in the District of Columbia;
 2 purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles for
 3 replacement only; and printing and binding; (241)\$200,000
 4 \$180,000.

5 WORKING CAPITAL FUND

6 For establishment of a working capital fund, to be avail-
 7 able without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary
 8 for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central repro-
 9 duction service; (2) communication services; (3) a central
 10 supply service for stationery, supplies, equipment, blank
 11 forms, and miscellaneous materials, for which adequate stocks
 12 may be maintained to meet in whole or in part requirements
 13 of the bureaus and offices of the Department in the city of
 14 Washington and elsewhere; (4) a central library service;
 15 (5) health services; and (6) such other similar service
 16 functions as the Secretary determines may be performed more
 17 advantageously on a reimbursable basis; \$300,000. Said
 18 fund shall be reimbursed from available funds of bureaus,
 19 offices, and agencies for which services are performed at
 20 rates which will return in full all expenses of operation,
 21 including reserves for accrued annual leave and depreciation
 22 of equipment.

23 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER

24 MARKETING AREA

25 For necessary expenses of marketing electric power and

1 energy produced or to be produced at multiple-purpose
 2 projects of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army,
 3 in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood
 4 Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the
 5 area east of the Mississippi River, including purchase (not
 6 to exceed two) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and
 7 printing and binding; ~~(242)\$150,000~~ \$100,000.

8 CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

9 For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,
 10 substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administra-
 11 tive expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provi-
 12 sions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16
 13 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area,
 14 to remain available until expended, ~~(243)\$10,350,000~~
 15 \$8,620,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000,000 is for liquida-
 16 tion of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously
 17 granted; and, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to
 18 enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in
 19 an amount not to exceed ~~(244)\$6,000,000~~ \$1,730,000:
 20 *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of funds appropri-
 21 ated under the head "Construction, operation, and mainte-
 22 nance, power transmission facilities" in the Interior Depart-
 23 ment Appropriation Act, 1950, for the foregoing purposes
 24 shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

1 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER
2 ADMINISTRATION

3 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance
4 of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric
5 power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5
6 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s),
7 as applied to the southwestern power area, ~~(245)\$760,000~~
8 \$660,000.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

10 Appropriations of the Southwestern Power Administra-
11 tion shall be available for personal services in the District
12 of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed eight, of which six
13 shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor
14 vehicles; and printing and binding. Appropriations made
15 herein to the Southwestern Power Administration shall be
16 available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein
17 made for operation and maintenance shall be available only
18 for the service of the current fiscal year.

19 COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing
22 a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U. S. C. 104), including
23 personal services in the District of Columbia, hire of pas-
24 senger motor vehicles, printing and binding and payment
25 of actual traveling expenses of the members and secretary

1 of the Commission in attending meetings and committee
 2 meetings of the Commission either within or outside of the
 3 District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers approved
 4 by the Commission, \$12,530.

5 BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

6 CONSTRUCTION

7 For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,
 8 substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law,
 9 to remain available until expended, ~~(246)\$41,500,000~~
 10 \$39,500,000, of which not to exceed \$17,000,000 is for liqui-
 11 dation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously
 12 granted; and, in addition, the Administrator is authorized
 13 to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation
 14 in an amount not to exceed ~~(247)\$21,750,000~~ \$20,000,-
 15 000: *Provided*, That unexpended balances of prior year
 16 appropriations, including unused balances of related contract
 17 authorizations, for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred
 18 to and merged with this appropriation.

19 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

20 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance
 21 of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing
 22 electric power and energy, ~~(248)\$5,000,000~~ \$4,500,000.

23 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

24 Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administra-
 25 tion shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed

1 upon the Administrator pursuant to law, including personal
 2 services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed
 3 seventeen of which twelve shall be for replacement only)
 4 and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not to ex-
 5 ceed two) of aircraft; and printing and binding. Appro-
 6 priations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administra-
 7 tion shall be available in one fund, except that the appro-
 8 priation herein made for operation and maintenance shall
 9 be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

10 Not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation for
 11 construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Admin-
 12 istration shall be available for construction work by force
 13 account or on a hired-labor basis, except in case of emer-
 14 gencies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville
 15 Power Administrator.

16 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

17 MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

18 For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement,
 19 development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and
 20 performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the
 21 management of lands and their resources under the jurisdic-
 22 tion of the Bureau of Land Management, ~~(249)~~\$6,756,800
 23 \$7,127,810: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be ex-
 24 pended on a reimbursable basis for surveys of lands other
 25 than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land

1 Management (250): *Provided further, That of the appro-*
 2 *priations herein made in connection with the Revested Oregon*
 3 *and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon*
 4 *Road grant lands, expenditures may be made for weed control*
 5 *on such lands, including those under cooperative weed control*
 6 *agreements with the State and counties.*

7 CONSTRUCTION

8 For construction of access roads on the revested Oregon
 9 and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon
 10 Road grant lands; acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing
 11 connecting roads adjacent to such lands; and for acquisition,
 12 construction, or reconstruction of buildings and appurtenant
 13 facilities in Alaska; to remain available until expended,
 14 (251) ~~\$600,000~~ \$800,000, of which not to exceed \$200,000
 15 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority
 16 granted under the head "Revested Oregon and California
 17 Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant
 18 lands" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950:
 19 *Provided, That the amounts of appropriation made herein*
 20 *for road construction shall be transferred to the Bureau of*
 21 *Public Roads, Department of Commerce.*

22 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

23 Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management
 24 shall be available for personal services in the District of
 25 Columbia; purchase (not to exceed twenty-eight for replace-

1 ment only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase
2 of two aircraft; printing and binding; and alteration and
3 maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities
4 to which the United States has title: (252)*Provided, That of*
5 *appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Man-*
6 *agement expenditures in connection with the revested*
7 *Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay*
8 *Wagon Road grant lands shall be reimbursed from the 25*
9 *per centum referred to in section c, title II, of the Act*
10 *approved August 28, 1937, of the special fund designated*
11 *the "Oregon and California Land Grant Fund" and section*
12 *4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939, of the special fund*
13 *designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund":*
14 *Provided further, That no part of such appropriations shall*
15 *be available for expenditure in connection with such lands*
16 *in excess of such reimbursements during the current fiscal*
17 *year* *Provided, That of appropriations herein made for the*
18 *Bureau of Land Management, expenditures in connection*
19 *with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and re-*
20 *conveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands for payment*
21 *of current expenses in connection with the management of*
22 *such lands of a type paid from the separate appropriation*
23 *heretofore made in connection with such lands shall be re-*
24 *imbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in section c,*
25 *title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937, of the special*

1 *fund designated the "Oregon and California Land Grant*
 2 *Fund" and section 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939, of*
 3 *the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road*
 4 *Grant Fund": Provided further, That no part of such appro-*
 5 *priations for such current expenses shall be available in excess*
 6 *of such reimbursements for the current fiscal year.*

7 RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

8 For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range
 9 improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10
 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315),
 11 sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received ~~(253)~~ *(not*
 12 *to exceed \$350,000)* as range improvement fees under sec-
 13 tion 3 of said Act and of 25 per centum of all moneys
 14 received under section 15 of said Act during the current
 15 and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated, to remain
 16 available until expended.

17 PAYMENTS TO STATES (PROCEEDS OF SALES)

18 For payment to the several States of 5 per centum of
 19 the net proceeds of sales of public lands ~~(254)~~ *and materials*
 20 *lying within their limits, for the purpose of education or of*
 21 *making public roads and improvements, sums equal to the*
 22 *aggregate of receipts (255) (not to exceed \$20,000) covered*
 23 *into the Treasury in accordance with section 4 of the Act of*
 24 *June 26, 1934 (31 U. S. C. 725c), during the current and*
 25 *prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated.*

PAYMENT TO OKLAHOMA

For payment to the State of Oklahoma in lieu of all State and local taxes upon tribal funds accruing under the provisions of the joint resolution of June 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 740), to be expended by the State in the same manner as if received under section 35 of the Act approved February 25, 1920 (30 U. S. C. 191), sums equal to $37\frac{1}{2}$ per centum of the royalties received **(256)***(not to exceed \$300)* during the current and prior fiscal years (but not yet appropriated) from the south half of Red River in Oklahoma under the provisions of said joint resolution of June 12, 1926.

LEASING OF GRAZING LANDS

For leasing State, county, or privately owned lands in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-1), sums equal to the aggregate of receipts **(257)***(not to exceed \$6,000)* covered into the Treasury in accordance with the Act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-4), during the current and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated.

PAYMENTS TO STATES (GRAZING FEES)

Sums not in excess of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per centum of all grazing fees received **(258)***(not to exceed \$300)* during the current and prior fiscal years (but not yet appropriated) from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-land laws, to be paid to the

1 State in which said lands are situated, in accordance with
 2 the provisions of section 11 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as
 3 amended (43 U. S. C. 315j).

4 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

5 HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES

6 For expenses necessary to provide health, education, and
 7 welfare services for Indians, either directly or in coopera-
 8 tion with States and other organizations, including payment
 9 (in advance or from date of admission) of care, tuition,
 10 assistance, and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes,
 11 institutions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy
 12 Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of
 13 rewards for information or evidence concerning violations
 14 of law on Indian reservations or lands; ~~(259)~~*research among*
 15 *mixed Indians and non-Indian groups including cooperation*
 16 *in medical research of benefit to Indians*; operation of Indian
 17 arts and crafts shops and museums; and per diem in lieu
 18 of subsistence and other expenses of Indians participating
 19 in folk festivals; ~~(260)~~~~\$37,929,000~~ \$40,252,328.

20 RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

21 For expenses necessary for management, development,
 22 improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant
 23 facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian
 24 Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and
 25 charges; acquisition of water rights; conducting agricultural

1 experiments and demonstrations; furnishing plants or seed
 2 to Indians; advances for Indian industrial and business
 3 enterprises; payment of expenses of Indian fairs, including
 4 premiums for exhibits; and development of Indian arts and
 5 crafts as authorized by law (25 U. S. C. 305), including
 6 expenses of exhibits; **(261)**~~\$10,542,000~~ \$10,814,576.

7 CONSTRUCTION

8 For construction, major repair, and improvement of
 9 irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, roads and
 10 trails, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests
 11 in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and archi-
 12 tectural and engineering services by contract; to remain
 13 available until expended, **(262)**~~\$22,422,000~~ \$23,635,151, of
 14 which not to exceed \$3,737,500 is for liquidation of obliga-
 15 tions incurred pursuant to authority previously granted; and,
 16 in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into con-
 17 tracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not
 18 to exceed **(263)**~~\$2,500,000~~ \$5,000,000 **(264)**: *Provided,*
 19 *That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for*
 20 *the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, Califor-*
 21 *nia, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyo-*
 22 *ming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations:*
 23 *Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall*
 24 *be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within*

1 *the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside*
 2 *or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.*

3 The unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore
 4 made, including unused balances of related contract author-
 5 izations, under the heads "Construction, and so forth, build-
 6 ings and utilities, Indian Service," "Construction, and so
 7 forth, irrigation systems, Indian Service," "Roads, Indian
 8 Service," "Navajo and Hopi construction and maintenance
 9 services," and "Acquisition of lands for Indian tribes", shall
 10 be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

11 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

12 For expenses necessary for the general administration
 13 of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses
 14 in field offices, ~~(265)\$3,500,000~~ \$3,644,000.

15 REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

16 For an additional amount for loans as authorized by
 17 sections 10 and 11 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (25
 18 U. S. C. 470, 471), as amended and supplemented,
 19 \$2,400,000.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

21 Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except
 22 the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for personal
 23 services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed
 24 ~~(266)two hundred and twenty-seven~~ two hundred and
 25 *fifty*, of which two hundred and twenty shall be for replace-

1 ment only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, which
2 may be used for the transportation of Indians; printing and
3 binding, including illustrations and purchase of reprints;
4 purchase of ice for official use of employees; services as
5 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
6 U. S. C. 55a, including not to exceed \$5,000 for expendi-
7 ture at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem
8 on irrigation and power matters, when authorized by the
9 Secretary; and expenses required by continuing or perma-
10 nent treaty provisions.

11 CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

12 For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of
13 New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and pay-
14 ment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as
15 provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary during
16 the current fiscal year.

17 PROCEEDS FROM POWER

18 Sums not in excess of the amount of power revenues
19 covered into the Treasury to the credit of each of the power
20 projects, including revenues credited prior to August 7,
21 1946, to be available for the purposes authorized by sec-
22 tion 3 of the Act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 647),
23 as amended, including printing and binding, in connection
24 with the respective projects from which such revenues are
25 derived.

TRIBAL FUNDS

2 In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be ex-
3 pended by existing law, there is hereby appropriated
4 (267) ~~\$2,430,965~~ \$2,437,965 from tribal funds not otherwise
5 available for expenditure for the benefit of Indians and Indian
6 tribes, including pay and travel expenses of employees; care,
7 tuition and other assistance to Indian children attending public
8 and private schools (which may be paid in advance or from
9 date of admission) ; purchase of land and improvements on
10 land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United
11 States in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of
12 lands and water rights; printing and binding; compensa-
13 tion and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed
14 by Indian tribes under approved contracts; pay, travel and
15 other expenses of tribal officers, councils, and committees
16 thereof, or other tribal organizations, including mileage for
17 use of privately owned automobiles and per diem in lieu
18 of subsistence at rates established administratively but not
19 to exceed those applicable to civilian employees of the
20 Government; relief of Indians, without regard to section
21 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391), including
22 cash grants; and employment of a recreational director for
23 the Menominee Reservation and a curator for the Osage
24 Museum, each of whom shall be appointed with the
25 approval of the respective tribal councils and without re-
26 gard to the classification laws (268): ~~Provided, That in addi-~~

tion to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary. Any tribal funds advanced under this authority shall be reported to the Congress in the annual Budget for the next succeeding fiscal year (269): *Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations.*

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans; engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and

1 activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and
 2 betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing proj-
 3 ects; to remain available until expended, ~~(270)\$5,150,000~~
 4 ~~\$6,500,000~~, of which ~~(271)\$4,400,000~~ \$5,791,000 shall be
 5 derived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 shall be
 6 derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Pro-*
 7 *vided*, That the expenditure of any sums from this appro-
 8 priation for investigations of any nature requested by States,
 9 municipalities, or other interests shall be upon the basis
 10 of the State, municipality, or other interest advancing
 11 at least 50 per centum of the estimated cost of such in-
 12 vestigations: *Provided further*, That the limitation on the
 13 amount available for surveys and preconstruction work
 14 in connection with the North Side pumping division,
 15 Minidoka project, Idaho, stated in the Interior Depart-
 16 ment Appropriation Act, 1950, is increased from \$725,000
 17 to \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That, except as herein ex-
 18 pressly provided with respect to investigations in Alaska,
 19 no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the
 20 conduct of activities which are not authorized by law.

21 CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

22 For construction and rehabilitation of authorized recla-
 23 mation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission
 24 facilities ~~(272)~~and emergency reconstruction of the La Prele
 25 unit, Wyoming and initiation of construction on the Kenne-
 26 wick Division of the Yakima project, Washington) and for

1 other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain avail-
 2 able until expended, ~~(273)\$297,467,000~~ \$294,713,000, of
 3 which ~~(274)\$22,897,700~~ \$25,135,700 shall be derived from
 4 the reclamation fund ~~(275)~~, and in addition thereto the Com-
 5 missioner of Reclamation is hereby authorized to incur obliga-
 6 tions and enter into contracts for additional work, materials,
 7 and equipment in an amount not exceeding \$3,000,000 for
 8 power transmission lines and substations in the fiscal year 1951:
 9 *Provided*, That hereafter when funds appropriated under this
 10 head are transferred to the credit of the appropriate regional
 11 disbursing officer of the Treasury Department for expenditure
 12 in connection with Hoover Dam and related works, such funds,
 13 solely for the purpose of computing interest on advances under
 14 the provisions of section 2 of the Act of December 21, 1928, as
 15 amended (43 U. S. C. 617a (b), 617a (d), 618e), shall
 16 be considered as if advanced to the Colorado River Dam
 17 fund ~~(276):~~ *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 of the funds provided
 18 in this paragraph for the construction of transmission lines in
 19 South Dakota shall be available only for connecting the load
 20 centers of Armour with Watertown via Sioux Falls, and of
 21 Midland with Rapid City, and of Winner with Randall Dam
 22 ~~(277)~~: *Provided further*, That \$3,000,000 of the funds pro-
 23 vided in this paragraph plus \$3,000,000 contract authority
 24 shall be available for construction of transmission lines and sub-
 25 stations in South Dakota, to include a transmission loop
 26 from Fort Randall through the load centers of Armour,

1 *Huron, Aberdeen, Andover, Watertown, Brookings, Sioux*
2 *Falls, and Gavins Point to Fort Randall, and lines from*
3 *Fort Randall to Winner and from Rapid City to Midland*
4 **(278):** *Provided further, That in order to promote agree-*
5 *ment among the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado*
6 *and to avoid any possible alteration of existing vested water*
7 *rights, no part of this or of any prior appropriation shall be*
8 *used for construction or for further commitment for construc-*
9 *tion of the Glendo unit or any feature thereof, until a definite*
10 *plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the*
11 *States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and approved*
12 *by Congress (279):* *Provided further, That no part of this*
13 *or prior appropriations shall be used for construction, nor for*
14 *further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and*
15 *Reservoir, Montana, or any feature thereof until a definite*
16 *plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the*
17 *States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the*
18 *Congress.*

19 Of the amount appropriated under the preceding para-
20 graph, \$1,600,000 is for liquidation of the contract au-
21 thority granted under the appropriation "Reclamation fund,
22 special fund, construction, Santa Barbara County project,
23 California, Cachuma unit", in the Interior Department
24 Appropriation Act, 1949; \$225,700 is for partial liquida-
25 tion of the contract authority granted under the appropriation
26 "General fund, construction, advances to Colorado River

1 dam fund, Boulder Canyon project (All-American Canal)."
 2 in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950;
 3 \$1,000,000 is for liquidation of the contract authority pro-
 4 vided under the appropriation "General fund, construction,
 5 Fort Sumner project, New Mexico", in the Interior Depart-
 6 ment Appropriation Act, 1950; and \$1,770,000 is for partial
 7 liquidation of the contract authority granted under the appro-
 8 priation "General fund, construction, Missouri River Basin",
 9 in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950.

10 (280) *Such amount of the \$1,300,000 appropriated in the*
 11 *Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, under the*
 12 *heading "Bureau of Reclamation", "General fund, construc-*
 13 *tion", "Fort Peck project, Montana", for the Havre-Shelby*
 14 *transmission line and substations as may be determined by*
 15 *the Secretary of the Interior not to be required for termination*
 16 *of work on these facilities and the meeting of obligations*
 17 *heretofore incurred against said appropriation for such facili-*
 18 *ties shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the*
 19 *Treasury.*

20 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

21 For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects
 22 or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law;
 23 and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands
 24 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pur-
 25 suant to law, \$15,491,000, of which \$12,001,400 shall be
 26 derived from the reclamation fund and \$1,808,000 shall

1 be derived from the Colorado River dam fund: *Provided*,
 2 That funds advanced for operation and maintenance of
 3 reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to
 4 the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the
 5 same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated
 6 herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of
 7 such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the
 8 next succeeding fiscal year.

9 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

10 For necessary expenses of general administration and
 11 related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Recla-
 12 mation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclama-
 13 tion, ~~(281)\$7,000,000~~ \$7,400,000, to be derived from the
 14 reclamation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the
 15 Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377) : *Provided*, That no
 16 part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available
 17 for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year
 18 as general administrative expenses (282): *Provided further*,
 19 *That not exceeding \$150,000 of funds available for expendi-*
 20 *ture under this appropriation shall be used for salaries and*
 21 *expenses in connection with information work.*

22 SPECIAL FUNDS

23 Sums herein referred to as being derived from the recla-
 24 mation fund, the Colorado River dam fund, or the Colorado
 25 River development fund, are appropriated from the special
 26 funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902

1 (43 U. S. C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43
2 U. S. C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U. S. C.
3 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon
4 request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended
5 under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended bal-
6 ances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads
7 "Operation and maintenance" and "General administrative
8 expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special fund
9 from which derived.

10 PRIOR YEAR APPROPRIATIONS

11 Except for the emergency fund established in the First
12 Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, the unexpended bal-
13 ances on June 30, 1950, of sums heretofore appropriated for
14 the Bureau of Reclamation which were made available until
15 expended shall be classified under the corresponding heads
16 herein established, shall be transferred to and merged with
17 the amounts appropriated under those headings, and shall be
18 available for the purposes therein specified.

19 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

20 Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be
21 available for personal services in the District of Columbia;
22 purchase (not to exceed two hundred for replacement only)
23 and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of not to ex-
24 ceed three aircraft for replacement only; printing and binding;
25 ~~(283)~~not to exceed \$75,000 for services as authorized by
26 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 ~~(5 U. S. C. 55a)~~;

1 including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed
 2 \$100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary services
 3 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
 4 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of
 5 \$100 per diem (not exceeding \$100,000 for individuals);
 6 payment of claims for damage to or loss of property,
 7 personal injury, or death arising out of activities of the
 8 Bureau of Reclamation; (284) payment, except as otherwise
 9 provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on
 10 the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as author-
 11 ized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation
 12 and administration of interstate compacts; and, without reim-
 13 bursement or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for
 14 information or evidence concerning violations of law involv-
 15 ing property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclama-
 16 tion; payments to school districts as authorized by law (43
 17 U. S. C. 385a and 618 (a) (e)) (285), including payments
 18 on account of dependents of employees in field offices in project
 19 areas engaged in construction and related activities; per-
 20 formance of the functions specified under the head "Operation
 21 and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclamation, in
 22 the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945 (286), to
 23 be reimbursable to the extent therein provided; preparation
 24 and dissemination of useful information including recordings,
 25 photographs, and photographic prints (287); and studies of
 26 recreational uses of reservoir areas, as authorized by law:

1 *Provided, That funds appropriated for the Bureau of Recla-*
 2 *mation shall be available for expenditure through the facilities*
 3 *of the National Park Service in amounts of not to exceed*
 4 *\$25,000 for any one reservoir area for studies of recrea-*
 5 *tional areas and planning for their utilization, and funds so*
 6 *expended shall not be reimbursable or returnable under the*
 7 *reclamation law (288):* ~~*Provided, That no part of any appro-*~~
 8 ~~*priation made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of*~~
 9 ~~*April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than*~~
 10 ~~*those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects*~~
 11 ~~*except \$7,000,000 under the head "General Administrative*~~
 12 ~~*Expenses" and \$375,000 (\$175,000 for reconnaissance and*~~
 13 ~~*\$200,000 for general engineering and research) under the*~~
 14 ~~*head "General Investigations.":*~~ *Provided further, That, ex-*
 15 *cept as otherwise provided by the Act of April 19, 1945*
 16 *(43 U. S. C. 377), or by any other law, no part of any*
 17 *appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to*
 18 *the said Act of April 19, 1945, for expenses other than those*
 19 *incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except*
 20 *expenses under the head "General administrative expenses"*
 21 *and under the head "General investigations".*

22 Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the
 23 appropriation under the head "Construction and rehabilita-
 24 tion" shall be available additionally for said project for those
 25 functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under
 26 the head "General investigations" (but this authorization

1 shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head
2 within that area), and for the continuation of investigations
3 by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the
4 development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments
5 may be expended through or in cooperation with State and
6 other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are
7 hereby authorized.

8 Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the
9 performance of functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall
10 be reimbursable or returnable to the extent and in the manner
11 provided by law.

12 Any agency of the United States Government having title
13 thereto is authorized to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation,
14 without reimbursement, parts, equipment and supplies for
15 aircraft excess to its needs.

16 No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Recla-
17 mation, contained in this chapter or in any prior Act, which
18 represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but
19 remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose,
20 regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*,
21 That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this
22 paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section 665 of
23 title 31 of the United States Code.

24 No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation
25 for operation and maintenance, except those derived from
26 advances by water users, shall be used for the particular

1 benefit of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation
2 district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization,
3 or (c) of any individual, when such district, organization,
4 or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months in
5 the payment of charges due under a contract entered into
6 with the United States pursuant to laws administered by
7 the Bureau of Reclamation.

8 Not to exceed 12 per centum of the construction allot-
9 ment made by the Bureau of Reclamation for any project
10 from the appropriation "Construction and Rehabilitation"
11 contained in this chapter shall be available for construction
12 work by force account or on a hired-labor basis; except that
13 not to exceed \$225,000 may on approval of the Commis-
14 sioner be expended for construction work by force account
15 on any one project or Missouri Basin unit when the work
16 is unsuitable for contract or when excessive bids are received;
17 and except in cases of emergencies local in character, so
18 declared by the Commissioner.

19 APPROPRIATION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS

20 There are hereby appropriated from the reclamation
21 fund such sums as may be necessary after June 30, 1950,
22 to make payments, to the extent authorized by the Act of
23 May 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 273), to the Farmers' Irrigation
24 District on behalf of the Northport Irrigation District
25 (North Platte project, Nebraska-Wyoming) for water car-

1 riage in accordance with contracts entered into pursuant to
2 said Act.

3 REFUNDS AND RETURNS

4 There are hereby appropriated such amounts as may be
5 necessary after June 30, 1950, for the Bureau of Reclama-
6 tion to refund overcollections, and to return deposits in
7 excess of amounts applied to the purposes for which the
8 deposits were accepted, each such refund or return to be
9 derived from the account into which such overcollection or
10 deposit shall have been covered.

11 (289) TRANSFER OF EPHRATA AIR FORCE BASE

12 *For the purpose of assisting in the construction, opera-*
13 *tion, and maintenance, and settlement programs on the*
14 *Columbia Basin project in the State of Washington, the*
15 *Armed Services, General Services Administration, or other*
16 *Federal agency having ownership or custody thereof or*
17 *interest therein, is authorized and directed to transfer to*
18 *the Bureau of Reclamation, without reimbursement or trans-*
19 *fer of funds, all of their right, title, and interest to certain*
20 *buildings, facilities, and equipment at the Ephrata Air*
21 *Force Base, Ephrata, Washington, including the following*
22 *buildings in accordance with block and building numbers:*
23 *Block 800, building numbered 68; block 1900, buildings*
24 *numbered 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17; block 2000, four*
25 *buildings numbered 75, two buildings numbered 56; block*

1 3000, buildings numbered 56, 131, 58; block 2900, buildings
 2 numbered 59, 53, 55, 57, 66, 89, 90, 85, 84, 124, 141,
 3 two buildings numbered 60, two buildings numbered 64, two
 4 buildings numbered 65; block 3300, eleven buildings num-
 5 bered 28; block 3400, seven buildings numbered 28; block
 6 3500, buildings numbered 43, 46; block 3600, buildings
 7 numbered 34, 35, 36, 38, two buildings numbered 37; block
 8 3700, buildings numbered 35, 38, four buildings numbered
 9 31, two buildings numbered 32, two buildings numbered 34,
 10 two buildings numbered 37; block 3800, buildings numbered
 11 35, 38, 39, 42, two buildings numbered 37; block 4300,
 12 buildings numbered 19, 20, 21, 22; block 4400, buildings
 13 numbered 113, 114, two buildings numbered 112; block
 14 4600, buildings numbered 134; block 4700, buildings num-
 15 bered 94, 95, 96, 99, 109, 100, 35, 108, 104, 110, six
 16 buildings numbered 97; block 4800, buildings numbered 53,
 17 40, 102, 101, 103, 105, 107, 111, two buildings numbered
 18 32, five buildings numbered 106, three buildings numbered
 19 98, together with one sewage-disposal plant numbered 116,
 20 one water tank numbered 115, one well, one flag pole num-
 21 bered 118, two garbage racks numbered 155, two garbage
 22 racks numbered 158, one wash rack numbered 63, two
 23 grease racks numbered 62, and sewer system, water lines,
 24 electric-power lines, railroad spur and siding, road improve-

1 *ments, and all other facilities and equipment incident to the*
 2 *foregoing property, and including land and rights-of-way*
 3 *formerly under Reclamation withdrawal to other federally*
 4 *owned land on which said buildings are situate, which have*
 5 *heretofore or which may hereafter be declared surplus to the*
 6 *needs of the Armed Forces.*

7 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

8 SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

9 For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to per-
 10 form surveys, investigations, and research covering topog-
 11 raphy, geology, and the mineral and water resources of
 12 the United States, its territories and possessions; classify
 13 lands as to mineral character and water and power resources;
 14 give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal
 15 Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations
 16 applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits,
 17 licenses, and operating contracts; and publish and disseminate
 18 data relative to the foregoing activities; ~~(290)~~\$19,129,000
 19 \$19,382,000, of which \$3,100,000 shall be available only for
 20 cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources
 21 investigations: *Provided*, That the share of the Geological
 22 Survey in any topographic mapping or water resources in-
 23 vestigations carried on in cooperation with any State or
 24 municipality shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost
 25 thereof.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

1 The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey
2 shall be available for personal services in the District of
3 Columbia; purchase (not to exceed one hundred and twenty-
4 nine, of which eighty-five shall be for replacement only) and
5 hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, in-
6 cluding purchase of reprints; reimbursement of the General
7 Services Administration for security guard service for pro-
8 tection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing
9 of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or
10 other specialized surveys when it is administratively deter-
11 mined that such procedures are in the public interest; con-
12 struction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appur-
13 tenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging stations;
14 and payment of compensation and expenses (not to exceed
15 \$10,000) of the person appointed by the President to par-
16 ticipate as the representative of the United States in the
17 administration of the compact consented to by the Act of
18 May 31, 1949 (Public Law 82) : *Provided*, That notwith-
19 standing the provisions of any other law, the President is
20 authorized to appoint a retired officer as such representative,
21 without prejudice to his status as a retired Army officer, and
22 he shall receive such compensation and expenses in addition
23 to his retired pay.

1 BUREAU OF MINES
2 CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL
3 RESOURCES

4 For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation,
5 exploration, development, production, and utilization of
6 mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its
7 Territories, and possessions; developing synthetics and sub-
8 stitutes; producing and distributing helium; and controlling
9 fires in inactive coal deposits on public lands, and on private
10 lands, with the consent of the owner; ~~(291)~~ \$17,758,000
11 \$17,813,403: *Provided*, That the Secretary is hereby author-
12 ized and directed to make suitable arrangements with owners
13 of private property or with a State or its subdivisions for
14 payment in the current fiscal year of a sum equal to not less
15 than one-half the amount of expenditure to be made for con-
16 trol or extinguishment of fires in inactive coal deposits from
17 funds provided under the authorization of this Act except that
18 expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose in any pri-
19 vately owned operating coal mine shall be limited to in-
20 vestigation and supervision ~~(292)~~: *Provided further, That*
21 *the Director of the Bureau of Mines, for the purpose of the*
22 *project now in progress under this appropriation on chromite*
23 *deposits near Nye, Montana, is authorized to reacquire for*
24 *the Government certain land, buildings, and other facilities*
25 *essential to the conduct of that project and known as Plancor*
26 *587, at a price not to exceed \$55,403.*

HEALTH AND SAFETY

For expenses necessary for promotion of health and safety in mines and in the minerals industries as authorized by law, \$3,805,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, to remain available until expended, ~~(293)\$1,372,600~~ \$1,268,100, of which not to exceed \$550,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under the heads "Anthracite research laboratory" and "Drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colorado", in The Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950: *Provided*, That unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made, including unused balances of related contract authorizations, under the heads, "Synthetic liquid fuels", "Drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colorado", "Lignite research laboratory", and "Anthracite research laboratory" shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Mines, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$1,300,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Mines may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed ~~(294)one hundred and~~

1 ~~forty-five~~ *one hundred and fifty, of which one hundred and*
2 *forty-five shall be* for replacement only) and hire of passenger
3 motor vehicles; printing and binding, including purchase of
4 reprints; providing transportation services in isolated areas
5 for employees, student dependents of employees, and other
6 pupils, and such activities may be financed under coopera-
7 tive arrangements; temporary and emergency contracts for
8 personal services and employment of persons without regard
9 to civil-service regulations as required in the conduct of
10 programs for the control of fires in inactive coal deposits
11 and flood prevention in anthracite mines; purchase and
12 bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine
13 rescue and first-aid work: *Provided*, That the Secretary
14 is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment and other
15 contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute
16 projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State,
17 or private: *Provided further*, That power produced in the
18 operation of the power plant of the Bureau of Mines at
19 Louisiana, Missouri, in excess of the Bureau's needs may
20 be sold to non-Federal purchasers, but the expenses of the
21 Bureau in the production and sale of such excess power
22 shall not exceed the total amount of such sales, and expendi-
23 tures for the production of excess power shall not be deemed
24 a charge against the total appropriations authorized by the
25 Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, as amended: *Provided further*,
26 That the sums made available for the current fiscal year in

1 the Act making appropriations for the Departments of the
2 Army, Navy, and Air Force for the acquisition of helium
3 from the Bureau of Mines shall be transferred to the Bureau
4 of Mines on July 1 of said fiscal year: *Provided further,*
5 That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current
6 fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government
7 agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral prod-
8 uct that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by
9 the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall
10 be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

11 (295) *The Veterans' Administration is authorized to transfer*
12 *to the Department of the Interior, for the use of the Bureau*
13 *of Mines, without compensation therefor, full jurisdiction,*
14 *possession, and control of a parcel of forty-three acres, more*
15 *or less, within the boundaries of the Fort Snelling Govern-*
16 *ment Reservation in Hennepin County, Minnesota.*

17 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

18 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

19 For expenses necessary for the management and protec-
20 tion of the areas and facilities administered by the National
21 Park Service, including protection of lands in process of
22 condemnation; and for plans, investigations, and studies of
23 the recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of de-
24 tailed plans and working drawings) and archaeological
25 values in river basins of the United States (except the Mis-
26 souri River Basin); \$7,688,700: *Provided, That the unex-*

tion of a public information building in the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, North Dakota: Provided, That the unexpended balances of prior year appropriations, including unused balances of related contract authorizations, for the foregoing purposes, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation (300): Provided further, That not to exceed \$150,000 of the funds available for the Independence National Historical Park, Pennsylvania, shall be available after January 1, 1951, for the management, protection, maintenance, and rehabilitation of Independence Hall, grounds, and structures in that Park.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the National Park Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, (301) ~~\$1,264,500~~ \$1,314,500.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed nineteen, of which sixteen shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding; cleaning and repair of uniforms for National Capital Parks police and guards; and the objects and purposes specified in the Act of August 7, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 17j-2).

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; purchase or rent of land, and functions related to wildlife management in California (16 U. S. C. 695-695c); ~~(302)~~ *and not to exceed \$30,000 for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service; (303) ~~\$7,157,000~~ \$7,082,000.*

INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies and investigations respecting conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, including related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such studies and investigations; and the performance of other functions related thereto; as authorized by law; ~~(304)~~ ~~\$3,900,000~~ \$4,125,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other

1 facilities required in the conservation, management, pro-
 2 tection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources and
 3 the acquisition of lands and interests therein, including
 4 continuing the construction of fish cultural facilities on lands
 5 owned by the State of South Dakota; to remain available
 6 until expended, ~~(305)\$2,401,000~~ \$2,423,500, of which not
 7 to exceed \$50,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred
 8 pursuant to authority granted under the head "Investiga-
 9 tions respecting food fishes" in the Interior Department
 10 Appropriation Act, 1950.

11 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

12 For expenses necessary for general administration of the
 13 Fish and Wildlife Service, including such expenses in the
 14 regional offices, \$917,500.

15 FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION

16 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of Sep-
 17 tember 2, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 669-669j),
 18 amounts equal to the sums credited during the next preceding
 19 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter to the special fund
 20 created by said Act.

21 MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION FUND

22 ~~(306)~~For carrying into effect section 4 of the Act of March
 23 16, 1934, as amended (16 U. S. C. 718-718h), an amount
 24 equal to the sum received during the current fiscal year

1 from the proceeds from the sale of stamps, to be warranted
2 monthly and to remain available until expended.

3 *For carrying into effect section 4 of the Act of March*
4 *16, 1934, as amended (16 U. S. C. 718-718h), amounts*
5 *equal to the sums received during the current year and each*
6 *fiscal year thereafter from the proceeds from the sale of*
7 *stamps, to be warranted monthly and to remain available*
8 *until expended.*

9 MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES

10 For management of national wildlife refuges, including
11 the construction, improvement, repair, and alteration of
12 buildings, roads, and other facilities, and enforcement of the
13 Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918, as amended
14 (16 U. S. C. 703-711), amounts equal to 75 per centum
15 of the net proceeds received during the next preceding fiscal
16 year and each fiscal year thereafter under the provisions of
17 section 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 715s),
18 to remain available until expended.

19 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

20 Appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service shall be
21 available for personal services in the District of Columbia;
22 purchase (not to exceed ninety, of which sixty shall be for
23 replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;
24 purchase (not to exceed ten, of which six shall be for replace-

ment only) of aircraft; printing and binding, including purchase of reprints; publication and distribution of bulletins as authorized by law (7 U. S. C. 417); rations or commutation of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates not to exceed \$2 per man per day; repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are not inconsistent with their primary purposes; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service and to which the United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant to law in connection with management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources.

TERRITORIES AND ISLAND POSSESSIONS

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and possessions under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the Offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam, and the Government of the Virgin Islands, including the agricultural station; compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska and Hawaii; compensation of members of

1 the Supreme Court and the legislature in Guam; care of
 2 insane as authorized by law for Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46-
 3 50) ; grants to the Virgin Islands and Guam, in addition to
 4 current local revenues, for support of governmental functions;
 5 personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and
 6 utilities necessary in the operation of the several Governors'
 7 houses; and personal services in the District of Columbia;
 8 ~~(307)\$2,329,500~~ \$3,392,180: *Provided*, That the territorial
 9 and local governments of the Virgin Islands and Guam are
 10 authorized to make purchases for their public institutions
 11 through the General Services Administration.

12 CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS, ALASKA

13 For construction of roads, tramways, buildings, ferries,
 14 bridges, and trails, including surveys and plans for new road
 15 construction; acquisition of lands or interests in lands by pur-
 16 chase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise; to remain avail-
 17 able until expended, ~~(308)\$20,400,000~~ \$18,883,212, of which
 18 not to exceed \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations in-
 19 curred pursuant to authority previously granted; and, in addi-
 20 tion, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the
 21 purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed
 22 \$8,000,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of prior
 23 year appropriations, including unused balances of related
 24 contract authorizations, for the foregoing purposes, shall be
 25 transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

1 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS, ALASKA

2 For operation and maintenance of roads, tramways,
3 buildings, ferries, bridges, and trails, \$2,600,000.

4 The total of the amounts appropriated for construction,
5 operation and maintenance of roads in Alaska shall be
6 available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein
7 made for operation and maintenance shall be available only
8 for the service of the current fiscal year.

9 (309)CLAIMS, ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION

10 *For payment of claims certified by the Comptroller Gen-*
11 *eral of the United States to be due for overtime compensation*
12 *earned in 1945 and prior fiscal years under the provisions*
13 *of section 23 of the Act of March 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 522),*
14 *\$12,893, to remain available until June 30, 1952: Pro-*
15 *vided, That no part of the amount received by any claimant*
16 *in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered*
17 *to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services*
18 *rendered in connection with any such claim, and the same*
19 *shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstand-*
20 *ing, and any person violating this provision shall be deemed*
21 *guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall*
22 *be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

23 CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA RAILROAD

24 For the authorized work of the Alaska Railroad, in-
25 cluding improvements and new construction, to remain

1 available until expended, ~~(310)\$31,000,000~~ \$28,700,000, of
 2 which not to exceed \$17,000,000 is for liquidation of obliga-
 3 tions incurred pursuant to authority granted in the Interior
 4 Department Appropriation Act, 1950: *Provided*, That funds
 5 appropriated under this head may be transferred to the Alaska
 6 Railroad Special Fund for purposes of accounting and ad-
 7 ministration.

8 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA RAILROAD

9 The Alaska Railroad Special Fund shall continue avail-
 10 able until expended for the work authorized by law, including
 11 personal services in the District of Columbia; operation of
 12 facilities under the jurisdiction of the railroad in Mount
 13 McKinley National Park; operation and maintenance of
 14 oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or
 15 arrangement with other branches of the Government service,
 16 for the purpose of providing additional facilities for trans-
 17 portation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed neces-
 18 sary for the benefit and development of industries or travel
 19 in the area served; and payment of compensation and
 20 expenses as authorized by section 42 of the Act of September
 21 7, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein pro-
 22 vided: *Provided*, That no one other than the general manager
 23 of said railroad, and one assistant general manager at not
 24 to exceed \$13,000 per annum, shall be paid an annual salary
 25 out of said fund of more than \$11,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for Territories and island possessions shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles and printing and binding.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 102. Appropriations made in this chapter shall be available for the purchase of station wagons without such vehicles being considered as passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, aliens may be employed during the current fiscal year in the field service of the Department for periods of not more than thirty days in cases of emergency caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage.

SEC. 104. Appropriations in this chapter available for travel expenses shall be available, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, for expenses of attendance of officers and employees at meetings or conventions of members of societies or associations concerned with the work of the bureau or office for which the appropriation concerned is made.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made in this chapter shall be available, with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement or repair of buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes:

1 *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this
2 authority until funds specifically made available to the
3 Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been
4 exhausted.

5 SEC. 106. The Secretary may authorize the use of any
6 appropriation in this chapter, in addition to the amounts
7 included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for
8 the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range
9 fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Depart-
10 ment of the Interior: *Provided*, That appropriations made
11 in this chapter for fire suppression purposes shall be avail-
12 able for the payment of obligations incurred during the
13 preceding fiscal year.

14 SEC. 107. Appropriations made in this chapter shall be
15 available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and
16 similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will
17 contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations
18 shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other
19 activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of
20 June 30, 1932 (31 U. S. C. 686): *Provided*, That reim-
21 bursements for cost of supplies, materials and equipment,
22 and for services rendered may be credited to the appro-
23 priation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

24 SEC. 108. Appropriations made in this chapter shall be
25 available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act

1 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) when authorized by
2 the Secretary; maintenance and operation of aircraft; exami-
3 nation of estimates of appropriations in the field; payment
4 for telephone service in private residences in the field, when
5 authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary;
6 health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C.
7 150) ; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C.
8 2672) ; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the
9 Secretary, for library membership in societies or associa-
10 tions which issue publications to members only or at a price
11 to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

12 SEC. 109. During the current fiscal year the head of any
13 Department or establishment of the Government having funds
14 available for scientific and technical investigations within the
15 scope of the functions of the Department of the Interior may,
16 with the approval of the Secretary, transfer to the Depart-
17 ment such sums as may be necessary therefor, which sums so
18 transferred may be expended for the same objects and in the
19 same manner as sums appropriated herein but without their
20 limitations.

21 SEC. 110. Transfers to the Department of the Interior,
22 pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Serv-
23 ices Act of 1949, of equipment, material and supplies, excess
24 to the needs of Federal agencies may be made at the request
25 of the Secretary without reimbursement or transfer of funds

1 when required by the Department for operations conducted
2 in Territories and island possessions.

3 TITLE II—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

4 GRANTS

5 For payment to the Virgin Islands Corporation in the
6 form of grants, \$474,000, for estimated losses to be sus-
7 tained during the fiscal years 1950 and 1951, as authorized
8 by section 8 (a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act, in
9 the conduct of activities budgeted as predominantly revenue
10 producing.

11 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

12 During the current fiscal year the Virgin Islands Cor-
13 poration is hereby authorized to make such expenditures,
14 within the limits of funds available to it and in accord with
15 law, and to make such contracts and commitments without
16 regard to fiscal-year limitations as provided by section 104
17 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended,
18 as may be necessary in carrying out its programs as set forth
19 in the budget for the fiscal year 1951: *Provided*, That not
20 to exceed \$121,480 shall be available for administrative
21 expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the Cor-
22 poration, covering the categories set forth in the 1951
23 Budget estimates for such expenses.

24 This chapter may be cited as the "Interior Department
25 Appropriation Act, 1951".

1 CHAPTER VIII—EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT

2 OFFICES

3 TITLE I

4 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

5 COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

6 For compensation of the President, including an expense
7 allowance at the rate of \$50,000 per annum, as authorized
8 by the Act of January 19, 1949 (Public Law 2), \$150,000.

9 THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for The
11 White House Office, including personal services in the District
12 of Columbia; printing and binding; not to exceed \$100,000
13 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
14 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at such per diem rates for
15 individuals as the President may specify, and other personal
16 services without regard to the provisions of law regulating
17 the employment and compensation of persons in the Govern-
18 ment service; and travel and official entertainment expenses
19 of the President, to be accounted for solely on his cer-
20 tificate; \$1,585,553.

1 EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT

2 To provide for emergencies affecting the national interest
3 or security, without regard to such provisions of law regu-
4 lating the expenditure of Government funds as the President
5 may specify, and for supplementing the efforts and available
6 resources of State and local governments or other agencies
7 in alleviating hardship or suffering caused by flood, fire,
8 hurricane, earthquake, or other catastrophe in any part of
9 the United States, \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That assistance in
10 alleviating hardship or suffering caused by such a catastrophe
11 may be rendered through such agency or agencies as the
12 President may designate and in such manner as he shall
13 determine, without regard to such provisions of law regu-
14 lating the expenditure of Government funds or the employ-
15 ment of persons in the Government service as he shall
16 specify, whenever he finds that such a catastrophe is of
17 sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant emergency
18 assistance by the Federal Government in alleviating hard-
19 ship or suffering caused thereby, and if the Governor of any
20 State in which such a catastrophe shall occur shall certify
21 that such assistance is required, and shall have entered into
22 an agreement with such agency of the Government as the
23 President may designate, giving assurance of expenditure of
24 a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such
25 State, local governments therein, or other agencies, for the

1 same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe:
 2 *Provided further*, That within any affected area Federal
 3 agencies are authorized to participate in any such emergency
 4 assistance: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropria-
 5 tion which may be allocated for alleviating hardship or
 6 suffering caused by a catastrophe shall be expended for
 7 departmental personal services or for permanent construc-
 8 tion: *And provided further*, That no part of this appropria-
 9 tion shall be available for allocation to finance a function or
 10 project for which function or project a budget estimate of
 11 appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the
 12 Eighty-first Congress or the first session of the Eighty-second
 13 Congress and such appropriation denied after consideration
 14 thereof by the Senate or House of Representatives or by
 15 the Committee on Appropriations of either body.

16 EXECUTIVE MANSION AND GROUNDS

17 For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refur-
 18 nishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including
 19 electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion and
 20 the Executive Mansion grounds, and traveling expenses, to
 21 be expended as the President may determine, notwith-
 22 standing the provisions of any other Act, \$266,000.

23 BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

24 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 25 Bureau of the Budget, personal services in the District of

1 Columbia and elsewhere; exchange of books; newspapers
 2 and periodicals (not exceeding \$200); teletype news serv-
 3 ice (not exceeding \$900); printing and binding; not to
 4 exceed \$20,000 for services as authorized by section 15
 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates
 6 not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals; a health service
 7 program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and the
 8 payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672);
 9 ~~(311)\$3,386,000~~ \$3,412,000.

10 COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

11 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the
 12 Council in carrying out its functions under the Employment
 13 Act of 1946 (15 U. S. C. 1021), including personal serv-
 14 ices in the District of Columbia; travel expenses; purchase
 15 of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; print-
 16 ing and binding; newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding
 17 \$200); press clippings (not exceeding \$300); a health
 18 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150);
 19 and payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C.
 20 2672); \$300,000.

21 OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

22 PHILIPPINE ALIEN PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION

23 Administrative expenses, Philippine Alien Property
 24 Administration: The Philippine Alien Property Adminis-
 25 trator is hereby authorized to pay out of any funds or other

1 property or interest vested in him or transferred to him,
2 necessary expenses incurred in carrying out the powers and
3 duties conferred on him pursuant to the Trading With the
4 Enemy Act, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.), and the
5 Philippine Property Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 418) : *Provided*,
6 That not to exceed ~~(312)\$160,000~~ \$215,500 shall be avail-
7 able for the current fiscal year for the general administrative
8 expenses of the Philippine Alien Property Administration;
9 printing and binding; rent of private or Government-
10 owned space in the District of Columbia; employment
11 outside the United States of persons without regard
12 to the civil service and classification laws including services
13 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
14 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; personal services in the District of
15 Columbia and expenses of attendance at meetings of organ-
16 izations concerned with the work of the agency: *Provided*
17 *further*, That on or before November 1 of the current fiscal
18 year the Philippine Alien Property Administrator shall
19 make a report to the Appropriations Committees of the
20 Senate and the House of Representatives giving detailed
21 information on all administrative and nonadministrative
22 expenses incurred during the next preceding fiscal year,
23 in connection with the activities of the Philippine Alien
24 Property Administration: *Provided further*, That the Philip-
25 pine Alien Property Administration shall cease to exist after

1 June 30, 1951, and all duties being performed by such
 2 Administration as of that date shall be transferred to the
 3 Office of Alien Property Custodian, including all records,
 4 files, and other property.

5 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

6 AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

7 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, as
 8 authorized by the Act of June 26, 1946 (36 U. S. C. 121,
 9 123-132, 138), including the acquisition of land or interest
 10 in land in foreign countries; personal services in the District
 11 of Columbia; purchase and repair of uniforms for caretakers
 12 of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United
 13 States and its Territories and possessions at a cost not exceed-
 14 ing \$4,845; travel expenses; rent of office and garage space
 15 in foreign countries; the purchase of one passenger motor
 16 vehicle; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign coun-
 17 tries when required by law of such countries; and printing,
 18 binding, engraving, lithographing, photographing, and type-
 19 writing; (313)~~\$695,000~~ \$670,000: *Provided*, That where
 20 station allowance has been authorized by the Department
 21 of the Army for officers of the Army serving the Army at
 22 certain foreign stations, the same allowance shall be author-
 23 ized for officers of the armed forces assigned to the Commis-
 24 sion while serving at the same foreign stations, and this
 25 appropriation is hereby made available for the payment of

1 such allowance: *Provided further*, That when traveling on
 2 business of the Commission, officers of the armed forces serv-
 3 ing as members or as secretary of the Commission may be
 4 reimbursed for expenses as provided for civilian members
 5 of the Commission.

6 Construction of memorials and cemeteries: For the per-
 7 manent design and construction of memorials and cemeteries
 8 in foreign countries as authorized by the Act of June 26,
 9 1946 (36 U. S. C. 121, 123-132, 138), and the Act of
 10 August 5, 1947 (50 U. S. C. 1819), and personal services
 11 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, ~~(314)~~~~\$8,680,000~~
 12 \$8,500,000, of which \$5,000,000 is for payment of obliga-
 13 tions incurred under authority provided under this head in
 14 the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, to remain
 15 available until expended; and in addition the Commission
 16 is authorized to enter into contracts in the amount of
 17 \$1,500,000 for the purposes of this appropriation.

18 ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

19 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes
 20 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, including personal
 21 services in the District of Columbia and employment of
 22 aliens; purchase of land and interests in land; services
 23 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
 24 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of not to exceed one hundred
 25 and fifty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only;

1 purchase, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; printing
2 and binding; health service program as authorized by law
3 (5 U. S. C. 150) ; publication and dissemination of atomic
4 information; payment of tort claims pursuant to law; pur-
5 chase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; purchase of news-
6 papers and periodicals (not to exceed \$8,000) and travel ex-
7 penses; official entertainment expenses (not to exceed
8 \$5,000) ; reimbursement of the General Services Administra-
9 tion for security guard services; and payment of obligations
10 incurred under prior year contract authorizations; \$647,820,-
11 000, together with the unexpended balances, as of June 30,
12 1950, of prior year appropriations to the Atomic Energy
13 Commission, of which amounts \$100,000 may be expended
14 for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case
15 the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the
16 expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify
17 the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher
18 for the sum therein expressed to have been expended; from
19 which appropriation transfers of sums may be made to
20 other agencies of the Government for the performance of
21 the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such
22 cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the
23 appropriation to which transferred; and in addition to the
24 amount herein provided, the Commission is authorized
25 to contract for the purposes of this appropriation during

1 the current fiscal year in an amount not exceeding
2 \$300,150,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropria-
3 tion shall be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee
4 (except such officers and employees whose compensation
5 is fixed by law, and scientific and technical personnel)
6 whose position would be subject to the Classification Act
7 of 1923, as amended, if such Act were applicable to such
8 position, at a rate in excess of the rate payable under such
9 Act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility:
10 *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation or
11 contract authorization shall be used—

12 (A) to start any new construction project for
13 which an estimate was not included in the budget for
14 the current fiscal year;

15 (B) to start any new construction project the cur-
16 rently estimated cost of which exceeds the estimated
17 cost included therefor in such budget; or

18 (C) to continue any community facility construc-
19 tion project whenever the currently estimated cost
20 thereof exceeds the estimated cost included therefor in
21 such budget;

22 unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically
23 approves the start of such construction project or its continu-
24 ation and a detailed explanation thereof is submitted forth-

1 with by the Director to the Appropriations Committees of
2 the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Joint
3 Committee on Atomic Energy; the limitations contained in
4 this proviso shall not apply to any construction project the
5 total estimated cost of which does not exceed \$500,000;
6 and, as used herein, the term "construction project" includes
7 the purchase, alteration, or improvement of buildings, and
8 the term "budget" includes the detailed justification support-
9 ing the budget estimates: *Provided further*, That whenever
10 the current estimate to complete any construction project
11 (except community facilities) exceeds by 15 per centum
12 the estimated cost included therefor in such budget or the
13 estimated cost of a construction project covered by clause
14 (A) of the foregoing proviso which has been approved by
15 the Director, the Commission shall forthwith submit a de-
16 tailed explanation thereof to the Director of the Bureau of
17 the Budget and the Committees on Appropriations of the
18 Senate and of the House of Representatives and the Joint
19 Committee on Atomic Energy: *Provided further*, That the
20 two foregoing provisos shall have no application with re-
21 spect to technical and production facilities (1) if the Com-
22 mission certifies to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget
23 that immediate construction or immediate continuation of
24 construction is necessary to the national defense and security,
25 and (2) if the Director agrees that such certification is justi-

1 filed (315):~~Provided further,~~ That no part of the foregoing
 2 appropriation or contract authorization shall be used in connec-
 3 tion with the payment of any contractor or firm of contractors
 4 engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts
 5 at any installation of the Commission, where the fee for
 6 community management is at a rate in excess of \$90,000
 7 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system
 8 where the fee is at a rate in excess of \$45,000 per annum.

9 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

10 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including
 11 personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed
 12 \$28,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the
 13 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; not to exceed
 14 \$10,000 for medical examinations performed for veterans by
 15 private physicians on a fee basis; travel expenses of examiners
 16 acting under the direction of the Commission, and expenses of
 17 examinations and investigations held in Washington and else-
 18 where; payment in advance for library membership in societies
 19 whose publications are available to members only or to mem-
 20 bers at a price lower than to the general public; printing and
 21 binding; not to exceed (316)\$50,000 \$80,000 for perform-
 22 ing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of
 23 July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767) ; reimbursement of the General
 24 Services Administration for security guard services for pro-
 25 tection of confidential files; a health service program as

1 authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ; payment of tort claims
2 pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) ; and not to exceed \$5,000
3 for actuarial services by contract, without regard to section
4 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended; ~~(317)\$15,261,913~~
5 \$15,761,913: *Provided*, That no details from any executive
6 department or independent establishment in the District of
7 Columbia or elsewhere to the Commission's central office
8 in Washington or to any of its regional offices shall be made
9 during the current fiscal year, but this shall not affect the
10 making of details for service as members of the boards of
11 examiners outside the immediate offices of the Commission
12 in Washington or of the regional directors, nor shall it affect
13 the making of details of persons qualified to serve as expert
14 examiners on special subjects: *Provided further*, That the
15 Civil Service Commission shall have power in case of
16 emergency to transfer or detail any of its employees to or
17 from its office or field force: *Provided further*, That mem-
18 bers of the Loyalty Review Board in Washington and of
19 the regional loyalty boards in the field may be paid actual
20 transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of sub-
21 sistence authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949
22 while traveling on official business away from their homes
23 or regular places of business, and while en route to
24 and from and at the place where their services are to be
25 performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in section 281

1 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of
2 the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99) shall be deemed to
3 apply to any person because of his appointment for part-time
4 or intermittent service as a member of the Loyalty Review
5 Board or a regional loyalty board in the Civil Service Com-
6 mission.

7 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
8 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and
9 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining
10 and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission,
11 established pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 9358
12 of July 1, 1943, or for the compensation or expenses of
13 any member of a board of examiners (1) who has not
14 made affidavit that he has not appeared in any agency
15 proceeding within the preceding two years, and will not
16 thereafter while a board member appear in any agency
17 proceeding, as a party, or in behalf of a party to the pro-
18 ceeding, before an agency in which an applicant is em-
19 ployed who has been rated or will be rated by such member;
20 or (2) who, after making such affidavit, has rated an
21 applicant who at the time of the rating is employed by an
22 agency before which the board member has appeared as
23 a party, or in behalf of a party, within the preceding two
24 years: *Provided*, That the definitions of "agency", "agency

1 proceeding” and “party” in section 2 of the Administrative
2 Procedure Act shall apply to these terms as used herein.

3 No part of appropriations herein shall be used to pay
4 the compensation of officers and employees of the Civil
5 Service Commission who allocate or reallocate supervisory
6 positions in the classified civil service solely on the size
7 of the group, section, bureau, or other organization unit,
8 or on the number of subordinates supervised. References
9 to size of the group, section, bureau, or other organization
10 unit or the number of subordinates supervised may be given
11 effect only to the extent warranted by the work load of
12 such organization unit and then only in combination with
13 other factors, such as the kind, difficulty, and complexity
14 of work supervised, the degree and scope of responsibility
15 delegated to the supervisor, and the kind, degree, and value
16 of the supervision actually exercised.

17 Panama Canal construction annuity fund: For pay-
18 ment of annuities authorized by the Act of May 29, 1944, as
19 amended (48 U. S. C. 1373a), \$2,803,177.

20 Civil-service retirement and disability fund: For financ-
21 ing the liability of the United States, created by the Act
22 approved May 22, 1920, and Acts amendatory thereof (5
23 U. S. C. chap. 14), \$305,000,000, which amount shall be
24 placed to the credit of the “civil-service retirement and dis-
25 ability fund”.

1 COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE
2 EXECUTIVE MANSION

3 For all expenses of the Commission on Renovation of the
4 Executive Mansion as authorized by Public Law 40, Eighty-
5 first Congress, ~~(318)\$20,000~~ \$50,000, together with not
6 exceeding \$30,000 of the unobligated balances of funds appro-
7 priated for such purpose in the Third Deficiency Appropriation
8 Act, 1949, and the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act,
9 1950.

10 DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

11 ~~(319)Displaced Persons Commission:~~ For expenses necessary
12 to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act
13 of 1948 (Public Law 774, approved June 25, 1948), in-
14 cluding personal services and rents in the District of
15 Columbia; travel expenses, including travel expenses outside
16 continental United States without regard to the Standardized
17 Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and the rates
18 of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act
19 of 1926, as amended; hire of passenger motor vehicles; print-
20 ing and binding, including printing and binding outside the
21 continental limits of the United States without regard to sec-
22 tion 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111);
23 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
24 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to

1 law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as auther-
2 ized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; and
3 payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; \$455,100:
4 *Provided*, That allocations may be made from this appropri-
5 ation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the
6 Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independ-
7 ent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for
8 the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures
9 may be made under the specific authority herein contained
10 or under the authority governing the activities of the de-
11 partment, agency, corporation, or independent establishment
12 to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further*, That the
13 Commission may enter into agreements with governmental
14 and private agencies and may make payment in advance or
15 by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in
16 rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the
17 purposes of this Act.

18 *Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary*
19 *to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of*
20 *1948, as amended by the Act of June 16, 1950. (Public*
21 *Law 555), including personal services and rents in the*
22 *District of Columbia; travel expenses without regard to the*
23 *Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended,*
24 *and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence*
25 *Expense Act of 1926, as amended; purchase (not to exceed*

1 three), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and
2 binding, including printing and binding outside the conti-
3 nental limits of the United States without regard to section 11
4 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); expenses
5 incident to the primary and secondary education of Ameri-
6 can children who are dependents of Government personnel
7 paid from this appropriation and stationed overseas; serv-
8 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
9 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant
10 to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as au-
11 thorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens;
12 and payment of rent in foreign countries in advance;
13 \$9,000,000: Provided, That allocations may be made from
14 this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the
15 Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corpora-
16 tion, or independent establishment of the Government for
17 direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation,
18 and any such expenditures may be made under the specific
19 authority herein contained or under the authority governing
20 the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or inde-
21 pendent establishment to which amounts are allocated: Pro-
22 vided further, That the Commission may enter into agree-
23 ments with international, governmental, and private agencies
24 and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for

1 *expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance*
2 *to the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this Act.*

3 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

4 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in per-
5 forming the duties imposed by the Communications Act
6 of 1934, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1064), the
7 Ship Act of 1910, approved June 24, 1910, as amended
8 (46 U. S. C. 484-487), the International Radiotelegraphic
9 Convention (45 Stat., pt. 2, p. 2760), Executive Order
10 3513, dated July 9, 1921, as amended under date of June
11 30, 1934, relating to applications for submarine cable
12 licenses, and the radiotelegraphy provisions of the Conven-
13 tion for Promoting Safety of Life at Sea, ratified by the
14 President July 7, 1936, including personal services in the
15 District of Columbia, contract stenographic reporting serv-
16 ices, special counsel fees, health service program as authorized
17 by law (5 U. S. C. 150), payment of tort claims pursuant to
18 law (28 U. S. C. 2672), improvement and care of grounds
19 and repairs to buildings (not to exceed \$17,500), purchase of
20 not to exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles for replace-
21 ment only, travel expenses (not to exceed \$93,000), and
22 printing and binding, \$6,625,000, of which \$25,000 shall be
23 available only for services as authorized by section 15 of the
24 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), for a survey as to
25 ways and means of expediting business: *Provided, That*

1 funds appropriated under this paragraph may be used for
 2 application processing and hearings in connection with broad-
 3 cast activities and for application processing in connection
 4 with safety and special services without regard to the
 5 apportionment of funds required by the Act of February 27,
 6 1906 (31 U. S. C. 665).

7 FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

8 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 9 work of the Commission, not otherwise provided for, as
 10 authorized by law, including personal services in the District
 11 of Columbia; not to exceed ~~(320)\$247,500~~ \$256,500 for
 12 travel; health service program as authorized by law (5
 13 U. S. C. 150) ; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28
 14 U. S. C. 2672) ; printing and binding; and purchase (not to
 15 exceed two, for replacement only) and hire of passenger
 16 motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$500 for newspapers;
 17 ~~(321)\$3,938,300~~ \$4,013,300, of which amount not to ex-
 18 ceed \$10,000 shall be available for special counsel and serv-
 19 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
 20 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates not exceeding \$50 per diem
 21 for individuals.

22 Flood-control surveys: For expenses necessary for the
 23 work of the Commission as authorized by section 4 of the
 24 Act of June 28, 1938 (33 U. S. C. 701j), and similar
 25 provisions in subsequent Acts, including personal services

1 in the District of Columbia; contract stenographic reporting
2 services, and printing and binding, \$351,700.

3 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

4 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
5 ing personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase
6 of one passenger motor vehicle; health service program as
7 authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ; payment of tort claims
8 pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) ; contract stenographic
9 reporting services; and printing and binding; and not to exceed
10 700 for newspapers; ~~(322)\$3,866,695~~ \$3,916,695, of which
11 not less than \$223,473 shall be available ~~(323)to the Bureau~~
12 ~~of Trade Practice Conferences~~ for trade practice agreement
13 work: *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated
14 herein for the Federal Trade Commission shall be expended
15 upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent
16 resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated sub-
17 sequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the
18 cost of such investigation.

19 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

20 Salaries: For personal services in the District of Colum-
21 bia and elsewhere, ~~(324)\$34,500,000~~ \$32,689,500.

22 Miscellaneous expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
23 ing printing and binding and the purchase of one passenger
24 motor vehicle for replacement only, \$1,750,000.

25 Appropriations for the General Accounting Office shall

1 be available for a health service program as authorized by
 2 law (5 U. S. C. 150), for payment of tort claims pursuant
 3 to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) ~~(325)~~, for newspapers and
 4 periodicals (not exceeding \$600), and services as authorized
 5 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

6 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

7 Sites and planning, public buildings outside the District
 8 of Columbia: For expenses necessary for continuing the
 9 program for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of
 10 drawings and specifications for Federal public building proj-
 11 ects outside the District of Columbia, as authorized and
 12 provided for by title I of the Act of June 16, 1949 (Public
 13 Law 105), and by the Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630),
 14 as amended, including personal services in the District of
 15 Columbia, ~~(326)\$28,000,000~~ \$22,000,000, to remain avail-
 16 able until expended.

17 Renovation and improvement of federally owned build-
 18 ings outside of the District of Columbia: For expenses neces-
 19 sary for continuing the program for the renovation and
 20 improvement of federally owned buildings outside the District
 21 of Columbia, for which funds are not otherwise available,
 22 including appurtenances and approaches thereto, that are
 23 under the control of the General Services Administration
 24 for repair and preservation, as authorized by title III of the
 25 Act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105), including personal

1 services in the District of Columbia, \$10,000,000, to remain
2 available until expended.

3 Repair, preservation, and equipment, outside the Dis-
4 trict of Columbia: For the repair, alteration, improvement,
5 preservation, and equipment, not otherwise provided for,
6 including personal services in the District of Columbia,
7 of completed Federal buildings, the grounds and approaches
8 thereof, wharves, and piers, together with the necessary
9 dredging adjacent thereto, and care and safeguarding of
10 sites acquired for Federal buildings and of surplus real
11 property, the custody of which is the responsibility of the
12 General Services Administration under the Act of August 27,
13 1935 (40 U. S. C. 304), and Public Law 152, Eighty-first
14 Congress, pending sale or disposition; the demolition of build-
15 ings thereon; the purchase and repair of equipment and
16 fixtures in buildings under the administration of the Gen-
17 eral Services Administration; and for changes in, main-
18 tenance of, and repairs to the pneumatic-tube system
19 in New York City installed under franchise of the city of
20 New York, approved June 29, 1909, and June 11, 1928,
21 and the payment of any obligations arising thereunder in
22 accordance with the provisions of the Acts approved August
23 5, 1909 (36 Stat. 120), and May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 533);
24 \$10,000,000.

25 Federal office building, Nashville, Tennessee: For com-

1 pletion of construction of a Federal office building in
2 Nashville, Tennessee, to remain available until expended,
3 \$1,200,000, which shall be for payment of obligations
4 incurred under authority granted under this head in the
5 Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949.

6 Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio: For comple-
7 tion of construction of buildings and facilities at Cincinnati,
8 Ohio, for the use of the Public Health Service, as authorized
9 by section 8 (b) of the Act of June 30, 1948 (Public Law
10 845), \$1,400,000, to remain available until expended, and
11 in addition thereto the General Services Administration is
12 authorized to enter into contracts for such purposes in an
13 amount not exceeding \$2,400,000.

14 Federal Courts Building, District of Columbia: For
15 completion of construction of a building for the use of the
16 United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia
17 and the District Court of the United States for the District of
18 Columbia, as authorized by the Act of May 14, 1948 (Public
19 Law 527), to remain available until expended, \$6,000,000,
20 which shall be for payment of obligations incurred under
21 authority granted under this head in the Second Deficiency
22 Appropriation Act, 1948.

23 General Accounting Office Building, District of Columbia:
24 For completion of construction of a building for the use of the
25 General Accounting Office on square 518, in the District of

1 Columbia, under the provisions of the Act of May 18, 1948
 2 (Public Law 533), to remain available until expended,
 3 \$15,358,194, which shall be for payment of obligations in-
 4 curred under authority granted under this head in the Second
 5 Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948.

6 Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion: For
 7 completing the renovation, repair, and modernization of the
 8 Executive Mansion, to remain available until expended,
 9 \$3,400,000, which shall be for payment of obligations
 10 incurred under authority granted under this head in the
 11 Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949.

12 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions
 13 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of
 14 July 23, 1946, including personal services in the District of
 15 Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
 16 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of five passen-
 17 ger motor vehicles; and printing and binding; ~~(327)\$633,-~~
 18 ~~608,240~~ \$605,000,000, to remain available until expended,
 19 ~~(328)of which not to exceed \$25,000,000 may be expended~~
 20 ~~in accordance with the purposes of said Act of July 23, 1946,~~
 21 ~~through purchase contracts negotiated with operators within~~
 22 ~~the United States, its Territories and possessions, and in~~
 23 ~~making advance payments on such contracts to the extent~~
 24 ~~determined to be necessary to the performance thereof, and~~
 25 of which \$240,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations in-

1 curred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this
2 head; and in addition to the amount herein appropriated,
3 contracts may be entered into for the purposes of the
4 said Act of July 23, 1946, in an amount not in excess
5 of ~~(329)\$100,000,000~~ \$125,000,000: *Provided*, That any
6 funds received as proceeds from sale or other disposition of
7 materials on account of the rotation of stocks under said
8 Act shall be deposited to the credit, and be available for
9 expenditure for the purposes, of this appropriation: *Pro-*
10 *vided further*, That during the current fiscal year, there
11 shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and
12 critical materials which, in accordance with subsection 6 (a)
13 of the Act of July 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 598), may be trans-
14 ferred to stock piles established in accordance with said Act.

15 For refunds under section 403 (a) (4) (D) (relating
16 to the recomputation of the amortization deduction) and by
17 the last sentence of section 403 (i) (3) (relating to excess
18 inventories) of the Renegotiation Act; and to refund any
19 amount finally adjudged or determined to have been erro-
20 neously collected by the United States pursuant to a uni-
21 lateral determination of excessive profits, with interest there-
22 on (at a rate not to exceed 4 per centum per annum) as
23 may be determined by the War Contracts Price Adjustment
24 Board, computed to the date of certification to the Treasury

1 Department for payment; \$7,400,000: *Provided*, That
2 to the extent refunds are made from this appropriation
3 of excessive profits collected under the Renegotiation Act
4 and retained by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation
5 or any of its subsidiaries, the Reconstruction Finance Corpo-
6 ration or the appropriate subsidiary shall reimburse this
7 appropriation: *Provided further*, That refunds made here-
8 under shall be based solely on the certificate of the War
9 Contracts Price Adjustment Board or its duly authorized
10 representatives.

11 To increase the General Supply Fund established by
12 section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative
13 Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, approved June 30,
14 1949), \$4,000,000.

15 Alaska public works: For an additional amount for
16 expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the
17 Act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 264), relating to the
18 development of the Territory of Alaska, to remain available
19 until June 30, 1955, \$9,000,000, of which \$4,000,000
20 shall be for the liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant
21 to authority heretofore granted under this head and of which
22 not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available for administrative
23 expenses, including the purchase of not to exceed two pas-
24 senger motor vehicles (330); and, in addition, the General

1 *Services Administration is authorized to enter into contracts*
 2 *in an amount not to exceed \$4,000,000 for the purposes*
 3 *of this appropriation (331):*~~Provided, That no part of this~~
 4 ~~appropriation shall be available for expenditure on any project~~
 5 ~~until a certificate has been received from the Secretary of~~
 6 ~~Defense that the installation of such facility will be of value~~
 7 ~~in connection with national defense.~~

8 Advance planning of non-Federal public works: For an
 9 additional amount for expenses necessary for carrying out the
 10 provisions of the Act of October 13, 1949 (Public Law 352),
 11 relating to the advance planning of public works, to remain
 12 available until expended, (332)~~\$28,000,000~~ \$20,000,000,
 13 of which \$14,100,000 is for liquidation of obligations in-
 14 curred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this
 15 head and of which not to exceed \$1,704,000 shall be avail-
 16 able for administrative expenses, including personal services
 17 in the District of Columbia; and, in addition, the General
 18 Services Administration is authorized to enter into contracts,
 19 in an amount not to exceed (333)~~\$32,000,000~~ \$27,000,000,
 20 for the purposes of this appropriation.

21 Grants for plan preparation, water pollution control:
 22 For an additional amount for grants to States, municipalities,
 23 or interstate agencies to aid in financing the cost of action
 24 preliminary to the construction of projects for water pollution
 25 control as authorized by section 8 (c) of the Water
 26 Pollution Control Act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1155),
 27 (334)~~\$900,000~~ \$750,000.

1 Administrative expenses, water pollution control: For
 2 expenses necessary to carry out the administrative functions
 3 of the General Services Administration under the provisions
 4 of the Water Pollution Control Act of June 30, 1948 (62
 5 Stat. 1155), as authorized by section 8 (e) of said Act,
 6 including personal services in the District of Columbia;
 7 travel; hire of passenger motor vehicles; health service pro-
 8 grams as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ; and exchange
 9 of books; ~~(335)\$60,000~~ \$52,285.

10 Virgin Islands public works: For an additional amount
 11 to carry out the provisions of the Act of December 20, 1944
 12 (58 Stat. 827), ~~(336)\$1,300,000~~ \$1,000,000, and in addi-
 13 tion, the General Services Administration is authorized to
 14 enter into contracts, for an amount not to exceed \$1,467,000,
 15 for the purposes of this appropriation.

16 Public works advance planning: ~~(337)~~*The Not to exceed*
 17 *\$4,000,000 of the unexpended balances on June 30, 1950, of*
 18 *funds made available for public works advance planning*
 19 *under title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act*
 20 *of 1944 (58 Stat. 791), are hereby continued available for*
 21 *expenditure until June 30, 1951. (338)**The sum of*
 22 *\$2,000,000 carried in the said unexpended balances shall be*
 23 *carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury*
 24 *immediately upon the approval of this Act.*

25 Liquidation of public works advance planning: Not to

1 exceed \$125,000 of the unobligated balance on June 30,
2 1950, of the funds made available for public works advance
3 planning under title V of the War Mobilization and Recon-
4 version Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 791) shall be available
5 during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses
6 incident to the liquidation of the activity for which said
7 funds were appropriated, including the objects specified under
8 this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act,
9 1946.

10 War public works (community facilities) liquidation:
11 For administrative expenses necessary during the current
12 fiscal year for the liquidation of all activities under titles II,
13 III, and IV of the Act of October 14, 1940, as amended
14 (42 U. S. C. 1531-1534, 1541, and 1562), except expenses
15 related to the maintenance, operation and disposal of Fed-
16 eral project properties, and those in connection with the
17 management and disposal of project securities, including
18 personal services and rents in the District of Columbia;
19 printing and binding; and a health service program as
20 authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); not to exceed
21 \$40,000 of the unobligated balances of the funds here-
22 tofore appropriated for carrying out the provisions of titles
23 II, III, and IV of the Act of October 14, 1940, as amended
24 (42 U. S. C. 1531-1534, 1541, and 1562)'.
25

Operating expenses: For necessary expenses of the Gen-

1 eral Services Administration not otherwise provided for, in-
2 cluding: Operation, maintenance, protection, repair, and
3 improvement of public buildings and grounds to the extent
4 that such buildings and grounds are under the control of
5 the General Services Administration for any of such pur-
6 poses (including the operation, maintenance, and protection
7 of the District Court Building in the District of Columbia);
8 rental of buildings or parts thereof in the District of Columbia
9 and elsewhere; the restoration of leased premises; moving
10 Government agencies in connection with the assignment,
11 allocation, and transfer of building space; ground rent, which
12 may be paid in advance where required; demolition of build-
13 ings; furnishings and equipment; acquisition by purchase or
14 otherwise and disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and
15 interests therein; payment of sums in lieu of taxes accruing
16 against real property declared surplus by Government cor-
17 porations under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, where
18 legal title to such property remains in the Government cor-
19 poration; compliance with the provisions of the National
20 Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 451ff); pay-
21 ment of per diem employees employed in connection with
22 any of the foregoing functions at rates approved by the
23 Administrator of General Services or his designee not exceed-
24 ing current rates for similar services in the place where such
25 services are employed; arms and ammunition for the guard

1 force; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards
 2 and elevator operators; purchase of not to exceed twenty-
 3 three passenger motor vehicles; processing and determining
 4 net renegotiation rebates; liquidation of activities under the
 5 Act to promote the defense of the United States (55 Stat.
 6 31) ; scientific, technical and other apparatus and materials for
 7 the arrangement, titling, scoring, repair, editing, processing,
 8 duplication, and reproduction of photographic and other rec-
 9 ords (including motion-picture and other films and sound re-
 10 cordings) in the custody of the Archivist of the United States
 11 and preparation of guides and other finding aids to records of
 12 the Second World War; (339) ~~\$76,500,000~~ \$82,725,000.

13 Section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended
 14 (40 U. S. C. 278a) shall not apply to any lease entered into
 15 by, or transferred to, the General Services Administration,
 16 for the housing of agencies specifically exempted from the
 17 requirements of said section.

18 The foregoing appropriation shall be credited with (1)
 19 advances or reimbursements for salaries and administrative
 20 expenses chargeable against other appropriations of the Gen-
 21 eral Services Administration, and such salaries and expenses
 22 may be paid from this appropriation; (2) advances or reim-
 23 bursements for services, quarters, maintenance, or other facili-
 24 ties furnished other agencies on a reimbursable basis; (3)
 25 cost of maintenance, upkeep, and repair included as part of

1 rentals received from Government corporations pursuant to
2 law (40 U. S. C. 129) ; (4) reimbursements for services
3 performed in respect to bonds and other obligations under the
4 jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, issued
5 by public authorities, States, or other public bodies, and such
6 services in respect to such bonds or obligations as the Admin-
7 istrator deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon
8 the request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be pro-
9 vided from this appropriation; and (5) as respects property
10 transferred to the General Services Administration pursuant
11 to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U. S. C. 451ff), (a)
12 advances or reimbursements for necessary utilities and serv-
13 ices furnished private occupants of industrial plants, and
14 such utilities and services may be provided at cost from this
15 appropriation; (b) proceeds received from insurance against
16 damage to such property, and such proceeds may, at the direc-
17 tion of the Secretary of Defense, be used to repair or restore
18 the damaged property; and (c) appropriations or funds
19 available to other agencies, and transferred to the General
20 Services Administration, in connection with such property,
21 and such appropriations or funds may, with the approval of
22 the Bureau of the Budget, be so transferred.

23 Appropriations or other funds available to the Gen-
24 eral Services Administration shall be available during the
25 current fiscal year for personal services in the District of

1 Columbia; health service programs as authorized by law
 2 (5 U. S. C. 150) ; printing and binding; purchase of news-
 3 papers and periodicals (not to exceed \$400) ; preparation,
 4 shipment, and installation of photographic displays, exhibits,
 5 and other descriptive materials; and payment of tort claims
 6 pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

7 ~~(340)~~ During the current fiscal year, no part of any money
 8 appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used during
 9 any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase typewriting
 10 machines (except bookkeeping and billing machines) at a
 11 price which exceeds 90 per centum of the lowest net cash
 12 price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the
 13 most-favored customer (other than the Government, the
 14 American National Red Cross, and the purchasers of type-
 15 writing machines for educational purposes only) of the
 16 manufacturer of such machines during the six-month period
 17 immediately preceding such quarter.

18 No part of any money appropriated by this or any other
 19 Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Govern-
 20 ment (which shall include all departments, independent
 21 establishments, and wholly owned Government corporations)
 22 shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase
 23 within the continental limits of the United States of any
 24 typewriting machines (except typewriting machines for

1 veterans under public laws administered by the Veterans'
2 Administration) unless the Administrator of General Serv-
3 ices certifies that he is unable to furnish such agency with
4 suitable typewriting machines out of stock on hand. The
5 Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed
6 at such times as he may determine to be necessary to survey
7 and determine the numbers and kinds of typewriting ma-
8 chines located in the continental limits of the United States
9 which are at any time surplus to the requirements of any
10 agency in the executive branch of the Government (which
11 shall include all departments, independent establishments,
12 and wholly owned Government corporations). Upon such
13 determination, the Administrator of General Services is au-
14 thorized to direct, upon such notice and in such manner as
15 he may prescribe, the head of any such agency to surrender
16 to the General Services Administration any and all type-
17 writing machines surplus to its requirements, the costs of
18 packing, shipping, and handling thereof to be charged to
19 the general supply fund. Each such agency shall furnish
20 the Administrator of General Services such information re-
21 garding typewriting machines, wherever located, as he may
22 from time to time request. The General Services Adminis-
23 tration is authorized and directed to receive, hold, sell,
24 exchange, or supply to any branch of the Government,
25 including the District of Columbia, typewriting machines

1 surrendered to it hereunder. The Administrator of General
 2 Services is authorized to charge each agency to which type-
 3 writing machines are supplied hereunder amounts equal to
 4 the fair value thereof, as determined by him, and such
 5 amounts shall be credited to the general supply fund.

6 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

7 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

8 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the
 9 Office of the Administrator, including personal services and
 10 rent in the District of Columbia; purchase of one passenger
 11 motor vehicle, for replacement only; printing and binding;
 12 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
 13 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; expenses of attendance at meet-
 14 ings of organizations concerned with the work of the Agency;
 15 payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) ;
 16 a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C.
 17 150) ; and transportation expenses and not to exceed \$25
 18 per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5
 19 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b-2), for
 20 persons serving without compensation as members of any
 21 advisory committee established pursuant to Title VI of the
 22 Housing Act of 1949; ~~(341)\$4,200,000~~ \$4,900,000: *Pro-*
 23 *vided*, That the Administrator may, with the approval of the
 24 Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transfer to this account
 25 from funds of the constituent agencies such sums as relate pri-

1 marily to functions which are consolidated in the Office of
 2 the Administrator as authorized by Title III of the Housing
 3 Act of 1948, as amended (342): *Provided further, That nec-*
 4 *essary expenses of inspections of projects financed through loans*
 5 *to educational institutions authorized by Title IV of the Housing*
 6 *Act of 1950 shall be compensated by such institutions by the*
 7 *payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to*
 8 *the development costs of such projects will cover the costs*
 9 *of rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose*
 10 *shall be considered nonadministrative, and for the purpose*
 11 *of providing such inspections, the Administrator may utilize*
 12 *any agency and such agency may accept reimbursement or*
 13 *payment for such services from such institutions or the Ad-*
 14 *ministrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropria-*
 15 *tions or funds against which such charges have been made.*

16 PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

17 Annual contributions: For the payment of annual con-
 18 tributions to public housing agencies in accordance with sec-
 19 tion 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as
 20 amended (42 U. S. C. 1410), (343) ~~\$7,500,000~~ \$9,250,000:
 21 *Provided, That except for payments required on contracts*
 22 *entered into prior to April 18, 1940, no part of this appro-*
 23 *priation shall be available for payment to any public housing*
 24 *agency for expenditure in connection with any low-rent hous-*
 25 *ing project, unless the public housing agency shall have*

1 adopted regulations prohibiting as a tenant of any such proj-
 2 ect by rental or occupancy any person other than a citizen
 3 of the United States, but such prohibition shall not be appli-
 4 cable in the case of a family of any serviceman or the family
 5 of any veteran who has been discharged (other than dishon-
 6 orably) from, or the family and any serviceman who died
 7 in, the armed forces of the United States within four years
 8 prior to the date of application for admission to such housing:
 9 *Provided further*, That all expenditures of this appro-
 10 priation shall be subject to audit and final settlement by
 11 the Comptroller General of the United States under the pro-
 12 visions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as
 13 amended.

14 Administrative expenses: For administrative expenses of
 15 the Public Housing Administration, ~~(344)\$8,750,000~~ \$11,-
 16 500,000, to be merged with and expended under the author-
 17 ization for such expenses contained in title II of this chapter.

18 INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

19 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry
 20 out the purposes of the Act of August 13, 1946 (25 U. S. C.
 21 70), creating an Indian Claims Commission, including per-
 22 sonal services in the District of Columbia and printing and
 23 binding, \$91,700, together with not exceeding \$7,300 of
 24 the unobligated balance available for such purpose contained
 25 in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950.

1 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

2 General expenses: For expenses necessary in perform-
3 ing the functions vested by law in the Commission (49 U.
4 S. C. 1-24, 301-327, 901-923, 1001-1022), except those
5 otherwise specifically provided for in this Act, and for
6 general administration, including not to exceed \$5,000
7 for the employment of special counsel; contract stenographic
8 reporting services; personal services in the District of Colum-
9 bia; newspapers (not to exceed \$200); health service
10 program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment
11 of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); purchase
12 of twenty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only;
13 and printing and binding; ~~(345)\$9,889,600~~ \$10,002,600, of
14 which \$100,000 shall be available for valuations of pipe lines,
15 and \$3,831,920 shall be available for the work of the Bureau
16 of Motor Carriers: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and
17 cooperating State commissioners may use Government trans-
18 portation requests when traveling in connection with their
19 duties as such.

20 Railroad safety: For expenses necessary in performing
21 functions authorized by law (45 U. S. C. 1-15, 17-21,
22 35-46, 61-64; 49 U. S. C. 26) to insure a maximum of
23 safety in the operation of railroads, including authority to
24 investigate, test experimentally, and report on the use and
25 need of any appliances or systems intended to promote the

1 safety of railway operation, including those pertaining to
 2 block-signal and train-control systems, as authorized by the
 3 joint resolution approved June 30, 1906, and the Sundry
 4 Civil Act of May 27, 1908 (45 U. S. C. 35-37), and to
 5 require carriers by railroad subject to the Act to install
 6 automatic train-stop or train-control devices as prescribed by
 7 the Commission (49 U. S. C. 26), including the employ-
 8 ment of inspectors, engineers, and personal services in the
 9 District of Columbia, and payment of tort claims pursuant
 10 to law (28 U. S. C. 2672), ~~(346)\$1,000,000~~ \$1,016,000.

11 Locomotive inspection: For expenses necessary in the
 12 enforcement of the Act of February 17, 1911, entitled "An
 13 Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon
 14 railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in inter-
 15 state commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and
 16 suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto", as amended (45
 17 U. S. C. 22-34), including personal services in the District
 18 of Columbia, and payment of tort claims pursuant to law
 19 (28 U. S. C. 2672), ~~(347)\$700,000~~ \$718,600.

20 INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC

21 RIVER BASIN

22 Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac
 23 River Basin: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury
 24 to pay in advance to the Interstate Commission on the
 25 Potomac River Basin the Federal contribution toward

1 the expenses of the Commission during the current fiscal
2 year in the administration of its business in the conserv-
3 ancy district established pursuant to the Act of July 11,
4 1940 (54 Stat. 748), \$5,000.

5 MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For expenses necessary for the Motor Carrier Claims
8 Commission established by the Act of July 2, 1948 (Public
9 Law 880), including personal services in the District of
10 Columbia, travel, printing and binding, and services as
11 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
12 U. S. C. 55a), (348) ~~\$175,000~~ \$227,800.

13 NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR .

14 AERONAUTICS

15 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the
16 Committee, including contracts for the making of spe-
17 cial investigations and reports and for engineering, draft-
18 ing and computing services; equipment, maintenance, and
19 operation of the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, the Ames
20 Aeronautical Laboratory, and the Lewis Flight Propulsion
21 Laboratory; purchase and maintenance of cafeteria equip-
22 ment; maintenance and operation of aircraft; purchase of
23 eight passenger motor vehicles of which seven shall be
24 for replacement; printing and binding; personal services
25 in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section

1 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; pay-
 2 ment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) ;
 3 and a health service program for employees as author-
 4 ized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ; in all, ~~(349)\$40,890,630~~
 5 \$44,225,630: *Provided*, That statutory provisions prohibit-
 6 ing the payment of compensation to aliens shall not apply to
 7 any person whose employment by the Committee shall be de-
 8 termined by the Chairman thereof to be necessary: *Pro-*
 9 *vided further*, That aircraft and parts, equipment, and sup-
 10 plies may be transferred to the Committee by the Air Force,
 11 Army, and Navy without reimbursement ~~(350):~~*Provided*
 12 *further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available
 13 for the operation of a field office outside the continental
 14 or territorial limits of the United States.

15 Construction and equipment: For construction and
 16 equipment at laboratories and research stations of the Com-
 17 mittee, to be available until June 30 of the next succeeding
 18 year, \$15,500,000, of which \$10,000,000 and \$5,000,000
 19 shall be available for payments under contracts entered into
 20 pursuant to the contract authority under this head in the
 21 Independent Offices Appropriation Acts, 1949 and 1950 re-
 22 spectively: *Provided*, That in addition, the Committee may
 23 enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in
 24 an amount not in excess of ~~(351)\$10,000,000~~ \$12,500,000.

1 NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

2 Maintenance and operation of properties: For the
3 maintenance and operation of properties under title I of
4 the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Authority Act,
5 ~~(352)\$35,000~~ \$39,600: *Provided*, That all receipts derived
6 from sales, leases, or other sources shall be covered into the
7 Treasury of the United States monthly ~~(353)~~: *Provided fur-*
8 *ther, That so long as funds are available from appropriations*
9 *for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of*
10 *the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first*
11 *Congress) shall not be effective.*

12 NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING
13 COMMISSION

14 Land acquisition, National Capital and metropolitan
15 area: For necessary expenses for the National Capital Park
16 and Planning Commission in connection with the acquisition
17 of land for the park, parkway, and playground system of
18 the National Capital, as authorized by the Act of May 29,
19 1930 (46 Stat. 482), and amendment of August 8, 1946
20 (60 Stat. 960), including services as authorized by sec-
21 tion 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),
22 and real estate appraisers, by contract or otherwise without
23 regard to the civil service and classification laws, at rates
24 of pay or fees not to exceed those usual for similar services;
25 and purchase of options and other costs incident to the

1 acquisition of land; \$724,500, to remain available until
2 expended, \$480,500 of said sum to be used for carrying
3 out the provisions of section 1 (b) of said Act and \$244,000
4 for carrying out the provisions of section 4 of said Act:
5 *Provided*, That not exceeding \$29,000 of the funds available
6 under the above appropriation during the current fiscal year
7 may be used for regular and part-time personal services of
8 the Commission, excepting services by contract.

9 OFFICE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE RECORDS

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
11 operation and maintenance of the Office of Selective Service
12 Records, as authorized by the Act of March 31, 1947 (61
13 Stat. 31), and by section 10 (a) (4) of the Selective Service
14 Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), including personal services in
15 the District of Columbia; printing and binding; services as
16 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
17 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28
18 U. S. C. 2672); and a health service program as authorized
19 by law (5 U. S. C. 150); \$4,954,000.

20 PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

21 Philippine War Damage Commission: For carrying out
22 the provisions of title I of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act
23 of 1946, \$40,200,000, to remain available until April 30,
24 1951, of which not to exceed \$1,620,000 shall be for
25 necessary expenses of the Philippine War Damage Com-

1 mission for the current fiscal year, including personal
2 services in the District of Columbia; purchase of news-
3 papers and periodicals not to exceed \$200; housing of
4 American employees by rental or lease and necessary repairs
5 and alterations to and maintenance of quarters, without re-
6 gard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended
7 (40 U. S. C. 278a) ; printing and binding without regard to
8 section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111) ;
9 and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
10 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) : *Provided*, That the
11 provisions of the Act of June 29, 1936 (46 U. S. C. 1241),
12 shall not apply to any travel or transportation of effects pay-
13 able from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That no
14 payment shall be made under the provisions of such title of
15 such Act to any person who, by a civil or military court
16 having jurisdiction, has been found guilty of collaborating
17 with the enemy or of any act involving disloyalty to the
18 United States or the Republic of the Philippines (354)or, in
19 the absence of such finding by such court, the Commission
20 after hearing finds upon evidence that such person was guilty
21 of such collaboration or act of disloyalty: *Provided further*,
22 That no part of this appropriation shall be available for
23 engaging in any phase of activity or for undertaking any
24 phase of activity authorized by the Philippine Rehabilitation
25 Act of 1946 which would result in obligating the Govern-

1 ment of the United States in any sense or respect to the
 2 future payment of amounts in excess of the amounts author-
 3 ized to be appropriated in such Act.

4 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

5 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
 6 ing personal services in the District of Columbia; health
 7 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150);
 8 payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672);
 9 not to exceed \$1,150 for the purchase of newspapers; printing
 10 and binding; and services as authorized by section 15 of the
 11 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); ~~(355)\$6,130,000~~
 12 \$6,330,000.

13 SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

14 Salaries and expenses, Smithsonian Institution: For
 15 all necessary expenses for the preservation, exhibition, and
 16 increase of collections from the surveying and exploring
 17 expeditions of the Government and from other sources; for
 18 the system of international exchanges between the United
 19 States and foreign countries; for anthropological researches
 20 among the American Indians and the natives of
 21 lands under the jurisdiction or protection of the United
 22 States, independently or in cooperation with State, educa-
 23 tional, and scientific organizations in the United States,
 24 and the excavation and preservation of archeological re-
 25 mains; for maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory and

1 making necessary observations in high altitudes; for the
 2 administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts; for
 3 the administration, and for the construction and maintenance,
 4 of laboratory and other facilities on Barro Colorado Island,
 5 Canal Zone, under the provisions of the Act of July 2, 1940,
 6 as amended by the provisions of Reorganization Plan Num-
 7 bered 3 of 1946; for the maintenance and administration
 8 of a national air museum as authorized by the Act of August
 9 12, 1946 (20 U. S. C. 77) ; including personal services in
 10 the District of Columbia and not to exceed \$35,000 for
 11 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
 12 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; traveling expenses; payment
 13 of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) ; a health
 14 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ;
 15 printing and binding, including printing the report of the
 16 American Historical Association; purchase, repair, and clean-
 17 ing of uniforms for guards and elevator conductors; repairs
 18 and alterations of buildings and approaches; and preparation
 19 of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications;
 20 (356)\$2,606,490 \$2,770,000.

21 (357)*Paleontological investigations: For payments to non-*
 22 *Federal agencies for cooperative paleontological investiga-*
 23 *tions in accordance with the Act of August 15, 1949 (Public*
 24 *Law 228), to remain available until expended, \$20,000.*

25 Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art: For the

1 upkeep and operation of the National Gallery of Art, the
2 protection and care of the works of art therein, and admin-
3 istrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the
4 Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the
5 public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9,
6 Seventy-sixth Congress), including personal services in the
7 District of Columbia; health service program as authorized
8 by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of tort claims pursuant
9 to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); services as authorized by sec-
10 tion 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
11 traveling expenses; payment in advance when author-
12 ized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in
13 library, museum, and art associations or societies whose
14 publications or services are available to members only, or
15 to members at a price lower than to the general public;
16 purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and
17 elevator operators; printing and binding; purchase or rental
18 of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents
19 thereof, and maintenance and repair of buildings, approaches,
20 and grounds; and not to exceed \$15,000 for restoration and
21 repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by
22 contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms,
23 or organizations at such rates or prices and under such
24 terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper;
25 (358) ~~\$1,158,000~~ \$1,200,000.

TARIFF COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Tariff Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, subscriptions to newspapers (not to exceed \$250), health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), and contract stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), ~~(359)~~\$1,290,700 \$1,340,700: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of any member of the Tariff Commission who shall hereafter participate in any proceedings under sections 336, 337, and 338 of the Tariff Act of 1930, wherein he or any member of his family has any special, direct, and pecuniary interest, or in which he has acted as attorney or special representative.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 12A), including purchase (not to exceed two) and hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft; the purchase (not to exceed two hundred and twenty-five for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$102,714,000 to remain available until expended, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against prior appropriations.

1 THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

2 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-
3 ing printing and binding and contract stenographic reporting
4 services, ~~(360)\$820,000~~ \$826,900: *Provided*, That travel
5 expenses of the judges shall be paid upon the written cer-
6 tificate of the judge.

7 UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

8 Ship construction: For new ship construction, including
9 reconditioning and betterment, as authorized by title V of
10 the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (except for construction of
11 one prototype vessel under title VII of said Act), \$35,000,-
12 000, of which \$30,000,000 is for payment of obligations
13 for new ship construction incurred under authority granted
14 in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948; and, in
15 addition, the Commission is authorized to enter into con-
16 tracts for new ship construction in an amount not to exceed
17 \$63,000,000 ~~(361):~~ ~~*Provided*~~, That no part of this appro-
18 priation or contract authorization shall be used to start any
19 new ship construction for which an estimate was not included
20 in the budget for the current fiscal year, nor to start any
21 new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which
22 exceeds by 10 per centum the estimated cost included there-
23 for in such budget unless the Director of the Bureau of the
24 Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construc-
25 tion and the Director shall submit forthwith a detailed

1 explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of
 2 the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, as
 3 used herein, the term "budget" includes the detailed justifi-
 4 cation supporting the budget estimates: *Provided, That no*
 5 *part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be*
 6 *used (1) to start any new ship construction for which an*
 7 *estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal*
 8 *year or (2) to start any new ship construction the currently*
 9 *estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 per centum the estimated*
 10 *cost included therefor in such budget unless, in either case,*
 11 *the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves*
 12 *the start of such ship construction and the Director shall*
 13 *submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Com-*
 14 *mittees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House*
 15 *of Representatives; and, as used herein, the term "budget"*
 16 *includes the detailed justification supporting the budget*
 17 *estimates: Provided further, That not to exceed \$64,875,000*
 18 *of the funds and contract authority made available for new*
 19 *ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment,*
 20 *in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, shall*
 21 *continue to be available until December 31, 1950.*

22 Operating-differential subsidies: For operating-differential
 23 subsidies, as authorized by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936,
 24 as amended, (362)\$26,450,000 \$30,108,000, together with
 25 funds appropriated under this head in the Supplemental Inde-

1 pendent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, the Independent
2 Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, not to exceed \$16,770,000
3 from the special deposit account established with receipts from
4 sales under Public Laws 44 and 305 of the Seventy-eighth
5 Congress, and not to exceed \$3,529,000 from the special
6 deposit account established from the refund of unobligated
7 amounts out of the working fund established with the Corps
8 of Engineers, Department of the Army, for development
9 of reserve fleet sites, all to be available until expended for
10 payment of operating-differential subsidies for the fiscal years
11 1949, 1950, and 1951, to grant operating-differential sub-
12 sidies on a long-term basis and to obligate the United States
13 to make future payments in accordance with the terms of
14 such contracts: *Provided*, That to the extent that the
15 operating-differential subsidy accrual (computed on the basis
16 of parity) is represented on the operator's books by a
17 contingent accounts receivable item against the Commis-
18 sion as a partial or complete offset to the recapture accrual,
19 the operator (1) shall be excused from making deposits in
20 the special reserve fund, and (2) as to the amount of such
21 earnings the deposit of which is so excused shall be entitled
22 to the same tax treatment as though it had been deposited
23 in said special reserve fund. To the extent that any amount
24 paid to the operator by the Commission reduces the balance
25 in the operator's contingent receivable account against the

1 Commission, such amount, unless it is forthwith deposited
2 in the fund, shall be considered as withdrawn under section
3 607 (h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended:
4 *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this Act, or
5 in any prior appropriation Act, shall be construed to affect
6 the authority of the Commission pursuant to the provisions
7 of section 603 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as
8 amended, (1) to grant operating-differential subsidies on
9 a long-term basis, and (2) to obligate the United States to
10 make future payments in accordance with the terms of such
11 operating-differential subsidy contracts (363):~~*Provided fur-*~~
12 ~~*ther*~~, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be
13 available for obligation, nor any obligation made, for the
14 payment of an operating-differential subsidy for any number
15 of ships in excess of the number of ships which are entitled
16 to receive an operating-differential subsidy pursuant to pro-
17 visions of any contract, authorization, commitment or obli-
18 gation by the Commission in existence on January 1, 1950,
19 including within said limitation as to number any ships
20 being constructed or contracted for on said date under a
21 construction-differential subsidy contract and including also
22 any ships the operation of which may be authorized by the
23 Commission under any contracts which may result from
24 any formal applications filed with the Commission prior to
25 January 1, 1950: *Provided further*, That the balance in

1 excess of \$16,770,000 as of June 30, 1950, in the special
2 deposit account established with receipts from sales under
3 Public Laws 44 and 305 of the Seventy-eighth Congress,
4 together with any receipts after that date from such sales,
5 shall be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

6 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for car-
7 rying into effect the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and other
8 laws administered by the United States Maritime Commis-
9 sion, \$19,903,300, within limitations as follows:

10 Administrative expenses, including personal services in
11 the District of Columbia; printing and binding; not to ex-
12 ceed \$2,000 for newspapers and periodicals; purchase of
13 five passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; not
14 to exceed \$17,700 for services as authorized by section 15
15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not
16 to exceed \$1,125 for entertainment of officials of other coun-
17 tries when specifically authorized by the Chairman; payment
18 of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); and
19 \$50,000 to be available exclusively for ship structure re-
20 search, testing and models; \$9,271,700: *Provided*, That the
21 Maritime Commission is authorized to dispense with the
22 administrative audit of agents' accounts covering voyages
23 beginning prior to April 1, 1949;

24 Maintenance of shipyard facilities, \$452,000;

25 Operation of warehouses, \$436,000;

1 Reserve fleet expense, \$8,978,600;

2 Maintenance and operation of terminals, \$765,000.

3 (364) Maritime training: For training personnel for the man-
 4 ning of the merchant marine (including operation of training
 5 stations at Kings Point, New York; Sheepshead Bay, New
 6 York; Alameda, California, and the United States Mari-
 7 time Service Institute), including not to exceed \$2,229,300
 8 for administrative personal services in the District of Colum-
 9 bia and elsewhere; purchase of three passenger motor ve-
 10 hicles, for replacement only; printing and binding; health
 11 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); not
 12 to exceed \$2,500 for contingencies for the Superintendent,
 13 United States Merchant Marine Academy, to be expended
 14 in his discretion; not to exceed \$77,000 for transfer to
 15 applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for
 16 services rendered the Commission; \$3,342,660, including
 17 uniforms and textbooks for cadet midshipmen, to be provided
 18 in kind at an average yearly cost of not to exceed \$200 per
 19 cadet: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be
 20 used for compensation or allowances for trainees or cadets.

21 *Maritime training: For training personnel for the man-*
 22 *ning of the merchant marine (including operation of training*
 23 *stations at Kings Point, New York; Sheepshead Bay, New*
 24 *York; Alameda, California, and the United States Maritime*
 25 *Service Institute), including not to exceed \$2,477,000 for*

1 administrative personal services (exclusive of pay of cadet
 2 midshipmen and other trainees) in the District of Columbia
 3 and elsewhere which may be used to provide pay and allow-
 4 ances for personnel of the United States Maritime Service com-
 5 parable to those of the Coast Guard as authorized by law
 6 (46 U. S. C. 1126, 14 F. R. 7707); purchase of three passen-
 7 ger motor vehicles, for replacement only; printing and binding;
 8 health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150);
 9 not to exceed \$2,500 for contingencies for the Superintendent,
 10 United States Merchant Marine Academy, to be expended in
 11 his discretion; not to exceed \$77,000 for transfer to applicable
 12 appropriations of the Public Health Service for services ren-
 13 dered the Commission; \$4,348,520, including the pay of cadet
 14 midshipmen and other trainees.

15 (365) State marine schools: To reimburse the State of Cali-
 16 fornia, \$50,000; the State of Maine, \$50,000; the State of
 17 Massachusetts, \$50,000; and the State of New York, \$50,-
 18 000; for expenses incurred in the maintenance and support
 19 of marine schools in such States as provided in the Act
 20 authorizing the establishment of marine schools, and so forth;
 21 approved March 4, 1911, as amended (34 U. S. C. 1121-
 22 1123); \$153,000 for the maintenance and repair of vessels
 23 loaned by the United States to the said States for use in
 24 connection with such State marine schools, and \$340,000
 25 for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence of cadets at an

1 average yearly cost of not to exceed \$475 per cadet; \$668,-
 2 000, together with not to exceed \$25,000 of the unobligated
 3 balance for this purpose contained in the Independent
 4 Offices Appropriation Act, 1950.

5 *State marine schools: To reimburse the State of Cali-*
 6 *fornia, \$50,000; the State of Maine, \$50,000; the State of*
 7 *Massachusetts, \$50,000; and the State of New York, \$50,-*
 8 *000; for expenses incurred in the maintenance and support*
 9 *of marine schools in such States as provided in the Act*
 10 *authorizing the establishment of marine schools, and so forth,*
 11 *approved March 4, 1911, as amended (34 U. S. C. 1121-*
 12 *1123); \$153,000 for the maintenance and repair of vessels*
 13 *loaned by the United States to the said States for use in*
 14 *connection with such State marine schools, and \$749,050*
 15 *for the pay of seven hundred and ten cadet midshipmen at*
 16 *\$65 per month and \$275 per annum for the subsistence of*
 17 *each cadet midshipman; \$1,102,050.*

18 Vessel operating functions: For expenses (other than
 19 administrative expenses) necessary for liquidating the oper-
 20 ating functions transferred to the United States Maritime
 21 Commission by section 202 of the Naval Appropriation
 22 Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 501), \$764,760, together with not
 23 to exceed \$150,000 of the unobligated balance for this pur-
 24 pose contained in the (366)Independent Offices Appropria-
 25 tion Act, 1950 Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949,
 26 which latter sum, together with not to exceed \$150,000

1 of the amount herein appropriated, shall be available for
2 liquidation of liens or claims which may take prece-
3 dence over the Government's preferred mortgage on
4 vessels, and other expenses necessary to protect the Gov-
5 ernment's interest in vessels sold or chartered: *Pro-*
6 *vided*, That receipts from such functions during the current
7 fiscal year shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous
8 receipts.

9 No additional vessels shall be allocated under charter,
10 nor shall any vessel be continued under charter by reason
11 of any extension of chartering authority beyond June 30,
12 1949, unless the charterer shall agree that the Commission
13 shall have no obligation upon redelivery to accept or pay
14 for consumable stores, bunkers, and slop-chest items, except
15 with respect to such minimum amounts of bunkers as the
16 Commission considers advisable to be retained on the vessel
17 and that prior to such redelivery all consumable stores,
18 slop-chest items, and bunkers over and above such mini-
19 mums shall be removed from the vessel by the charterer
20 at his own expense.

21 War Shipping Administration liquidation: The unex-
22 pended balance of the appropriation to the Secretary of the
23 Treasury in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act,
24 1948, for liquidation of obligations approved by the General

1 Accounting Office as properly incurred against funds of the
2 War Shipping Administration prior to January 1, 1947, is
3 hereby continued available during the current fiscal year.

4 Construction fund: For an additional amount for pay-
5 ment of obligations (exclusive of obligations for ship con-
6 struction, reconditioning, and betterments incurred pursuant
7 to authority contained in the Independent Offices Appropria-
8 tion Act, 1948) incurred prior to July 1, 1948, against
9 the Construction fund established pursuant to the Merchant
10 Marine Act, 1936, as amended, \$10,000,000, to be avail-
11 able until June 30, 1951, for expenditure only.

12 Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the
13 Commission is authorized to furnish utilities and services and
14 make necessary repairs in connection with any lease, con-
15 tract, or occupancy involving Government property under
16 control of the Commission, and payments received by the
17 Commission for utilities, services, and repairs so furnished or
18 made shall be credited to the appropriation charged with the
19 cost thereof: *Provided*, That rental payments under any such
20 lease, contract, or occupancy on account of items other than
21 such utilities, services, or repairs shall be covered into the
22 Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

23 The United States Maritime Commission shall not incur
24 any obligations during the current fiscal year from the con-
25 struction fund established by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936,

1 or otherwise, in excess of the appropriations and limitations
2 contained in this chapter, or in any prior appropriation Act,
3 and all receipts which otherwise would be deposited to the
4 credit of said fund shall be covered into the Treasury as
5 miscellaneous receipts.

6 VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

7 Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary serv-
8 ices: For necessary expenses of the Veterans' Administra-
9 tion, including maintenance and operation of medical, hos-
10 pital, and domiciliary services, in carrying out the functions
11 pursuant to all laws for which the Administration is charged
12 with administering, including personal services in the Dis-
13 trict of Columbia; health service program as authorized by
14 law (5 U. S. C. 150) ; purchase of ninety-three passenger
15 motor vehicles for replacement only, and one without refer-
16 ence to the provisions of this or any other Act; services as
17 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
18 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; maintenance and operation of farms;
19 recreational articles and facilities at institutions maintained
20 by the Veterans' Administration; expenses incidental to
21 securing employment for war veterans; funeral, burial,
22 and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries of
23 the Veterans' Administration except burial awards author-
24 ized by Veterans' Administration Regulation Numbered 9
25 (a), as amended; aid to State or Territorial homes in con-

1 formity with the Act approved August 27, 1888, as amended
 2 (24 U. S. C. 134), for the support of veterans eligible for
 3 admission to Veterans' Administration facilities for hospital
 4 or domiciliary care; not to exceed \$5,600 for newspapers
 5 and periodicals; payment of tort claims pursuant to law
 6 (28 U. S. C. 2672); not to exceed \$44,000 for the prep-
 7 aration, shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photo-
 8 graphic displays, moving pictures, and other visual educa-
 9 tional information and descriptive material, including the
 10 purchase or rental of equipment; and not to exceed \$800,000
 11 for research work in connection with prosthetic appliances;
 12 **(367)**~~\$875,847,795~~ \$887,621,000, together with not to ex-
 13 ceed \$179,000 of the unobligated balance of funds appropri-
 14 ated for this purpose in the Independent Offices Appropriation
 15 Act, 1950, from which allotments and transfers may be made
 16 to the Federal Security Agency (Public Health Service),
 17 the Army, Navy, and Interior Departments, for disburse-
 18 ments by them under the various headings of their applicable
 19 appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care
 20 and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administra-
 21 tion: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be
 22 used to pay in excess of seventy persons engaged in public
 23 relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appro-
 24 priation shall be expended for the purchase of any site for or
 25 toward the construction of any new hospital or home, or for

1 the purchase of any hospital or home; and not more than
2 \$4,708,000 of this appropriation may be used to repair, alter,
3 improve, or provide facilities in the several hospitals and
4 homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration
5 either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and
6 the purchase of materials: *Provided further*, That hereafter
7 the Administrator shall assign as his representatives, as pro-
8 vided for in the last sentence of section 1100 (a) of the Serv-
9 icemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C. 696f),
10 only such numbers of regional or sectional representatives
11 as he finds necessary to provide for the processing of read-
12 justment allowances in an efficient and economical manner.

13 Compensation and pensions: For the payment of com-
14 pensation, pensions, gratuities, and allowances (including
15 subsistence allowances authorized by part VII of Veterans
16 Regulation 1a, as amended), authorized under any Act of
17 Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon, in-
18 cluding emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities,
19 the administration of which is now or may hereafter be
20 placed in the Veterans' Administration, and for the payment
21 of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and
22 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended (38 U. S. C.
23 631 and 661), \$2,147,520,000, to be immediately available
24 and to remain available until expended.

25 Readjustment benefits: For the payment of benefits to

1 or on behalf of veterans as authorized by titles II, III, and
2 V, of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944,
3 \$2,505,600,000, to be immediately available and to remain
4 available until expended (368): *Provided*, That no part of
5 this appropriation for education and training under title II of
6 the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, shall be
7 expended for tuition, fees, or other charges, or for sub-
8 sistence allowance, for any course elected or commenced
9 by a veteran on or subsequent to July 1, 1948, and which
10 is determined by the Administrator to be avocational or
11 recreational in character. For the purposes of this proviso,
12 education or training for the purpose of teaching a veteran
13 to fly or related aviation courses in connection with his
14 present or contemplated business or occupation shall not,
15 in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, be
16 considered avocational or recreational when a certificate in
17 the form of an affidavit supported by corroborating affidavits
18 by two competent disinterested persons, has been furnished
19 by a physically qualified veteran stating that such education
20 or training will be useful to him in connection with earning
21 a livelihood: *Provided further*, That no part of this appro-
22 priation for education and training under title II of the
23 Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, shall be ex-
24 pended subsequent to the effective date of this chapter for

1 subsistence allowance or for tuition, fees, or other charges in
2 any of the following situations:

3 (1) For any veteran for a course in an institution
4 which has been in operation for a period of less than one
5 year immediately prior to the date of enrollment in such
6 course unless such enrollment was prior to August 24, 1949;

7 (2) For any course of education or training for
8 which the educational or training institution involved has
9 no customary cost of tuition, until a fair and reasonable
10 rate of payment for tuition, fees, or other charges for
11 such course has been determined. In any case in which
12 one or more contracts providing a rate or rates of tuition
13 have been executed for two successive years, the rate
14 established by the most recent contract shall be considered
15 to be the customary cost of tuition notwithstanding the
16 definition of "customary cost of tuition" as hereinafter
17 set forth. If the Administrator finds that any institution
18 has no customary cost of tuition he shall forthwith
19 fix and pay or cause to be paid a fair and reason-
20 able rate of payment for tuition, fees, and other charges
21 for the courses offered by such institution. Any educa-
22 tional or training institution which is dissatisfied with a
23 determination of a rate of payment for tuition, fees, or other
24 charges under the foregoing provisions of this paragraph

1 shall be entitled, upon application therefore, to a review of
2 such determination (including the determination with respect
3 to whether there is a customary cost of tuition) by a board
4 to be known as the "Veterans' Tuition Appeals Board"
5 consisting of three members, appointed by the Administrator
6 for such purpose. Such board shall be subject, in respect
7 to appointment, hearings, appeals, and all other actions and
8 qualifications, to the provisions of sections 5 to 11, inclu-
9 sive, of the Administrative Procedure Act, approved June
10 11, 1946, as amended. The decision of such board with
11 respect to all matters shall constitute the final administrative
12 determination. In no event shall the board fix a rate of
13 payment in excess of the maximum amount allowable under
14 the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended. The
15 term "customary cost of tuition" as employed herein and
16 in paragraph 5, part VIII, Veterans Regulation Numbered
17 1 (a), as amended, is regarded as that charge which an
18 educational or training institution requires a nonveteran en-
19 rollee similarly circumstanced to pay as and for tuition for
20 a course, except that the institution (other than a nonprofit
21 institution of higher learning) is not regarded as having a
22 "customary cost of tuition" for the course or courses in ques-
23 tion in the following circumstances:

24 (a) Where the majority of the enrollment of the edu-
25 cational and training institution in the course in question con-

1 sists of veterans in training under Public Laws 16 and 346,
2 Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended; and

3 (b) One of the following conditions prevails:

4 1. The institution has been established subsequent
5 to June 22, 1944.

6 2. The institution, although established prior to June
7 22, 1944, has not been in continuous operation since
8 that date.

9 3. The institution, although established prior to
10 June 22, 1944, has subsequently increased its total
11 tuition charges for the course to all students more than
12 25 per centum.

13 4. The course (or a course of substantially the same
14 length and character) was not provided for nonveteran
15 students by the institution prior to June 22, 1944,
16 although the institution itself was established before June
17 22, 1944: *Provided further*, That nothing in the fore-
18 going proviso shall be construed to affect adversely any
19 legal rights which have accrued prior to the date of
20 enactment of this chapter, or to affect payments to
21 educational or training institutions under contracts in
22 effect on such date.

23 Military and naval insurance: For military and naval
24 insurance, \$6,830,000 to remain available until expended.

25 Hospital and domiciliary facilities: For hospital and

1 domiciliary facilities, \$160,000,000, to remain available
2 until expended for the payment of obligations hereto-
3 fore or herein authorized to be incurred under this head,
4 for extending, with the approval of the President, any
5 of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans'
6 Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sec-
7 tions 1 and 2 of the Act approved March 4, 1931 (38
8 U. S. C. 438 j-k) or in section 101 of the Servicemen's
9 Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C. 693a): *Provided*,
10 That the authority contained in the Third Urgent Deficiency
11 Appropriation Act, 1946, the Independent Offices Appro-
12 priation Act, 1948, the Supplemental Independent Offices
13 Appropriation Act, 1949, and the Independent Offices
14 Appropriation Act, 1950, to incur obligations for the pur-
15 poses specified in those Acts, is hereby extended to July 1,
16 1952: *Provided further*, That not to exceed ~~(369)~~ 6.7
17 per centum of the foregoing appropriation and contract au-
18 thorizations shall be available for the employment in the
19 District of Columbia and in the field of all necessary tech-
20 nical and clerical personnel for the preparation of plans and
21 specifications for the projects as approved hereunder and in
22 the supervision of the execution thereof, and for all travel
23 expenses, field office equipment, and supplies in connection
24 therewith, except that whenever the Veterans' Administra-

tion finds it necessary in the construction of any project to employ other Government agencies or persons outside the Federal service to perform such services not to exceed ~~(370)~~ 10 per centum of the cost of such projects may be expended for such services: *Provided further*, That the amount of the foregoing contract authorizations available for obligation for portable initial equipment, is increased from \$10,000,000 to \$25,000,000, including the purchase of one hundred and seventy-six passenger motor vehicles.

National service life insurance: For the payment of benefits and for transfer to the national service life insurance fund, in accordance with the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, \$31,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That certain premiums shall be credited to this appropriation as provided by the Act.

Veterans' miscellaneous benefits: For the payment of burial awards authorized by Veterans' Administration Regulation Numbered 9 (a), as amended, and for supplies, equipment, and tuition authorized by part VII and payments authorized by part IX of Veterans' Administration Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, \$71,100,000, to remain available until expended.

Grants to the Republic of the Philippines: For payments to the Republic of the Philippines of grants in accordance

1 with the Act of July 1, 1948 (Public Law 865), for
2 expenses incident to medical care and treatment of veterans,
3 \$3,285,000.

4 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-
5 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons except
6 beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits
7 to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the
8 appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Admin-
9 istrator of Veterans' Affairs.

10 WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

11 PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

12 For payment of claims, as authorized by the War Claims
13 Act of 1948, from funds deposited in the Treasury to the
14 credit of the war claims fund created by section 13 (a)
15 of said Act, such sums as may be necessary, to be available
16 to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment of claims under
17 sections 4 (a), 4 (b) (2), 5 (e), 6 (b), and 7 of said
18 Act to the payees named and in the amounts stated in certi-
19 fications by the War Claims Commission and the Federal
20 Security Administrator or their duly authorized represent-
21 atives, which certifications shall be in lieu of any vouchers
22 which might otherwise be required: *Provided*, That this
23 appropriation shall not be available for administrative ex-
24 penses: *Provided further*, That no claims shall be allowed or
25 paid under the provisions of said War Claims Act of 1948

1 from any funds other than those covered into the Treasury
 2 pursuant to the provisions of section 39 of the Trading With
 3 the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, as provided
 4 by section 13 (a) of said War Claims Act of 1948.

5 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

6 For expenses necessary for the War Claims Commission,
 7 including personal services in the District of Columbia;
 8 travel; printing and binding; purchase of one passenger
 9 motor vehicle; services as authorized by section 15 of the
 10 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; expenses of attend-
 11 ance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appro-
 12 priation; and advances or reimbursements to other Govern-
 13 ment agencies for use of their facilities and services in carry-
 14 ing out the functions of the Commission; ~~(371)~~\$600,000
 15 \$700,000, to be derived from the war claims fund
 16 created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948
 17 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948).

18 INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

19 SEC. 102. No part of any appropriation contained
 20 in this title for the Atomic Energy Commission shall be
 21 used to confer a fellowship on any person who advo-
 22 cates or who is a member of an organization or party that
 23 advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United
 24 States by force or violence or with respect to whom the
 25 Commission finds, upon investigation and report by the

1 Federal Bureau of Investigation on the character, asso-
2 ciations, and loyalty of whom, that reasonable grounds
3 exist for belief that such person is disloyal to the Gov-
4 ernment of the United States: *Provided further*, That
5 any person who advocates or who is a member of an
6 organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the
7 Government of the United States by force or violence and
8 accepts employment or a fellowship the salary, wages,
9 stipend, grant, or expenses for which are paid from any
10 appropriation contained in this title shall be guilty of a
11 felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than
12 \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both:
13 *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in
14 addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions
15 of existing law.

16 SEC. 103. Where appropriations in this title are ex-
17 pendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific
18 limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such
19 travel expenses may not exceed the amount set forth therefor
20 in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations.

21 SEC. 104. Where appropriations in this title are ex-
22 pendable for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and
23 no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expendi-
24 tures therefor under each such appropriation may not exceed
25 the amount of \$50: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not

1 apply to the purchase of scientific, technical, trade, or traffic
2 periodicals necessary in connection with the performance of
3 the authorized functions of the agencies for which funds are
4 herein provided.

5 SEC. 105. No part of any appropriation contained
6 in this title shall be available to pay the salary of any
7 person filling a position, other than a temporary position,
8 formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the
9 armed forces of the United States and has satisfactorily com-
10 pleted his period of active military or naval service and has
11 within ninety days after his release from such service or from
12 hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not
13 more than one year made application for restoration to his
14 former position and has been certified by the Civil Service
15 Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his
16 former position and has not been restored thereto.

17 SEC. 106. Appropriations contained in this title,
18 available for expenses of travel shall be available, when
19 specifically authorized by the head of the activity or estab-
20 lishment concerned, for expenses of attendance at meetings
21 of organizations concerned with the function or activity for
22 which the appropriation concerned is made; and shall be
23 available for the examination of estimates of appropriations
24 and activities in the field.

25 SEC. 107. No part of any appropriation or fund

1 contained in this title shall be available for installing or
2 maintaining systems for administrative appropriation, fund,
3 or inventory accounting except such systems as are pre-
4 scribed or approved by the Comptroller General: *Provided*,
5 That all agencies, for whose activities provision is made in
6 this title, shall hereafter maintain fiscal-accounting control
7 of all inventories of supplies, materials, or equipment which
8 may be owned by or be in the custody of such agencies.

9 SEC. 108. No part of any appropriations made
10 available by the provisions of this title shall be used for
11 the purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of
12 establishing new offices outside the District of Columbia:
13 *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to programs
14 which have been approved by the Congress and appropria-
15 tions made therefor.

16 SEC. 109. No part of any appropriation contained in
17 this title shall be used to pay the compensation of any
18 employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the num-
19 ber that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee
20 to one hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-
21 time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned:
22 *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall
23 be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend
24 half time or more in personnel administration consisting of
25 direction and administration of the personnel program;

1 employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and
 2 classification; employee relations and services; training;
 3 committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service
 4 examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording,
 5 and reporting.

6 (372)SEC. 110. *None of the sections under the head "Inde-*
 7 *pendent offices, General provisions" in this title shall apply*
 8 *to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Inland*
 9 *Waterways Corporation, or the Tennessee Valley Authority.*

10 TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

11 The following corporations and agencies, respectively,
 12 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within
 13 the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to
 14 each such corporation or agency and in accord with law,
 15 and to make such contracts and commitments without
 16 regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104
 17 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended,
 18 as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth
 19 in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for each such corpo-
 20 ration or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

21 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

22 Home Loan Bank Board: Not to exceed a total of
 23 \$455,000 to be derived from the special deposit
 24 account established under the provisions under the head
 25 "Federal Home Loan Bank Administration" in the Inde-

1 pendent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, and from receipts
2 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, the Federal
3 Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home Loan Bank Board
4 for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, shall be
5 available during the current fiscal year for administrative
6 expenses of the Home Loan Bank Board, including health
7 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150),
8 and the Board may utilize and may make payment for
9 services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the
10 Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan
11 Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corpora-
12 tion, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That
13 all necessary expenses in connection with the conservator-
14 ship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan
15 Insurance Corporation and all necessary expenses (including
16 services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not in-
17 cluding other personal services) in connection with the
18 handling, including the purchase, sale, and exchange, of
19 securities on behalf of Federal home-loan banks, and the
20 sale, issuance, and retirement of, or payment of interest on,
21 debentures or bonds, under the Federal Home Loan Bank
22 Act, as amended, shall be considered as nonadministrative
23 expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That not-
24 withstanding any other provisions of this chapter, except for
25 the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the admin-

1 istrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall be
2 incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions
3 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22, 1932, as
4 amended (12 U. S. C. 1421-1449).

5 Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation:
6 Not to exceed \$635,000 shall be available for admin-
7 istrative expenses, including health service program as
8 authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), which shall be on
9 an accrual basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid,
10 depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in
11 connection with liquidation of insured institutions, liquida-
12 tion or handling of assets of or derived from insured insti-
13 tutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward
14 the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the
15 case of specific insured institutions, and legal fees and
16 expenses, and said Corporation may utilize and may make
17 payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan
18 banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Home Loan Bank
19 Board, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and other agen-
20 cies of the Government: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any
21 other provisions of this chapter, except for the limitation
22 in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses
23 and other obligations of said Corporation shall be incurred,
24 allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the Act
25 of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1724-1730).

1 Home Owners' Loan Corporation: Not to exceed
2 \$1,400,000 shall be available for administrative ex-
3 penses, including health service program as authorized
4 by law (5 U. S. C. 150), which shall be on an accrual
5 basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation,
6 properly capitalized expenditures, expenses (including per-
7 sonal services) in connection with the termination or liquida-
8 tion of accounts carried on the books of the Corporation
9 not to exceed \$500,000, expenses (including services
10 performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but
11 not including other personal services) in connection with the
12 acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement,
13 or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said
14 Corporation or in which it has an interest, and legal fees
15 and expenses, and said Corporation may utilize and may
16 make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-
17 loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Home Loan Bank
18 Board, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corpora-
19 tion, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided, That,*
20 notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter, except
21 for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the ad-
22 ministrative expenses and other obligations of said Corpora-
23 tion shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with
24 the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12
25 U. S. C. 1461-1468).

1 Federal Housing Administration: In addition to the
 2 amounts available by or pursuant to law (which shall be
 3 transferred to this authorization) for the administrative
 4 expenses of the Federal Housing Administration in carrying
 5 out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed
 6 \$5,425,000 of the various funds of the Federal Housing
 7 Administration shall be available for expenditure, in ac-
 8 cordance with the National Housing Act, as amended (12
 9 U. S. C. 1701): *Provided*, That, except as herein other-
 10 wise provided, all expenses and obligations of said Admin-
 11 istration shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance
 12 with the provisions of said Act: *Provided further*, That
 13 funds available for expenditure shall be available for contract
 14 actuarial services (not to exceed \$1,500); purchase of
 15 periodicals and newspapers (not to exceed \$1,500); health
 16 service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and
 17 the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles, of which one
 18 shall be for replacement only.

19 Public Housing Administration: Of the amounts avail-
 20 able by or pursuant to law for the administrative expenses
 21 of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out duties
 22 imposed by or pursuant to law including funds appro-
 23 priated by title I of this chapter, not to exceed (373)\$17,-
 24 724,000 \$17,524,000 shall be available for such ex-
 25 penses, including purchase of not to exceed nine passenger

1 motor vehicles, of which eight shall be for replacement only;
2 expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned
3 with the work of the Administration; and a health service
4 program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) : *Provided*,
5 That necessary expenses of providing representatives of the
6 Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects in connec-
7 tion with the construction of such non-Federal projects by
8 public housing agencies with the aid of the Administration,
9 shall be compensated by such agencies by the payment of
10 fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the develop-
11 ment costs of such projects will cover the costs of render-
12 ing such services, and expenditures by the Administration
13 for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative
14 expenses, and funds received from such payments may be
15 used only for the payment of necessary expenses of provid-
16 ing representatives of the Administration at the sites of
17 non-Federal projects or for administrative expenses of the
18 Administration not in excess of the amount authorized by
19 the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Administrator
20 of the Housing and Home Finance Agency may relinquish
21 and transfer, pursuant to the same general terms and condi-
22 tions specified in subsections 505 (a) and (b) of the
23 Act of October 14, 1940, as added by the Act of June 28,
24 1948 (Public Law 796), title to temporary housing pro-
25 vided for certain veterans and their families under title

1 V of said Act of October 14, 1940, as amended, to any
2 State, county, city, other public body, educational institution,
3 or nonprofit organization: *Provided further*, That any appli-
4 cation for such relinquishment and transfer shall be filed with
5 the Administrator by December 31, 1950: *Provided further*,
6 That funds made available by the Act of June 29, 1936 (49
7 Stat. 2035) shall be available for necessary expenses, in-
8 cluding administrative expenses, of the Public Housing
9 Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Act of
10 May 19, 1949 (Public Law 65).

11 INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

12 Inland Waterways Corporation (administered under
13 the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Commerce) :
14 Not to exceed \$542,000 shall be available for admin-
15 istrative expenses, to be determined in the manner set
16 forth under the title "General expenses" in the Uniform
17 System of Accounts for Carriers by Water of the Interstate
18 Commerce Commission (effective January 1, 1947) : *Pro-*
19 *vided*, That no funds shall be used to pay compensation of
20 employees normally subject to the Classification Act of
21 1949 at rates in excess of rates fixed for similar services
22 under the provisions of said Act, nor to pay the compensa-
23 tion of vessel employees and such terminal and other em-
24 ployees as are not covered by said Act, at rates in excess
25 of rates prevailing in the river transportation industry in

1 the area (including prevailing leave allowances for vessel
2 employees, but the granting of such allowances shall not be
3 construed as establishing a different leave system within the
4 meaning of that term as used in section 3 of the Act of
5 December 21, 1944 (5. U. S. C. 61d)).

6 TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

7 Not to exceed \$4,026,000 of the funds available
8 to the Tennessee Valley Authority, shall be available
9 during the current fiscal year for all administrative and
10 general expenses of the Corporation, which expenses shall
11 be inclusive of costs of all administrative offices and other
12 activities representing management and other functions serv-
13 ing the programs and projects of the Corporation in general.

14 CORPORATIONS—GENERAL PROVISION

15 SEC. 202. No part of the funds of, or available for ex-
16 penditure by, any corporation or agency included in this
17 title shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee
18 engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that
19 would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one
20 hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time,
21 and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Pro-*
22 *vided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be

1 considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-
2 time or more in personnel administration consisting of di-
3 rection and administration of the personnel program;
4 employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and
5 classification; employee relations and services; training;
6 committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service
7 examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording,
8 and reporting.

9 This chapter may be cited as the "Independent Offices
10 Appropriation Act, 1951".

1 CHAPTER IX—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT
2 OF THE ARMY
3 QUARTERMASTER CORPS
4 CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

5 Cemetery expenses: For maintaining and improving
6 national cemeteries, including personal services and fuel for
7 superintendents; purchase of grave sites; maintenance of the
8 Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, chapel, and grounds in
9 the Arlington National Cemetery, and that portion of Con-
10 gressional Cemetery to which the United States has title and
11 the graves of those buried therein, including Confederate
12 graves, and the burial site of Pushmataha, a Choctaw Indian
13 chief; repair to roadways but not to more than a single
14 approach road to any national cemetery; for headstones or
15 markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces
16 under the Act of July 1, 1948 (24 U. S. C. 279a, b),
17 and civilians interred in post cemeteries; for maintenance
18 of monuments, tablets, roads, fences, and so forth, made and
19 constructed by the United States in Cuba and China to mark
20 the places where American soldiers fell; maintenance of the

1 amounts received during the current fiscal year by each of the
2 Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as proceeds
3 from the sale of scrap or salvage material, shall be available
4 during the current fiscal year for expenses of transportation,
5 demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage of
6 military supplies, equipment, and matériel: *Provided*, That a
7 report of receipts and disbursements under this limitation
8 shall be made quarterly to the Appropriation Committees of
9 the Congress.

10 (467) SEC. 630. *Appropriations and contract authority con-*
11 *tained in this chapter shall not be subject to the provisions of*
12 *subsections (c) to (i), inclusive, of section 3679 of the Revised*
13 *Statutes, as amended by section 1111 of this Act, during the*
14 *existence of an emergency affecting the national security.*

15 TITLE VII—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

16 SEC. 701. The contract authorization granted under the
17 head "Ordnance for New Construction," in title IV of the
18 "National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950,"
19 is reduced by the sum of \$31,460,000 and the amount of the
20 limitation imposed by the proviso under said head on the
21 total obligations to be incurred for armor, armament, and
22 ammunition, for construction, conversion, or replacement ap-
23 proved during the fiscal year 1950, is also reduced by the
24 sum of \$31,460,000.

25 This chapter may be cited as the "Defense Appropria-
26 tion Act, 1951".

1 (468) CHAPTER X A—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN
2 APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORI-
3 ZATIONS

4 Reductions in appropriations and contract authoriza-
5 tions contained in this Act are hereby made in the sum
6 of \$600,000,000.

7 Not more than the following sums may be obligated by
8 any agency or department provided for in this Act, viz:

9 (1) For civilian personnel, not more than an amount 10
10 per centum below the amount proposed in the President's
11 budget estimates for fiscal year 1951, except that in the De-
12 partment of Defense where no more than the amount of the
13 President's budget estimate minus 2 per centum shall be
14 obligated. This paragraph shall not apply to nurses, doc-
15 tors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the
16 Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration.

17 (2) For travel, not more than a total for all depart-
18 ments and agencies of \$319,000,000, and not more than 5
19 per centum less than the estimates provided for military
20 personnel travel and not more than 20 per centum less than
21 the amount provided for civilian personnel travel, than the
22 estimates therefor contained in the President's budget mes-
23 sage for the fiscal year 1951.

1 (3) For transportation of things, for all departments
2 and agencies, not more than \$720,000,000: *Provided fur-*
3 *ther,* That in no case shall the amount obligated exceed a
4 figure 10 per centum below the estimates submitted by the
5 President in his budget message for 1951 for each item
6 for all agencies except the Department of Defense, and for
7 the Department of Defense not more than 5 per centum less
8 than the estimates of the President, transmitted in said
9 budget message.

10 (4) For communications services, not more than \$59,-
11 000,000, and not more for any department other than the
12 Department of Defense than the amount of the President's
13 budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum, and for
14 the Department of Defense not more than a figure 5 per
15 centum below the President's budget estimates for 1951.

16 (5) For rents and utilities, not more than \$205,-
17 000,000, and for all establishments other than the Depart-
18 ment of Defense not more than the President's budget
19 estimates for fiscal year 1951 minus 10 per centum.

20 (6) For printing and reproduction, not more than
21 \$52,000,000, and not more in any case than the President's
22 budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

23 (7) For other contractual services, not more than
24 \$1,301,000,000, and for all departments other than the

1 Department of Defense not more than the President's budget
2 estimates for 1951 minus 10 per centum.

3 ~~(8)~~ For supplies and materials, not more than \$3,888,-
4 000,000, and for all departments of the Government except
5 the Department of Defense and the Veterans' hospitals not
6 more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus
7 10 per centum.

8 ~~(9)~~ For equipment, not more than \$3,577,000,000,
9 and for all departments other than the Department of De-
10 fense, not more than the President's budget estimates for
11 1951 minus 10 per centum.

12 ~~(10)~~ For lands and structures, for all departments of
13 the Government, except the Department of Defense not
14 more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 5
15 per centum.

(469)CHAPTER X-B—FOREIGN AID

(470)TITLE I—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO
THE PRESIDENT

(471)ECONOMIC COOPERATION

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended by the Act of April 19, 1949 (Public Law 47), and as further amended by the Act of June 5, 1950 (Public Law 535), including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation (not to exceed \$30,000); hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation and hire of aircraft; payment of damage claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); rents in the District of Columbia; transportation of privately owned automobiles; entertainment (not to exceed \$20,000); exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes; and loss by exchange; \$2,450,000,000, of which not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for expenditures of a confidential character (other than entertainment) under the direction of the Administrator or the Deputy Administrator, who shall make a certificate of the amount of each such expenditure which he may think it advisable not

1 to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a suffi-
2 cient voucher for the amount therein specified: Provided,
3 That this appropriation shall be consolidated and merged
4 with funds heretofore made available for the purposes of
5 the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and
6 such consolidated appropriation may be used during the fis-
7 cal year 1951 within the limitations herein specified (472):
8 Provided further, That the Administrator is authorized and
9 directed to issue notes from time to time during the fiscal year
10 1951 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, who is
11 hereby authorized and directed to make such purchases, in
12 an amount not exceeding in the aggregate \$100,000,000 for
13 the purpose of assistance to Spain, to be extended upon credit
14 terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic
15 Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (473): Provided fur-
16 ther, That not to exceed \$15,255,000 of such consolidated
17 appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses
18 during the fiscal year 1951, (474) of which not more than
19 \$25,000 shall be available to the Administrator for any
20 further action he may consider advisable to carry out the provi-
21 sions of section 115 (f) of the Economic Cooperation Act of
22 1948, as amended (475): Provided further, That not to exceed
23 \$600,000,000 shall be available for transfers under section 111
24 (d) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended
25 (476): Provided further, That after November 1, 1950,
26 no funds herein appropriated shall be made available to any

1 nation of which a dependent area fails to comply with any
 2 treaty to which the United States and such dependent area
 3 are parties (477): Provided further, That no part of the
 4 funds herein appropriated shall be used to provide assist-
 5 ance to any participating country which, in the opinion of
 6 the President, has failed, refused, or neglected to support the
 7 United Nations in the Korean War by supplying armed
 8 personnel, materials of war, or services.

9 (478) ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

10 For expenses necessary to provide assistance to the
 11 Republic of Korea, as authorized by law, including expenses
 12 of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of
 13 this appropriation; payment of tort claims pursuant to law
 14 (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service programs as author-
 15 ized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); transportation of privately
 16 owned automobiles; hire of passenger motor vehicles and
 17 aircraft; exchange of funds without regard to section 3651
 18 of the Revised Statutes; and loss by exchange; \$90,000,000:
 19 Provided, That not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be available
 20 for administrative expenses.

21 (479) INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S WELFARE WORK

22 To enable the President to carry out the provisions of
 23 title V of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950
 24 (Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950), \$12,500,000:
 25 Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used

1 *for contributions to any agency or to any subordinate body*
2 *of the United Nations other than to the United Nations*
3 *International Children's Emergency Fund.*

4 (480)INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

5 *For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry*
6 *out the provisions of the Act for International Development*
7 *(title IV of Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950), in-*
8 *cluding personal services in the District of Columbia; expenses*
9 *of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this*
10 *appropriation; purchase (not to exceed twelve), and hire of*
11 *passenger motor vehicles for use outside the continental limits*
12 *of the United States; printing and binding; payment of tort*
13 *claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service*
14 *programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); insurance*
15 *of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by*
16 *law of such countries; acquisition of temporary quarters out-*
17 *side the continental limits of the United States to house em-*
18 *ployees of the United States Government by rental (with-*
19 *out regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as*
20 *amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), lease, or construction, and*
21 *necessary repairs and alterations to such temporary quarters;*
22 *exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the*
23 *Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543); entertainment (not*
24 *to exceed \$2,000); health and accident insurance for foreign*
25 *trainees and technicians while absent from their own*
26 *countries participating in activities authorized under this*

1 appropriation, and actual expenses of preparing and trans-
2 porting to their former homes the remains of such persons
3 who may die away from their homes while participating in
4 such activities; services of commissioned officers of the Public
5 Health Service and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and
6 for purposes of providing such services the Public Health
7 Service may appoint not to exceed twenty officers in the Regu-
8 lar Corps to grades above that of senior assistant, but not
9 above that of director, as otherwise authorized in accordance
10 with section 711 of the Act of July 1, 1944, as amended
11 (42 U. S. C. 211a), and the Coast and Geodetic Survey
12 may appoint for such purposes not to exceed twenty com-
13 missioned officers in addition to those otherwise authorized;
14 \$26,900,000; and, in addition, there may be transferred
15 to this appropriation for the purposes hereof not to exceed
16 \$2,600,000 from the appropriation to the Department of State
17 for "International information and educational activities,"
18 fiscal year 1951: Provided, That this appropriation shall be
19 available for contracts or agreements entered into during the
20 fiscal year 1951 pursuant to section 405 (e) of the Act for
21 International Development which entail commitments for the
22 expenditure of funds for not to exceed three years (481):
23 Provided, however, That no part of this appropriation may
24 be expended for the duplication of any program being carried
25 on by any other agency of the United States Government or
26 any international agency to which the United States is a

1 major contributor, nor for the construction of any project
 2 except for demonstration or instructional purposes, nor for
 3 any purpose except administrative expenses, and prelimi-
 4 nary surveys and technical cooperation programs upon
 5 which reports shall be made to the Congress of the United
 6 States quarterly (482): Provided further, That the mak-
 7 ing of any survey or the advancement of any technical
 8 cooperation program or the preparation of plans for
 9 projects does not constitute any obligation whatsoever on
 10 the part of the Government of the United States to make any
 11 loan or grant for the execution or construction of any project
 12 or for the completion of any program devised under title IV
 13 of Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950 (483): Pro-
 14 vided further, That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of
 15 State to give written notice to each recipient of funds or
 16 beneficiary under said title that such assistance shall not be
 17 construed as an obligation on the part of the United States
 18 to make funds available for the construction or execution of
 19 any project and to report such action to Congress.

20 (484) MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE

21 For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry
 22 out the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of
 23 1949, as amended, for the period through June 30, 1951,
 24 \$1,678,023,729, of which (a) \$1,000,000,000 shall be
 25 available, in accordance with section 102 (b), for carrying
 26 out the provisions of title I, including expenses, as authorized

1 by section 408 (b), of administering the provisions of said
 2 Act and the Act of May 22, 1947 (61 Stat. 103), as
 3 amended; (b) \$131,500,000 shall be available for carrying
 4 out the provisions of title II; (c) \$91,000,000 shall be
 5 available for carrying out the provisions of title III, includ-
 6 ing \$16,000,000 as authorized by section 302 (b) and
 7 \$75,000,000 as authorized by section 303 (b); and (d)
 8 \$455,523,729 shall be available for payment of obligations
 9 incurred under the authority to enter into contracts granted
 10 under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation
 11 Act, 1950: Provided, That the unexpended balances of ap-
 12 propriations and contract authorizations granted under this
 13 head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950,
 14 shall continue available until June 30, 1951.

15 (485) *TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE*

16 (486) *DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CIVIL FUNCTIONS*

17 *GOVERNMENT AND RELIEF IN OCCUPIED AREAS*

18 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
 19 meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States
 20 in connection with the government or occupation of certain
 21 foreign areas (except Germany), including personal services
 22 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere and, subject to
 23 such authorizations and limitations as may be prescribed by
 24 the head of the department or agency concerned, tuition,
 25 personal allowances (not to exceed \$10 per day), travel
 26 expenses (not to exceed those authorized for like United

1 *States military or civilian personnel), and fees incident to*
2 *instruction in the United States or elsewhere of such persons*
3 *as may be required to carry out the provisions of this appro-*
4 *priation; travel expenses and transportation; services as*
5 *authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946*
6 *(5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem*
7 *for individuals; health service program as authorized by*
8 *law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of claims pursuant to law*
9 *(28 U. S. C. 2672); translation rights, photographic work,*
10 *educational exhibits, and dissemination of information, in-*
11 *cluding preview and review expenses incident thereto; expenses*
12 *incident to the operation of schools in Japan for American*
13 *children who are dependents of Government personnel; print-*
14 *ing and binding; purchase and hire of passenger motor*
15 *vehicles and aircraft; repair and maintenance of buildings,*
16 *utilities, facilities, and appurtenances; contingencies for the*
17 *United States commanders, commissioners, or other adminis-*
18 *trators of foreign areas, to be expended in their respective*
19 *discretions (not exceeding amounts authorized or approved*
20 *by the head of the department or agency concerned); such*
21 *minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such areas*
22 *as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest,*
23 *prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished; and*
24 *such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be essential*
25 *to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; \$288,000,000,*
26 *of which not to exceed \$18,200,000 shall be available for*

1 *administrative expenses: Provided, That the general pro-*
2 *visions of the appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1951*
3 *for the military functions of the Department of the Army*
4 *shall apply to expenditures made by that Department*
5 *from this appropriation: Provided further, That ex-*
6 *penditures from this appropriation may be made out-*
7 *side continental United States, when necessary to carry*
8 *out its purposes, without regard to sections 355, 1136,*
9 *3648, and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, civil*
10 *service or classification laws, or provisions of law prohibiting*
11 *payment of any person not a citizen of the United States:*
12 *Provided further, That expenditures from this appro-*
13 *priation may be made, when necessary to carry out its*
14 *purposes, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes,*
15 *as amended, and the Armed Services Procurement Act of*
16 *1947 (41 U. S. C. 151-161): Provided further, That ex-*
17 *penditures may be made hereunder for the purposes of eco-*
18 *nomie rehabilitation in such occupied areas in such manner*
19 *as to be consistent with the general objectives of the Economic*
20 *Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended: Provided further,*
21 *That funds appropriated hereunder and unexpended at the*
22 *time of the termination of occupation by the United States, of*
23 *any area for which such funds are made available, may be*
24 *expended by the President for the procurement of such com-*
25 *modities and technical services, and commodities procured*
26 *from funds herein or heretofore appropriated for government*

1 *and relief in occupied areas and not delivered to such an area*
2 *prior to the time of the termination of occupation, may be*
3 *utilized by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the*
4 *maintenance of the political and economic stability of such*
5 *areas: Provided further, That before any such assistance is*
6 *made available, an agreement shall be entered into between*
7 *the United States and the recognized government or authority*
8 *with respect to such area containing such undertakings by*
9 *such government or authority as the President may deter-*
10 *mine to be necessary in order to assure the efficient use of*
11 *such assistance in furtherance of such purposes: Provided*
12 *further, That such agreement shall, when applicable, include*
13 *requirements and undertakings corresponding to the require-*
14 *ments and undertakings specified in sections 5, 6, and 7*
15 *of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, approved*
16 *December 17, 1947): Provided further, That funds appro-*
17 *priated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable, and*
18 *under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by*
19 *the head of the department or agency concerned to pay*
20 *ocean transportation charges from United States ports, in-*
21 *cluding territorial ports, to ports in Japan and the Ryukyus*
22 *for the movement of supplies donated to, or purchased*
23 *by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies regis-*
24 *tered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee*
25 *on Voluntary Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned*
26 *to individuals residing in such countries: Provided further,*

1 *That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the*
 2 *head of the department or agency concerned shall fix and*
 3 *pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation*
 4 *of all relief packages of food or other general classification*
 5 *of commodities shipped to Japan or the Ryukyus regardless*
 6 *of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by par-*
 7 *ticular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not*
 8 *apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals: Pro-*
 9 *vided further, That the President may transfer to any other*
 10 *department or agency any function or functions provided for*
 11 *under this appropriation, and there shall be transferred to any*
 12 *such department or agency such unobligated balances of this*
 13 *appropriation and, without reimbursement and without regard*
 14 *to the appropriation from which procured, such property*
 15 *as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine*
 16 *to relate primarily to any function or functions so transferred;*
 17 *and any funds so transferred may be expended either under*
 18 *the authority contained herein or under the authority govern-*
 19 *ing the activities of the department or agency concerned.*

20 **(487) TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

21 **(488) GOVERNMENT IN OCCUPIED AREAS OF GERMANY**

22 *For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to*
 23 *meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States*
 24 *in connection with the government, occupation, and control*
 25 *of occupied areas of Germany, under such regulations as*
 26 *the Secretary of State may prescribe, including personal*

1 *services in the District of Columbia; one deputy to the United*
2 *States High Commissioner for Germany at a salary of*
3 *\$17,500; tuition, personal allowances (not to exceed \$10*
4 *per day), travel expenses (not to exceed those authorized for*
5 *United States civilian personnel), health and accident insur-*
6 *ance, and fees incident to instruction in the United States or*
7 *elsewhere, of such persons as may be required to carry out*
8 *the provisions of this appropriation; actual expenses of pre-*
9 *paring and transporting to their former homes the remains*
10 *of persons who may die away from their homes while partici-*
11 *pating in activities authorized under this appropriation;*
12 *services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,*
13 *1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per*
14 *diem for individuals; health service program as authorized*
15 *by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of tort claims pursuant*
16 *to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) and payment of tort claims in*
17 *the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672,*
18 *as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such*
19 *claims arise in foreign countries; expenses for translation*
20 *and reproduction rights; acquisition, maintenance, operation,*
21 *and distribution of educational, informational, reorientation,*
22 *and rehabilitation materials and equipment for Germany,*
23 *including grants; medical and health assistance for the*
24 *civilian population of Germany; expenses incident to the*
25 *operation of schools for American children who are depend-*
26 *ents of Government personnel; expenses incident to main-*

1 *taining discipline and order in occupied areas (including*
2 *trial and punishment by courts established by or under*
3 *authority of the President); printing and binding, includ-*
4 *ing printing and binding outside continental United States*
5 *without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919*
6 *(44 U. S. C. 111); purchase, rental, operation, and mainte-*
7 *nance of printing and binding machines, equipment, and*
8 *devices abroad; purchase and hire of passenger motor ve-*
9 *hicles; transportation to occupied Germany of property*
10 *donated for the purposes of this appropriation; unforeseen*
11 *contingencies (not to exceed \$100,000) for the United States*
12 *High Commissioner for Germany, to be accounted for pur-*
13 *suant to the provisions of section 291 of the Revised Statutes*
14 *(31 U. S. C. 107); and representation allowances (not to*
15 *exceed \$20,000) similar to those authorized by section 901*
16 *(3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C.*
17 *1131); \$27,000,000: Provided, That provisions of law,*
18 *including current appropriation Acts, applicable to the De-*
19 *partment of State shall be available for application to*
20 *expenditures made from this appropriation: Provided fur-*
21 *ther, That when section 601 of the Economy Act of 1932,*
22 *as amended (31 U. S. C. 686), is employed to carry out*
23 *the purposes of this appropriation the requisitioned agency*
24 *may utilize the authority contained in this appropriation:*
25 *Provided further, That expenditures from this appropriation*
26 *may be made outside the continental United States, when*

1 necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sec-
2 tions 355 and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended: Provided
3 further, That the Department of State is authorized to utilize
4 for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, includ-
5 ing unforeseen contingencies, without dollar reimbursement
6 from this or any other appropriation (1) currencies de-
7 posited in Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany
8 in accordance with section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic
9 Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and which may be
10 made available by the Economic Cooperation Administration,
11 (2) currencies otherwise deposited in Germany by the
12 Federal Republic of Germany and which become available
13 for use of the Government of the United States, its repre-
14 sentatives or agencies in Germany, in such quantities and
15 under such terms and conditions as may be determined by
16 the Secretary of State after consultation with the Adminis-
17 trator for Economic Cooperation, and (3) other currencies
18 derived from activities carried on under this appropriation:
19 Provided further, That civilian employees of the United
20 States serving in Germany who received appointments in
21 October 1949 to the Foreign Service of the United States
22 for service in Germany shall, for the purposes of section
23 625 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, be considered to
24 have been in class on September 30, 1949: Provided fur-
25 ther, That for the purposes of this appropriation appoint-
26 ments may be made to the Foreign Service Reserve without

1 regard to the four-year limitation contained in section 522
 2 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946: Provided further, That
 3 in the event the President assigns to the Department of State
 4 responsibilities and obligations of the United States in con-
 5 nection with the government, occupation, or control of foreign
 6 areas in addition to Germany, the authorities contained in
 7 this appropriation may be utilized by the Department of
 8 State in connection with such government, occupation, or
 9 control of such foreign areas: Provided further, That when
 10 the Department of the Army, under the authority of the Act
 11 of March 3, 1911, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1253), fur-
 12 nishes subsistence supplies to personnel of civilian agencies
 13 of the United States Government serving in Germany, pay-
 14 ment therefor by such personnel shall be made at the same
 15 rate as is paid by civilian personnel of the Department of
 16 the Army serving in Germany.

17 (489) AID TO PALESTINE REFUGEES

18 For contributions by the United States to the United
 19 Nations for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency
 20 for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, as authorized by
 21 title III of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950
 22 (Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950), \$27,450,000.

23 This chapter may be cited as the "Foreign Aid Appro-
 24 priation Act, 1951".

1 CHAPTER XI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

2 DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

3 SEC. 1101. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the
4 maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal
5 year, in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2,
6 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger
7 motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station
8 wagons), is hereby fixed at \$1,400.

9 SEC. 1102. Unless otherwise specified and during the
10 current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained
11 in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensa-
12 tion of any officer or employee of the Government of the
13 United States (including any agency the majority of the
14 stock of which is owned by the Government of the United
15 States) whose post of duty is in continental United States
16 unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States,
17 (2) is a person in the service of the United States on
18 the date of enactment of this Act who, being eligible for
19 citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become
20 a citizen of the United States prior to such date, or (3)
21 is a person who owes allegiance to the United States:
22 *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit
23 signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie

1 evidence that the requirements of this section with respect
2 to his status have been complied with: *Provided further*,
3 That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty
4 of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more
5 than \$4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year,
6 or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause
7 shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any
8 other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That
9 any payment made to any officer or employee contrary
10 to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in
11 action by the Federal Government. This section shall not
12 apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to
13 nationals of those countries allied with the United States
14 in the prosecution of the war.

15 SEC. 1103. Appropriations of the executive departments
16 and independent establishments for the current fiscal year,
17 available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the
18 activity concerned, are hereby made available for living
19 quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26,
20 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), and regulations prescribed there-
21 under, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed
22 under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946,
23 in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regula-
24 tions of the President, for all civilian officers and employees
25 of the Government permanently stationed in foreign coun-

1 tries: *Provided*, That the availability of appropriations made
2 to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions of
3 the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected hereby.

4 SEC. 1104. No part of any appropriation for the current
5 fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid
6 to any person for the filling of any position for which he or
7 she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to
8 approve of the nomination of said person.

9 SEC. 1105. No part of any appropriation contained in
10 this or any other Act shall be used to pay in excess of \$4
11 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United
12 States Code Annotated and such volumes shall be purchased
13 on condition and with the understanding that latest pub-
14 lished cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the
15 date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in
16 excess of \$4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes
17 of the Lifetime Federal Digest.

18 SEC. 1106. Funds made available by this or any other
19 Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year
20 of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government
21 Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 841),
22 shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds
23 are otherwise available, for personal services and rent in
24 the District of Columbia; printing and binding; examination
25 of budgets and estimates of appropriations in the field;

1 services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of
2 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and the objects
3 specified in the sections of this title under the head
4 "Departments and agencies", all the provisions of
5 which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such
6 funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which
7 they are made available: *Provided*, That in the event any
8 functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subse-
9 quently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limita-
10 tions on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly
11 reduced.

12 SEC. 1107. No part of any funds of or available to any
13 wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for
14 the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the
15 purchase or construction of any office building at the seat
16 of government primarily for occupancy by any department
17 or agency of the United States Government or by any cor-
18 poration owned by the United States Government.

19 SEC. 1108. Funds of corporations and agencies, subject
20 to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended,
21 covered by the provisions of this or any other Act shall
22 be available during the current fiscal year for payment of
23 tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

24 SEC. 1109. No part of any appropriation contained in this

1 or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure
2 by any corporation included in this or any other Act, shall
3 be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages
4 in a strike against the Government of the United States or
5 who is a member of an organization of Government employees
6 that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
7 United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an or-
8 ganization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government
9 of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for
10 the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima
11 facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not
12 contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike
13 against the Government of the United States, is not a member
14 of an organization of Government employees that asserts the
15 right to strike against the Government of the United States,
16 or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
17 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Gov-
18 ernment of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*
19 *further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the
20 Government of the United States or who is a member of an
21 organization of Government employees that asserts the right
22 to strike against the Government of the United States, or
23 who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that
24 advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
25 States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary

1 or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund
2 contained in this or any other Act shall be guilty of a felony
3 and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or
4 imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided*
5 *further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to,
6 and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing
7 law: *Provided further*, That, as applicable to the Depart-
8 ments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section
9 shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person
10 employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency
11 work involving the loss of human life or destruction of
12 property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made
13 to such persons from applicable appropriations for services
14 rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit
15 contemplated by this section.

16 SEC. 1110. No funds made available by this or any other
17 Act shall be withdrawn from one appropriation account for
18 credit to another, or to a working fund, except as authorized
19 by law: *Provided*, That, except as otherwise specifically
20 provided by law, any funds so withdrawn and credited shall
21 be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same
22 limitations, conditions, and restrictions, as provided by the
23 Act appropriating such funds: *Provided further*, That any
24 such withdrawal and credit shall be made, without warrant
25 action, by check: *Provided further*, That no funds withdrawn

1 and credited pursuant to section 601 of the Act of June
2 30, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686),
3 shall be available for any period beyond that provided by the
4 Act appropriating such funds.

5 SEC. 1111. Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as
6 amended (31 U. S. C. 665), is hereby further amended to
7 read as follows:

8 "SEC. 3679. (a) No officer or employee of the United
9 States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create
10 or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund
11 in excess of the amount available therein; nor shall any
12 such officer or employee involve the Government in any
13 contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for
14 any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such
15 purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized
16 by law.

17 "(b) No officer or employee of the United States shall
18 accept voluntary service for the United States or employ
19 personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except
20 in cases of emergency involving the safety of human life or
21 the protection of property.

22 "(c) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section,
23 all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a defi-
24 nite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obli-
25 gation (490) or expenditure thereof in a manner which would

1 indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropria-
2 tions for such period; and all appropriations or funds not
3 limited to a definite period of time, and all authorizations to
4 create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations,
5 shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and
6 economical use thereof. As used hereafter in this section, the
7 term 'appropriation' means appropriations, funds, and au-
8 thorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of
9 appropriations.

10 “(2) In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may
11 be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect sav-
12 ings whenever savings are made possible by or through
13 changes in (491) ~~requirements~~, *requirements* or greater effi-
14 ciency of operations (492), ~~or other developments~~ subse-
15 quent to the date on which such appropriation was made
16 available. Whenever it is determined by an officer desig-
17 nated in subsection (d) of this section to make apporportion-
18 ments and reapportionments that any amount so reserved
19 will not be required to carry out the purposes of the appro-
20 priation concerned, he shall recommend the rescission of such
21 amount in the manner provided in the Budget and Account-
22 ing Act, 1921, for estimates of appropriations.

23 “(3) Any appropriation subject to apportionment shall
24 be distributed by months, calendar quarters, operating sea-
25 sons, or other time periods, or by activities, functions, proj-

1 ects, or objects, or by a combination thereof, as may be
2 deemed appropriate by the officers designated in subsection
3 (d) of this section to make apportionments and reappor-
4 tionments. Except as otherwise specified by the officer
5 making the apportionment, amounts so apportioned shall
6 remain available for obligation, in accordance with the
7 terms of the appropriation, on a cumulative basis unless
8 reapportioned.

9 “(4) Apportionments shall be reviewed at least four
10 times each year by the officers designated in subsection (d)
11 of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments,
12 and such reapportionments made or such reserves established,
13 modified, or released as may be necessary to further the
14 effective use of the appropriation concerned, in accordance
15 with the purposes stated in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

16 “(d) (1) Any appropriation available to the legisla-
17 tive branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, which
18 is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this
19 section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by
20 the officer having administrative control of such appropria-
21 tion. Each such appropriation shall be apportioned not later
22 than thirty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for
23 which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty
24 days after approval of the Act by which the appropriation
25 is made available, whichever is later.

1 “(2) Any appropriation available to an agency, which
2 is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this
3 section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by
4 the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The head of
5 each agency to which any such appropriation is available
6 shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in
7 such form and manner and at such time or times as the
8 Director may prescribe, as may be required for the appor-
9 tionment of such appropriation. Such information shall be
10 submitted not later than forty days before the beginning
11 of any fiscal year for which the appropriation is available,
12 or not more than fifteen days after approval of the Act by
13 which such appropriation is made available, whichever is
14 later. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall
15 apportion each such appropriation and shall notify the agency
16 concerned of his action not later than twenty days before
17 the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation
18 is available, or not more than thirty days after the approval
19 of the Act by which such appropriation is made available,
20 whichever is later. When used in this section, the term
21 ‘agency’ means any executive department, agency, commis-
22 sion, authority, administration, board, or other independent
23 establishment in the executive branch of the Government,
24 including any corporation wholly or partly owned by the
25 United States which is an instrumentality of the United

1 States. (493) ~~Nothing in this subsection shall be so con-~~
2 ~~strued as to interfere with the initiation, operation, and~~
3 ~~administration of agricultural price support programs. No~~
4 ~~funds (other than funds for administrative expenses) avail-~~
5 ~~able for price support, surplus removal, and related opera-~~
6 ~~tions, with respect to agricultural commodities shall be subject~~
7 ~~to apportionment pursuant to this section. The provisions of~~
8 ~~this section shall not apply (494) to appropriations for the~~
9 ~~transportation of mail or to any corporation which obtains~~
10 ~~funds for making loans, other than paid in capital funds,~~
11 ~~without legal liability on the part of the United States.~~

12 “(e) (1) No apportionment or reapportionment which,
13 in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment
14 or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a de-
15 ficiency or supplemental estimate shall be made except upon
16 a determination by such officer that such action is required
17 because of (A) any laws enacted subsequent to the trans-
18 mission to the Congress of the estimates for an appropria-
19 tion which require expenditures beyond administrative con-
20 trol; or (B) emergencies involving the safety of human
21 life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare
22 of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been
23 made to enable the United States to make payment of, or
24 contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to
25 individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in
26 accordance with formulae prescribed by law.

1 “(2) In each case of an apportionment or a reappor-
 2 tionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such
 3 apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a neces-
 4 sity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate, such officer
 5 shall immediately submit a detailed report of the facts of
 6 the case to the Congress. In transmitting any deficiency
 7 or supplemental estimates required on account of any such
 8 apportionment or reapportionment, reference shall be made
 9 to such report.

10 “(f) (495)(1) The officers designated in subsection (d)
 11 of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments
 12 may exempt from apportionments (496) *trust funds and*
 13 *working funds expenditures from which have no significant*
 14 *effect on the financial operations of the Government, working*
 15 *capital and revolving funds established for intra-govern-*
 16 *mental operations*, receipts from industrial and power opera-
 17 tions available under law and any appropriation made
 18 specifically for—

19 “(1) interest on, or retirement of, the public debt;

20 “(2) payment of claims, judgments, refunds, and
 21 draw-backs;

22 “(3) any item determined by the President to be
 23 of a confidential nature;

24 “(4) payment under private relief Acts or other
 25 laws requiring payments to designated payees in the
 26 total amount of such appropriation;

1 (497)“(5) *grants to the States under title I, IV, or*
 2 *X of the Social Security Act, or under any other public*
 3 *assistance title in such Act.*

4 (498)“(5) *contingent expenses of the Senate or of the*
 5 *House of Representatives.*

6 (499)“(2) *The provisions of subsection (c) of this section*
 7 *shall not apply to appropriations to the Senate or House of*
 8 *Representatives or to any Member, committee, Office (includ-*
 9 *ing the office of the Architect of the Capitol), officer, or*
 10 *employee thereof.*

11 “(g) Any appropriation which is apportioned or reap-
 12 portioned pursuant to this section may be divided and
 13 subdivided administratively within the limits of such appor-
 14 tionments or reapportionments. The officer having admin-
 15 istrative control of any such appropriation available to the
 16 legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia,
 17 and the head of each agency, subject to the approval of the
 18 Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall prescribe, by
 19 regulation, a system of administrative control (not incon-
 20 sistent with any (500) ~~other~~ accounting procedures pre-
 21 scribed by or pursuant to law) which shall be designed to
 22 (A) restrict obligations (501) ~~or expenditures~~ against each
 23 appropriation to the amount of apportionments or reappor-
 24 tionments made for each such appropriation, and (B) enable
 25 such officer or agency head to fix responsibility for the

1 creation of any obligation ~~(502)~~*or the making of any ex-*
2 *penditure* in excess of an apportionment or reappropriation.

3 “(h) No officer or employee of the United States shall
4 authorize or create any obligation ~~(503)~~*or make any ex-*
5 *penditure* (A) in excess of an apportionment or reappropriation,
6 ment, or (B) in excess of the amount permitted by regulations
7 prescribed pursuant to subsection (g) of this section.

8 “(i) (1) In addition to any penalty or liability under
9 other law, any officer or employee of the United States who
10 shall violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall
11 be subjected to appropriate administrative discipline, including,
12 when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without
13 pay or removal from office; and any officer or employee
14 of the United States who shall knowingly and willfully violate
15 subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall, upon conviction,
16 be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned for not
17 more than two years, or both.

18 “(2) In the case of a violation of subsection (a), (b),
19 or (h) of this section by an officer or employee of an agency,
20 or of the District of Columbia, the head of the agency concerned
21 or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall immediately
22 report to the President, through the Director of the Bureau of the
23 Budget, and to the Congress all pertinent facts together with a
24 statement of the action taken thereon.”

26 SEC. 1112. No part of the funds of, or available for

1 expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this
 2 Act (504), including the government of the District of Colum-
 3 bia, shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by
 4 any (505)civilian officer or employee during the calendar
 5 year 1950 and unused at the close of business on (506)De-
 6 cember 31, 1950 June 30, 1951: *Provided*, That this sec-
 7 tion shall not apply to officers and employees whose post
 8 of duty is outside the continental United States (507): *And*
 9 *provided further*, That this section shall not apply with re-
 10 spect to the payment of compensation for accumulated annual
 11 leave in the case of officers or employees who leave their
 12 civilian positions for the purpose of entering upon active
 13 military or naval service in the Armed Forces of the United
 14 States.

15 SEC. 1113. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6
 16 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the
 17 provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may,
 18 in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year,
 19 terminate the employment of any officer or employee of
 20 the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the
 21 United States whenever he shall deem such termination
 22 necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

23 Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act
 24 of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of
 25 any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his
 26 absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate

1 the employment of any officer or employee of the Depart-
 2 ment of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination
 3 necessary or advisable in the best interests of the United
 4 States.

5 (508)SEC. 1114. No part of any appropriation contained in
 6 this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any
 7 incumbent appointed to any civil office or position under
 8 the United States Government which may become vacant
 9 during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1950: *Provided,*
 10 That this inhibition shall not apply—

11 ~~(a)~~ to not to exceed 10 per centum of all such
 12 vacancies in any agency caused by separation from
 13 such agency;

14 ~~(b)~~ to positions filled from within the agency;

15 ~~(c)~~ to offices or positions required by law to be
 16 filled by appointment of the President by and with the
 17 advice and consent of the Senate;

18 ~~(d)~~ to scientific and technical positions in the
 19 Atomic Energy Commission and the Armed Services;

20 ~~(e)~~ to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel,
 21 including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and
 22 the Veterans' Administration;

23 ~~(f)~~ to law enforcement officers;

24 ~~(g)~~ to temporary, emergency, seasonal, or coopera-
 25 tive positions;

26 ~~(h)~~ to commissioned, commissioned warrant, war-

1 rant, and enlisted personnel, and cadets of the Coast
2 Guard, and the undergraduates of the United States
3 Military and Naval Academies, or

4 (i) to any agency in the legislative or judicial
5 branches of the Government, or the municipal govern-
6 ment of the District of Columbia.

7 *SEC. 1114. (1) Except as hereinafter provided, each*
8 *appropriation, reappropriation, and contract authorization*
9 *or reauthorization, made by this Act for the fiscal year*
10 *ending June 30, 1951, to any department or agency in the*
11 *executive branch of the Government (including funds of*
12 *Government corporations authorized by this Act for adminis-*
13 *trative expenses), is hereby reduced by 10 per centum.*

14 *(2) In order to provide for the most effective use of*
15 *appropriations and contract authorizations reduced by this*
16 *section, the head of each department and agency in the*
17 *executive branch of the Government is hereby authorized*
18 *to make adjustments and transfers between such appropria-*
19 *tions, and between such contract authorizations, within his*
20 *department or agency; but no such appropriation or contract*
21 *authorization shall be increased under the authority of this*
22 *section to an amount in excess of that provided in other*
23 *chapters of this Act.*

24 *(3) The reductions provided for in this section shall not*
25 *apply to the following:*

1 (a) Title II of chapter IV; chapter X; so much of
2 title I of chapter X-B as is contained in the paragraphs
3 headed "Economic Cooperation", "International Children's
4 Welfare Work", and "Mutual Defense Assistance"; and
5 the amount appropriated to the General Services Admin-
6 istration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic
7 and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946;

8 (b) Appropriations in title I of chapter VIII for the
9 Executive Office of the President under the headings "Com-
10 pensation of the President", "The White House Office",
11 "Emergency Fund for the President", and "Executive Man-
12 sion and Grounds";

13 (c) Appropriations and contract authorizations for the
14 atomic energy program;

15 (d) Trust funds;

16 (e) Funds of Government corporations excluding those
17 made available in this Act (1) for administrative expenses
18 and (2) by appropriation from the general fund of the
19 Treasury;

20 (f) Amounts (other than under the Veterans' Adminis-
21 tration) for furnishing medical and hospital services and
22 domiciliary care, excluding (1) administrative expenses not
23 directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital,

1 dispensary, or clinic, and (2) expenses for employee health
2 service programs;

3 (g) Amounts provided in this Act for payment of
4 obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authoriza-
5 tions, and obligated balances of reappropriations;

6 (h) Appropriations of, or measured by, receipts;

7 (i) Amounts appropriated by this Act for the opera-
8 tion of law enforcement agencies, including the Federal
9 Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Customs, Immigration
10 and Naturalization Services, the Coast Guard, and the
11 Secret Service; or for the payment of compensation and
12 expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal
13 Revenue, and such other officers and employees of other
14 agencies whose duties primarily pertain to intelligence opera-
15 tions (including funds transferred pursuant to section 6 (a)
16 of the Act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 211) or to the
17 investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of
18 persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal
19 laws of the United States;

20 (j) Amounts provided for any program of the Veterans'
21 Administration, excluding (1) administrative expenses not
22 directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital,
23 dispensary, clinic, or facility, and (2) expenses for em-
24 ployee health service programs;

1 (k) Amounts provided for payments to States or politi-
2 cal subdivisions thereof;

3 (l) Amounts provided to make payment of or con-
4 tributions toward pensions, retirement and disability annui-
5 ties and benefits, employees' death or injury benefits, or
6 other items of a similar nature; and

7 (m) Appropriations for refunds, awards, and indem-
8 nities.

9 **(509)**SEC. 1115. During the current fiscal year, no part of
10 any money appropriated in this or any other Act shall be
11 used during any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase
12 typewriting machines (except bookkeeping and billing ma-
13 chines) at a price which exceeds 90 per centum of the lowest
14 net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded
15 the most-favored customer (other than the Government, the
16 American National Red Cross, and the purchasers of type-
17 writing machines for educational purposes only) of the
18 manufacturer of such machines during the six-month period
19 immediately preceding such quarter.

20 **(510)**SEC. 1116. No payment shall be made from appro-
21 priations in this Act to any officer on the retired lists of
22 the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps,
23 Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard, Coast and Geo-
24 detic Survey, and Public Health Service for a period of
25 two years after retirement who for himself or for others

1 *is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of*
2 *or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Depart-*
3 *ment of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic*
4 *Survey, and the Public Health Service any supplies or war*
5 *materials.*

6 This Act may be cited as the "General Appropriation
7 Act, 1951".

Passed the House of Representatives May 10, 1950.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments August 4 (legis-
lative day, July 20), 1950.

Attest:

LESLIE L. BIFFLE,

Secretary.

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the support of the
Government for the fiscal year ending June
30, 1951, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 4, 1950

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the
Senate numbered

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8345) to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act with reference to recordable contracts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Columbia Basin Project Act (act of March 10, 1943, ch. 14, 57 Stat. 14) be amended as follows:

(1) By adding a new paragraph, to be the second paragraph of subsection (c) of section 2, as follows:

"Notwithstanding the limitations of the preceding paragraph but subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed therefor by the Secretary, the privilege of executing recordable contracts is hereby extended as follows: (1) To any landowner as to a tract of land to which he, or his predecessor if he holds as an heir or devisee, held legal or equitable title on October 28, 1947; (ii) to any landowner as to a tract of land as to which he has held legal or equitable title for not less than 10 years (including the period of holding by predecessors where title is held as an heir or devisee), or as to which he furnishes proof in writing satisfactory to the Secretary as to the terms of the transaction and consideration paid by him (or by his predecessor where title is held as an heir or devisee) for the tract and as to which there is a finding by the Secretary that the transaction was bona fide and for a consideration not in excess of the full fair market value of the tract, valued as of the date of that transaction without reference to or increment by reason of the project. Any such recordable contract may be executed only on or before December 31, 1951, or on or before a date to be fixed by the Secretary as to each irrigation block in which the lands are situated, such date to be approximately 2 years before the commencement of the development period for that block."

(2) By deleting the last sentence of subdivision (ii) of subsection (c) of section 2.

(3) By amending subsection (a) of section 3 to read as follows:

"Fraudulent misrepresentation as to the true consideration involved in the conveyance of, or contract to convey, any freehold estate in land covered by recordable contract or which is sought to be covered by a recordable contract under subsection 2 (c) hereof in the affidavits required or which may be required under that subsection shall constitute a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding \$500 or by imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

(4) By amending the second sentence of subsection (b) of section 4 to read as follows: "In addition, land sale and exchange contracts shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, provides for the return, in a reasonable period of years, of not less than the appraised value of the land and improvements thereon, and provides, in the case of any land to be included in farm units, for the application of provisions similar to those of the recordable contracts provided under subsection 2 (c) hereof."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the words "Notwithstanding the", insert the word "time."

Page 2, line 1, delete the word "predecessor" and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "ancestors or devisors."

Page 2, line 5, delete the word "predecessors," and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "his ancestors or devisors."

Page 2, line 9, delete the word "predecessor," and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "ancestors or devisors."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1858) to permit the admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizen members of the United States Armed Forces.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C., 213 (c)), alien spouses or unmarried minor children of United States citizens serving in, or having an honorable discharge certificate from the armed forces of the United States during World War II shall, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, be eligible to enter the United States with non-quota immigration visas issued under the provisions of section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C. 204 (a)): *Provided*, That in the cases of such alien spouses of United States citizens serving in, or having an honorable discharge certificate from the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II, the marriage shall have occurred before 90 days after enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "90 days" and insert "6 months."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF GAMBLING DEVICES IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3357) to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARING. I object, Mr. Speaker.

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3584) to amend the act of June 9, 1906 (34 Stat. 227), entitled "An act granting land to the city of Albuquerque for public purposes."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the act approved June 9, 1906 (34 Stat. 227), entitled "An act granting land to the city of Albuquerque for public purposes," is hereby amended by adding thereto the following:

"Sec. 2. The city of Albuquerque is authorized to convey, without restrictions as to use, not to exceed one-half of the acreage patented under this act: *Provided, however*, That all the proceeds derived from such sale or sales shall be used for the construction of a public auditorium, erected either under the sole sponsorship of the city of Albuquerque or, if located upon land owned by the University of New Mexico, as a joint project with that university."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 8678) was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACT OF 1949

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3875) to amend section 9 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That section 9 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (act of June 20, 1949, ch. 227, sec. 9, 63 Stat. 212) is hereby amended by deleting the figure "\$10,000" and substituting in lieu thereof the figure "\$13,100."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a news release.

Mr. HEDRICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article written by Soterios Nicholson, which appeared in the June issue of the *Atlantis*, an article on Macedonia.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *Record*.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement from the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. WITHROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Dr. Lutz.

Mr. CLEVINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. WADSWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Le Roy Gazette-News entitled "An Open Letter To the President."

Mr. D'EWARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Growth of Marketing and Purchasing Cooperatives."

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Montgomery Advertiser.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article on America's most rugged highway.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION ON STATE OF NEW YORK IN ACTIONS TO WHICH INDIANS ARE PARTIES

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Calendar No. 658 the bill (S. 192) to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 7786, an act making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees:

Managers on the part of the House:

Messrs. CANNON, RABAUT, NORRELL, TABER, and:

on Chap. I, Messrs. BATES of Kentucky, YATES, FURCOLO, STOCKMAN, and WILSON of Indiana;

on Chap. II, Messrs. McGRATH, KIRWAN, ANDREWS, CANFIELD, and SCRIVNER;

on Chap. III, Messrs. ROONEY, FLOOD, PRESTON, STEFAN, and CLEVINGER;

on Chap. IV, Messrs. GARY, FERNANDEZ, PASSMAN, CANFIELD, and COUDERT;

on Chap. V, Messrs. FOGARTY, HEDRICK, McGRATH, SCRIVNER, and ANDERSEN;

on Chap. VI, Messrs. WHITTEN, STIGLER, KRUSE, ANDERSEN, and HORAN;

on Chap. VII, Messrs. KIRWAN, JACKSON of Washington, GORE, JENSEN, and FENTON;

on Chap. VIII, Messrs. THOMAS, GORE, ANDREWS, CASE of South Dakota, and PHILLIPS of California;

on Chap. IX, Messrs. KERR, GORE, HEDRICK, WIGGLESWORTH, and STEFAN;

on Chap. X, Messrs. MAHON, SHEPPARD, SIKES, PLUMLEY, and WIGGLESWORTH;

on Chap. X-A, Messrs. GORE, HEDRICK, PASSMAN, WIGGLESWORTH, and STEFAN;

on Chap. X-B, Messrs. GARY, ROONEY, BATES of Kentucky, WIGGLESWORTH, and STEFAN;

on Chap. XI, Messrs. GORE, HEDRICK, PASSMAN, WIGGLESWORTH, and STEFAN.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the chairman take a minute to explain how the conferees will operate under this arrangement?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, we expect to go to conference tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. The bill will be taken up by chapters seriatim. As a chapter is reached the entire subcommittee which wrote that particular chapter, and which therefore is more familiar with it than anyone else on the committee, along with the other managers on the part of the House, will take up the chapter with the Senate conferees.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This means, then, that the four Members who were first named will sit through the entire conference?

Mr. CANNON. They are the ranking members on the central subcommittee which reported the bill to the House and will sit with the respective subcommittees throughout the conference.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And the Members who are assigned to a particular chapter will receive notification as their particular chapter is approached?

Mr. CANNON. When a chapter is taken up, the conferees on the next suc-

ceeding chapter will be notified. We hope to proceed with as little delay as possible, subject always to the approval of the managers on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZING FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN MAJOR DISASTERS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up a resolution (H. Res. 742) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8336) to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the bills H. R. 9194 and H. R. 9313.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any objection whatever to the pending rule or to the bill which the rule makes consideration in order.

The bill provides assistance to States and local governments in alleviating suffering from damage resulting from major disasters. It authorizes the President to coordinate all Government agencies in such emergencies. It provides the framework for the Federal Government, under which prompt action will result in meeting the needs of certain areas. It establishes a general Government policy in respect to emergency relief in future disasters, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], if he has any requests for time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This is a measure for relief of other people where distress happens in peacetime?

Mr. COX. This is for relief in time of peace.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In view of the fact that the commanding officer of the marines down at the convention

to land or interests in land acquired by the War Department or the Department of the Interior, as the case may be" has no applicability to acquisitions for reclamation purposes.

The portion of section 355 of the Revised Statutes first above quoted was enacted on September 11, 1841, and was, of course, in effect when the Acting Attorney General's unpublished opinion of March 24, 1904, was given. The opinion of September 26, 1946, regards the practice which developed as a result of the earlier opinion as an "erroneous construction" of the statute which could not receive the further acquiescence of the Attorney General.

Pursuant to the Attorney General's opinion of September 26, 1946, as implemented by a letter dated June 17, 1948, from Assistant Attorney General Vanech to the chief counsel of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Justice now requires that all land acquisitions by the Bureau of Reclamation be referred to the Lands Division of the Justice Department for examination of titles and the preparation of title opinions.

Two courses of procedure have been set up. Under one, the regional counsel for the Bureau of Reclamation makes a complete preliminary determination as to validity of title and arrangements for the procurement of curative data, and then, if he determines that the title is free from doubt of consequence, prepares a closing opinion on the basis of which payment is made. At this stage the entire file is referred to the Lands Division of Justice in Washington for review and the preparation of a final opinion by the Department of Justice.

Under the second procedure the Bureau's attorneys obtain the basic title papers and make certain, as a minimum in the case of abstracts, that they are sufficiently complete and current to enable the Department of Justice to make a satisfactory title examination. The case is then referred to the Attorney General for examination and the preparation of a preliminary opinion. When the preliminary title opinion has been prepared it is necessary for Bureau attorneys again to handle procurement of curative papers and, if these cannot be obtained, to propose alternative courses of action to the Department of Justice. When title defects have been removed in a manner that, in the judgment of the Bureau attorney, meets the requirements of Justice's preliminary opinion, payment is made to the vendor and the documents are returned to the Department of Justice for examination and issuance of a final opinion.

Under the first procedure, so far as the determination of title is concerned, any review given after the closing of the transaction by a regional counsel of the Bureau is a duplication of effort. Under the second procedure, the work that Bureau attorneys must perform is but little different from that which they would do if they actually prepared the preliminary opinions. And because of delays of transmitting papers to Washington the second procedure of necessity results in some delay in the closing of transactions.

The procedures above described are relatively new. They became effective on October 1, 1948. Delays thus far have been those that are naturally to be expected in any drastic change of systems. When the new procedures have become familiar to all Bureau attorneys and land officers we expect that these delays will be reduced and we hope that time between procurement of title data and closing, while somewhat longer than under Bureau procedure, will not be objectionably so. But even with good service, we think that there will be, and inherently so, unnecessary duplication of effort.

The determination of the validity and sufficiency of title to lands or interests in lands is, as every Member of Congress who has practiced law knows, essentially a local matter. This is so because of the great variation in

State property laws and in locally acceptable practices in regard to titles. Attorneys who devote a considerable portion of their time to title examinations and related work on a particular project or in a particular area are bound to become experts on these local laws and the locally acceptable methods of correcting title defects. They also acquire a wealth of local factual information and knowledge as to local title practices that no centralized office, remote from the areas where the lands are situated, can hope to acquire. Moreover, efficient handling of title matters requires that the examining attorneys be in constant contact not only with the administrative officers who are responsible for the appraisal and acquisition of land but also with local abstract and title companies, local lawyers, and landowners with whom they must work in clearing title. Our limited experience thus far under the new Justice procedures have shown us that there is a tendency for Justice attorneys in Washington to impose initially requirements that they would not impose were they thoroughly conversant with local statutes and decisions and other pertinent local conditions.

There is, however, a far more fundamental basis for objection to the intervention of the Department of Justice in the Bureau's land-acquisition program. Justice attorneys or any attorney not working closely with the reclamation program simply cannot have the same full understanding of the problems of Bureau land acquisition as the attorneys who are working every day in the reclamation field, particularly in matters involving the Bureau's construction program.

For a better understanding of the problems at hand, it may help to illustrate, by a typical large reclamation project, the relation between the construction program and land acquisition. In connection with the Columbia Basin project in the State of Washington, land-acquisition officers and attorneys for the Bureau of Reclamation have heretofore handled the acquisition of all lands purchased for the site of Grand Coulee Dam and the 150-mile reservoir created thereby, for the equalizing dam and reservoir, and for O'Sullivan Dam and Reservoir. There remain to be acquired, over the next several years, lands and interests in lands for Long Lake Dam and the reservoir to be created thereby, some 4,000 miles of canals and laterals of which probably one-half will be acquired through purchase (the other half being located across lands subject to reserved right-of-way provided by the act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 371, 391)), and many miles of rights-of-way for roads, transmission lines, and other project facilities. The lands to be acquired lie in nine counties.

Similar projects may be found in each of the other six regions of the Bureau. Some of the larger ones are the Central Valley project in California, the Colorado-Big Thompson project in Colorado, and the Missouri River Basin program in the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

Acquisitions of the lands needed for these works present several problems quite unlike those encountered in the selection and acquisition of the sites for Federal public buildings. The location of the features of an irrigation system is governed by the topography and other characteristics of the areas to be crossed and to be irrigated. A canal system sprawls over a wide expanse and it frequently happens that a given portion of a canal system is put under contract to be built before detailed locations can be determined. The speed of the acquisition program is, therefore, governed by that of the construction program and must be handled so as not to delay that program.

The land-acquisition program presents another unusual aspect. In most situations the acquisitions are of but part of an owner's holdings, and the owner is one with

whom this Department will continue to have other contractual relations for many years in connection with the operation of the irrigation system. It is of more than usual importance, therefore, to handle all phases of the original acquisition so that good relations with the landowners will be established and maintained.

In the light of this background as to the nature of the legal work involved and the special problems encountered in the acquisition program, our reasons for believing that it is to the advantage of this Department and the Government as a whole to permit the continuation of our past title examination procedures with respect to the Bureau of Reclamation acquisition program are these:

1. There is need to have, in the agency which has the responsibility for the construction of these complex engineering works, complete administrative control of the title-examining procedure.

This need for administrative control is primarily because of the direct bearing that the closing of land transactions has on construction schedules. By administrative control of its attorneys, the agency which has the responsibility for the maintenance of construction schedules can direct the activities of attorneys to title matters needing preferred attention, and can direct and provide for the essential close-working relationship between attorneys and land-acquisition officers and with the landowners. This control was afforded under the procedure heretofore employed in the Bureau of Reclamation under the sanction of a long-standing interpretation of the Federal reclamation law. It will be at least partially lacking under the procedure now required by the Attorney General.

2. The work can be done more expeditiously and with less expense to the Government under the procedure heretofore employed than that necessary under the procedures prescribed pursuant to the Attorney General's opinion.

This Department learned long ago that the efficient and expeditious handling of title work requires delegation of final title responsibility to attorneys in the field. Such attorneys can handle the work more expeditiously because they, in preparing the preliminary and final opinions, have direct and immediate access to all the acquiring agency's land-acquisition files. This permits the resolution of many questions without the delays attendant on correspondence. Expedition in the closing of land transactions in this fashion results in direct savings in cost and has an indirect bearing on success in negotiating transactions at prices favorable to the United States.

There will, moreover, be no saving to the Government—in fact, there will be added expense—in having the sufficiency of titles passed upon finally by the Department of Justice, for it will be necessary for Bureau attorneys to perform substantially the same functions that they now perform in determining the validity of titles. The Attorney General is authorized, and it is his practice, to call upon the land-acquiring agency to "procure any evidence of title which the Attorney General may deem necessary" and the expenses incurred in complying with his requirements are charged to the acquiring agency. The work of the attorneys of the Department of Justice, in other words, will largely be that of reviewing cases prepared by Bureau attorneys.

The reclamation program requires the maintenance of a staff of attorneys in each region to handle other important legal work without regard to title work. The title load, however, is a variable one, depending on the pace of the construction program. It is possible, therefore, to fit the title load into the other legal workloads of regional legal staffs and thereby maintain a high degree of efficiency in the use of attorneys. This is a

point of economy over and above that to be realized from the avoidance of unnecessary legal review.

Since the Congress provides counsel to various agencies of the Government to permit the handling on a day-to-day basis on the legal aspects of the problems of those agencies and has provided such counsel on a regional basis in connection with the Bureau of Reclamation's program, it would seem to be poor economy to fail to take full advantage of the services of those counsel, particularly in matters so essentially local in character as the examination of title to land.

3. Bureau regional counsel and their staff attorneys have demonstrated that they are competent to do the work and are well organized and trained to do it.

The record of Bureau attorneys in handling title work is not open to question. In the 40 years and more that they have been handling this work there has been no instance, I am advised, of any loss attributable to title defects in lands acquired in the reclamation program. Their record for speed in handling the work, moreover, is excellent.

Bureau attorneys are organized on a regional basis. It has been our policy, as above stated, to give to each regional counsel final responsibility for title matters, thereby avoiding bringing such matters to a central office. Since these regional counsel, of necessity, must be acquainted with local law on land and water rights in connection with other of their responsibilities, they are better able to handle title matters than the staff in a central office. Moreover, it will be apparent to you from the description of the special problem of the Bureau's acquisition program, that the attorneys responsible for title examination in that program, to do the most effective job, must be able to exercise judgment in the application of technical rules of property law. That judgment can only be properly exercised by attorneys who, through daily work with the Bureau's whole program, know the various factors that enter into such a judgment.

It is for these reasons—not because I question the competency of the Department of Justice to handle title work adequately, efficiently, and economically—that I recommend the enactment of S. 1606.

If the bill is subject to amendment, I should like to suggest that it be amended in order to accomplish other purposes which, though not directly related to a determination of the validity of titles, are pertinent to the section of the reclamation law with which S. 1606 deals. Section 7 of the act of June 17, 1902, authorizes the acquisition of rights or property to carry out the provisions of that act and payment for such acquisitions from the reclamation fund. The act of June 17, 1902, has been amended many times and a number of special statutes have been enacted which alter or increase the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of reclamation projects. Furthermore, some projects are financed with appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury instead of the reclamation fund. In these circumstances, it is desirable that the authority to acquire land and interests in land be explicitly linked with the entire body of reclamation law instead of with the initial act only, and that the language authorizing payment for such acquisitions do not refer to a single fund only. To accomplish both of these purposes as well as the purpose of S. 1606, it is suggested that, following the enacting clause, the following language be substituted for that of S. 1606:

"That section 7 of the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, 389, 43 U. S. C. 421), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire such rights or property as he determines to be necessary and

desirable for the construction or operation and maintenance of projects undertaken pursuant to this act and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto. Such acquisitions shall be at prices and with titles satisfactory to him."

Inasmuch as I understand that your committee wishes an immediate report on this bill, I have not ascertained from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget its relation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,

Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. McCARRAN. I object to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill will go over.

EQUITIES OF PERMANENT CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 660) to amend the act of June 27, 1944, Public Law 359, and to preserve the equities of permanent classified civil service employees of the United States was announced as next in order.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In view of the numerosity of conferees, the Chair suggests that the list of names of the conferees be inserted in the RECORD without being read at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of conferees be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list of conferees appointed on the part of the Senate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chapter I—District of Columbia: Mr. HILL, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. YOUNG;

Chapter II—Legislative Branch: Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. CORDON;

Chapter III—State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary: Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. FERGUSON;

Chapter IV—Treasury and Post Office: Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. CORDON, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL;

Chapter V—Labor-Federal Security: Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. GURNEY;

Chapter VI—Agriculture Department: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. FERGUSON;

Chapter VII—Interior Department: Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. GURNEY;

Chapter VIII—Independent Offices: Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL;

Chapter IX—Civil Functions: Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. CORDON.

Chapter X—Defense Establishment: Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WHERRY.

Chapter X-A—General Reductions in Appropriations: Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WHERRY;

Chapter X-B—Foreign Aid: Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WHERRY;

Chapter XI—General Provisions: Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WHERRY.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does he wish to make a statement?

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to make a statement.

The Committee on Appropriations met this morning and adopted unanimously a resolution with respect to the appointment of conferees. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks without my reading it.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEETING OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ON TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, 1950, TO CONSIDER THE APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON THE GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Senator RUSSELL made the following motion, which was agreed to unanimously on a voice vote:

"Resolved, That the chairman of the Appropriations Committee recommend to the Vice President the appointment of conferees to deal with each chapter of the general appropriation bill, 1951, on the same basis on which conferees on the part of the Senate were appointed in the calendar year 1949 to deal with the separate bills which are identical with the separate chapters in the general appropriation bill, 1951, that the ratio of those appointed on the part of the Senate to the Conference Committee as between the two parties be the same as between the two parties in the calendar year 1949 (District of Columbia 4-3; Legislative, 3-2; State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, 4-3; Treasury and Post Office, 5-3; Labor-Federal Security, 3-2; Agriculture, 5-3; Interior, 3-2; Independent Offices, 4-3; Civil Functions, 5-3; National Defense, 5-4; Foreign Aid, 5-4), that the individual subcommittee chairmen appoint the ranking members on their subcommittees unless any Member desires to be relieved of duty on the conference, in which

case the subcommittee chairman is to tender the appointment to the next ranking member of the subcommittee, that the members of the conference on the part of the Senate on each chapter of the bill be authorized to bind the full committee on that chapter but that at the conclusion of the conference all of the conferees sign the conference report, and that with respect to the appointment of Senate conferees on chapters X-A, X-B, and XI, the same policy be followed as was followed on the foreign-aid appropriation bill in the calendar year 1949."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Sitting for the moment in the chair of the minority leader, I understand that conferees will be appointed for each chapter of the appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the same manner that conferees were appointed for the separate appropriation bills in 1949?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is not only correct, but I may add that the ratio in which they were appointed in 1949 is exactly the same ratio as today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Am I to understand that the conferees on each one of the titles are to reach conclusive agreements subject only to the matters coming finally before the full committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my understanding of the resolution introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] which deals with the subject.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under the rule the agreements are final and can be reopened by the whole committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I agree completely with what the Senator from Massachusetts has said about the resolution. As I understand, the conferees are to be appointed for each chapter, and when the conferees on each chapter have reached an agreement, that is the final agreement on that chapter, except of course that all conferees are to sign the final conference report, because no conference report could be agreed to unless the majority of the Senate conferees signed it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. McKELLAR. In order that it may be thoroughly understood by all Senators, I should like to read the resolution:

MEETING OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ON TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, 1950, TO CONSIDER THE APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON THE GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Senator RUSSELL made the following motion, which was agreed to unanimously on a voice vote:

"Resolved, That the chairman of the Appropriations Committee recommend to the Vice President the appointment of conferees to deal with each chapter of the general appropriation bill, 1951, on the same basis on which conferees on the part of the Senate were appointed in the calendar year 1949 to deal with the separate bills which are identical with the separate chapters in the general appropriation bill, 1951, that the ratio of those appointed on the part of the Senate to the conference committee as between the two parties be the same as between the two parties in the calendar year 1949 (District of Columbia, 4-3; Legislative, 3-2; State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, 4-3;

Treasury and Post Office, 5-3; Labor-Federal Security, 3-2; Agriculture, 5-3; Interior, 3-2; Independent Offices, 4-3; Civil Functions, 5-3; National Defense, 5-4; Foreign Aid, 5-4), that the individual subcommittee chairmen appoint the ranking members on their subcommittees unless any member desires to be relieved of duty on the conference, in which case the subcommittee chairman is to tender the appointment to the next ranking member of the subcommittee, that the members of the conference on the part of the Senate on each chapter of the bill be authorized to bind the full committee on that chapter but that at the conclusion of the conference all of the conferees sign the conference report, and that with respect to the appointment of Senate conferees on chapters X-A, X-B, and X-I, the same policy be followed as was followed on the foreign-aid appropriation bill in the calendar year 1949."

That seems to me to be perfectly plain, and I hope the Senate will accept the plan. I have read it into the RECORD so that Senators may be familiar with it.

REQUISITES OF PERMANENT CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Has Calendar No. 692, Senate bill 660 been called?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the last bill called, and the Chair has not put the question as to whether there is objection to its consideration.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I desire to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Kansas will withhold the objection.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I shall be glad to.

Mr. FREAR. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FREAR. Is it permissible to offer an amendment from the floor of the Senate on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not unless the Senate agrees to consider the bill. If the bill goes over, the Senator may offer the amendment and have it printed and lie on the table.

Mr. FREAR. But not for present consideration?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not for present consideration, unless the objection to present consideration is withdrawn.

Mr. FREAR. Then I ask the Senator from Kansas to permit the bill to go to the foot of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware that the bill go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I would have no objection to the bill going to the foot of the calendar, but I must say that when it is called again I shall object.

Mr. FREAR. I ask unanimous consent that the bill go to the foot of the calendar, and I thank the Senator from Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

WELFARE OF COAL MINERS

The bill (S. 1031) amending Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey withhold his objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly withhold it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], from Alabama [Mr. HELL], from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] joined me as sponsors of this bill. It was favorably and unanimously reported by a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] were members of the subcommittee. Through an extravagance of generosity the honor of being chairman of the subcommittee was conferred upon me.

The full committee, with not more than one dissenting vote, recommended that the Senate pass the bill—the object of which is to provide additional safety for the coal miners of the Nation. The necessity for that additional safety could not be exaggerated. Since the Nation recently began to defend itself against the aggression of the communistic hordes of northern Korea, more have been accidentally killed or injured in the coal mines of this country than have been killed or injured on the battlefields of the war in which we are now engaged.

It is my hope that the distinguished Republican Senators, Mr. CAPEHART, of Indiana, Mr. LANGER, of North Dakota, and Mr. MORSE, of Oregon, may be able to prevail upon their two Republican colleagues, who during the past year have again and again prevented the consideration of this bill, to withhold their objections today in order that this meritorious measure may be passed by the Senate without further delay.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey withhold his objection for one more moment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly withhold my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The general objection to the bill while it was being considered by the committee, as expressed by certain mine superintendents, was that the country was making good progress in providing for safety in the mines, on the State level, and that therefore the bill was unnecessary, that it might cause friction between State administration and Federal administration.

Mr. President, that objection is not any longer valid. In view of the fact that practically all the coal mines of the country are becoming mechanized, that new machinery is being installed, and new methods of mining are being developed, it is perfectly proper and appropriate that the Government should use all possible facilities for the protection of the miners.

If the present emergency becomes more universal, our Nation being dependent upon coal for its primary energy, we all know a great number of men will be sent into the mines.

After having gone through all the hearings I for one protest vigorously against postponement of action and trust the Senate will not stand in the way of providing the best means the Government possibly can adopt of protecting the lives of those men on whom everyone will be dependent.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly to disagree with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] and the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Pennsylvania has been mining coal for much more than a hundred years. We have provided in our State law for every possible safety device we can think of. The last 1,000,000 tons of coal mined in our State has been mined without a fatality. Whatever Federal inspectors come into our State do so in an advisory capacity. Dual control is confusing. If the bill were enacted I believe it would simply further centralize power in Washington. That is something which I feel is detrimental to the development of our industry and to the safety of our people. I regret exceedingly to oppose the unanimous consent request for consideration of the bill, but it is necessary for me to do so.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is it the distinguished Senator's view that proper safeguards can be provided at the local and State levels?

Mr. MARTIN. I will answer the distinguished Senator by saying yes, absolutely. I believe we must decentralize such matters as these. The States are more familiar with local conditions and local requirements than is the Federal Government. Enactment of the bill into law would, I am afraid, destroy many of the safety devices we have developed in Pennsylvania over more than 100 years of activity.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as the coauthor of the bill I had hoped no objection would be raised to it. Considerable coal is mined in Indiana, and I know our miners and the people of Indiana are in favor of the bill. I feel we should take whatever steps are necessary to protect the miners. Coal mine accidents are very serious. It seems to me that Federal inspection, such as we are now talking about, would simply be a plus, an addition to the inspection the States themselves make. I regret exceedingly that there should be objection to the bill. I recognize the position of those who object to it, and I know they are sincere and conscientious in their objection, but I was very hopeful the bill might be passed at the present session of Congress.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that I am in the position here today where I am constrained to object by request. I appreciate very much the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire what other Senators have objected to the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] objects to it. He is temporarily absent at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the Senator from West Virginia and other Senators who have spoken in favor of the bill. I should like to read into the RECORD at this time what the Secretary of the Interior said to the committee, which is included in the committee report:

Because of this lack of appropriate investigatory powers, hazardous conditions in many mines have been left uncorrected, and responsibility for many of the disasters that have taken place has never been fixed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois read with greater volume?

Mr. LUCAS. I am reading from page 1 of the report No. 695.

Power to make mandatory inspections of coal mines, both at periodic intervals and upon the occurrence of an accident, is absolutely necessary if the Department is to carry on efficient health and safety work, for the power to obtain information is necessarily basic to all its accident and disease prevention activities. The progressive increase in the inherent hazards of coal mining which growing mechanization of the industry has brought about makes it more imperative now than ever before that Federal protection be reinforced and extended through the granting of adequate inspection powers and enlargement of the reporting and educational duties to which these powers are incident.¹

Mr. President, that statement by the Secretary of the Interior regarding the safety and security of the miners who go into the bowels of the earth to dig coal is an important one. I distinctly recall what happened after the great mine disaster at Centralia, Ill., only 2 or 3 years ago. A committee was appointed at that time by the United States Senate to make an investigation into that mine disaster. But, after all, we in the Senate of the United States had no power to do what should have been done in the way of proper recommendations from the Federal standpoint in an endeavor to prevent disasters of a similar kind in the future.

It may be true that some States have sufficient safeguards for the protection of miners who go into the earth to dig coal. But a number of States do not provide the proper kind of inspection and examination which a Federal group, if it had the power, could make. The bill is a very important one from the standpoint of protection of the miners from accident and death.

I know that many persons do not like to have power to inspect and examine mines centralized in Washington. But

I undertake to say that there are many States which do not have provisions for properly safeguarding the security of the miners. Perhaps they do not have the money to provide safeguards for those who dig coal. It is my earnest hope that the bill may become the law of the land.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Education and Public Welfare which reported the bill I wish to say I am strongly in favor of it. I also come from a coal mining State. Many very severe accidents have occurred in the coal mines of my State. The government and the people of Montana are very much in favor of the bill. I believe it would be very unwise not to pass the bill now, because almost every day we read in the newspapers stories of serious coal-mine accidents. During the past year or so some very serious coal-mine accidents have occurred in Montana mines. I hope the objection to the bill will be withdrawn.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the contributions which have been made to the discussion of the bill by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I wish I could withhold objection. Under the circumstances I do not feel I can do so. A question of honor is involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will go over.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. LANGER. As one of the cosponsors of the bill, I announce that when the call of the calendar has been completed I shall make a motion to consider the bill. As the majority leader has just stated, the bill is a very important one. I believe it to be one of the most important bills on the calendar. In view of the fact that miners are dying because mine owners have not taken proper precautions for their safety or because proper State laws have not been enacted, I believe it would be a shameful thing not to pass this bill. As I said, I intend to move that the bill be taken up after the calendar has been called.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania will be recognized as soon as the next bill on the calendar has been announced. There will then be before the Senate a measure, and the Senator can address himself to the subject matter of the previous bill if he so desires.

The bill (S. 1976) for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I wish to address my remarks to the bill which has just been under discussion. As one of the sponsors of the bill, I share the views of those who have already spoken in favor of it. I believe Pennsylvania has mine safety laws which probably are much further advanced than the mine safety laws of many other States, but I

a hundred cents worth of value for each of the billions of dollars which the Congress appropriates, we should begin this vital reorganization task immediately, before any additional duties relating to war controls, such as food rationing and price controls go into effect.

I fear that if we grant these additional offices to the Secretary by this separate bill, we may never get a chance to approve a plan which would reorganize the Department along efficient operating lines. For that reason, it is vital that the granting of any additional offices be linked with the reorganization of the Department as recommended by the Hoover Commission. In my opinion, a vote for this bill is in effect a vote against the Hoover Commission suggestions since the only practical method of achieving those results is to turn down this bill in order that a complete reorganization plan may be submitted for congressional consideration.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain the House further than to observe that I believe the Members understand clearly the proposition now being submitted. I have no further comment to make.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] in the nature of a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 76, noes 28. So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8850) to establish two additional offices of Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture and office of an Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 819, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has just read the bill by title, which, according to the amendment which has been adopted, should have been amended.

The SPEAKER. An amendment to the title of the bill cannot be offered until after the bill has passed, which the Chair is sure will be done.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 8850, to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 123, nays 222, not voting 85, as follows:

[Roll No. 249]

YEAS—123

Allen, Calif.	Gary	Nicholson
Allen, Ill.	Golden	Nixon
Andresen,	Goodwin	Norblad
August H.	Gossett	O'Hara, Minn.
Andrews	Graham	Philbin
Angell	Gross	Phillips, Calif.
Arends	Gwinn	Plumley
Auchincloss	Hale	Potter
Bates, Mass.	Harden	Poulson
Beall	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Heseltun	Rees
Bishop	Hoffman, Ill.	Rich
Boggs, Del.	Hoffman, Mich.	Riehlman
Bolton, Ohio	Hull	Robeson
Brantlett	Jackson, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	James	Sadlak
Byson	Javits	Sanborn
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenison	Scott, Hardie
Camp	Jenkins	Scrivner
Canfield	Jennings	Scudder
Case, N. J.	Jonas	Secrest
Case, S. Dak.	Judd	Shafer
Chapfield	Kean	Short
Clevenger	Kearns	Smith, Wis.
Cole, N. Y.	Keating	Stanley
Corbett	Kunkel	Stefan
Cotton	LeCompte	Taber
Coudert	LeFevre	Towe
Cunningham	Lodge	Van Zandt
Curtis	Lovre	Vorys
Dague	McConnell	Vursell
Davis, Ga.	McDonough	Wadsworth
Davis, Wis.	Mack, Wash.	Welchel
Donohue	Macy	Wheeler
Eaton	Martin, Mass.	Widnall
Ellsworth	Marrow	Wigglesworth
Elston	Meyer	Wilson, Ind.
Fallon	Michener	Wolcott
Fenton	Miller, Md.	Wolverton
Ford	Miller, Nebr.	Woodruff
Fulton	Murray, Tenn.	
Gamble	Nelson	

NAYS—222

Abbott	Bates, Ky.	Breen
Abernethy	Battle	Brooks
Addonizio	Beckworth	Brown, Ga.
Albert	Bennett, Fla.	Buchanan
Allen, La.	Bentsen	Buckley, Ill.
Andersen,	Biemiller	Buckley, N. Y.
H. Carl	Blatnik	Burdick
Aspinall	Bolling	Burke
Bailey	Bolton, Md.	Burleson
Barden	Bonner	Burnside
Baring	Bosone	Burton
Barrett, Pa.	Boykin	Byrne, N. Y.

Cannon	Holmes	Patten
Carlyle	Hope	Perkins
Carnahan	Horan	Peterson
Cavalcante	Howell	Pickett
Celler	Huber	Poague
Chelf	Irving	Polk
Chesney	Jackson, Wash.	Preston
Christopher	Jacobs	Price
Clemente	Jensen	Priest
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Ala.	Rabaut
Colmer	Jones, Mo.	Rains
Combs	Jones, N. C.	Ramsay
Cooley	Karsten	Rankin
Cooper	Kee	Redden
Cox	Kelley, Pa.	Rhodes
Crook	Kelly, N. Y.	Ribicoff
Crosser	Kennedy	Richards
Davenport	Koogh	Rodino
Davies, N. Y.	King	Rogers, Fla.
Dawson	Kirwan	Rooney
Deane	Kruse	Roosevelt
DeGraffenried	Lane	Sasser
Delaney	Lanham	Saylor
Denton	Larcade	Sheppard
Dollinger	Lichtenwalter	Sikes
Dougherty	Lind	Simpson, Ill.
Doyle	Linehan	Sims
Durham	Lucas	Smathers
Eberhart	Lyle	Smith, Va.
Elliott	Lynch	Spence
Engle, Calif.	McCarthy	Staggers
Feighan	McCormack	Steed
Fisher	McGuire	Stigler
Flood	McKinnon	Stockman
Forand	McMillan, S. C.	Sullivan
Frazier	McSweeney	Tackett
Fugate	Mack, Ill.	Talle
Furcolo	Madden	Tauriello
Garmatz	Magee	Teague
Gathings	Mahon	Thomas
Gilmer	Mansfield	Thompson
Gordon	Marsalis	Thornberry
Gorski	Marshall	Trimble
Granahan	Mills	Underwood
Granger	Mitchell	Wagner
Grant	Monroney	Walsh
Green	Morgan	Welch
Guill	Morris	Whitaker
Hardy	Morton	White, Calif.
Harris	Multer	White, Idaho
Hart	Murdock	Whitten
Harvey	Murphy	Whittington
Havener	Noland	Wickersham
Hays, Ark.	Norrell	Wier
Hays, Ohio	O'Brien, Ill.	Willis
Hedrick	O'Brien, Mich.	Wilson, Okla.
Heffernan	O'Hara, Ill.	Withrow
Heller	O'Konski	Woodhouse
Herlong	O'Sullivan	Yates
Hill	O'Toole	Young
Hobbs	Pace	Zablocki
Hoeven	Passman	
Holifield	Patman	

NOT VOTING—85

Anderson, Calif.	Hand	Pfeiffer,
Barrett, Wyo.	Hare	William L.
Blackney	Harrison	Phillips, Tenn.
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Powell
Brehm	Hinshaw	Quinn
Bulwinkle	Johnson	Reed, N. Y.
Carroll	Karst	Regan
Chatham	Kearney	Rivers
Chudoff	Keefe	Sabath
Crawford	Kerr	Sadowski
Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn	St. George
D'Ewart	Kilday	Scott,
Dingell	Klein	Hugh D., Jr.
Dolliver	Latham	Shelley
Dondero	McCulloch	Simpson, Pa.
Douglas	McGrath	Smith, Kans.
Engel, Mich.	McGregor	Smith, Ohio
Evins	McMillen, Ill.	Sutton
Fellows	Marantonio	Taylor
Fernandez	Martin, Iowa	Tollefson
Fogarty	Mason	Velde
Gavin	Miles	Vinson
Gillette	Miller, Calif.	Walton
Gore	Morrison	Werdel
Gregory	Moulder	Williams
Hagen	Murray, Wis.	Wilson, Tex.
Hall,	Norton	Winstead
Edwin Arthur	O'Neill	Wood
Hall,	Patterson	
Leonard W.	Pfeifer,	
Halleck	Joseph L.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Karst against.

Mr. William L. Pfeiffer for, with Mr. Joseph L. Pfeiffer against.

Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr. Quinn against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Harrison against.
Mr. Latham for, with Mr. McGrath, against.
Mr. Wilson of Texas for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Crawford for, with Mr. Walter against.
Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Vinson against.
Mr. Blackney for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Fellows for, with Mrs. Norton against.
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mrs. Douglas against.
Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. O'Neill against.

Mr. McGregor for, with Mr. Fogarty against.
Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Miles against.
Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Sabbath with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Williams with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. WHEELER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CASE of New Jersey changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: Amend the title of the bill to read as follows: "to establish an additional office of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

RETURN OF H. R. 2854—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), I return herewith H. R. 2854, entitled "An act for the relief of Wade H. Noland."

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 23, 1950.

LOUISE PETERS LEWIS—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 694)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 7540 "For the relief of Louise Peters Lewis."

On October 12, 1949, I returned to the House of Representatives enrolled bill H. R. 683 "For the relief of Louise Peters Lewis" with a message setting forth the reasons I was unable to give it my approval.

H. R. 7540 would grant the same relief in slightly different language, the difference in no way affecting the merits of the claim. Despite the most careful examination of this bill and the reports of the House and Senate Committee on the Judiciary accompanying it, I am unable to see that any new facts, circumstances, or reasoning have been presented or that there was any error made in considering the facts, circumstances, or reasons previously presented that would justify different action on my part.

Accordingly, I am unable to give my approval to this bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 23, 1950.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

The message and the accompanying papers are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time during this week to consider the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7786), the omnibus appropriation bill, 1951, when reported, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the measure could not be taken up today anyway, because there is a conference scheduled for tomorrow morning

which would have to be disposed of prior to the report's being taken up.

Mr. CANNON. That is true. We expect to take it up tomorrow if permission for consideration without printing in the RECORD is secured on this request.

Mr. TABER. Some questions have been raised with reference to certain chapters on which an agreement has been arrived at. Some of the Members have not been able to see those chapters to know exactly what was done. There are one or two where language changes are involved, and the membership is quite anxious to know just what those changes are before we pass on them. If this request is to go through, it will be necessary that these printed reports, insofar as they have been accomplished, be made available to the membership right away. I think that would be the way to proceed, because on the independent offices chapter, and one or two other chapters, there is quite involved language waiting, and I would think that the membership should be supplied with these conference reports right away if we are going to agree to the gentleman's request.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman understands there will be a bill ahead of us tomorrow, the GI family allowance bill. We will necessarily follow that bill, and expect to have the complete conference report available for distribution before it is called up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the information of the House as well as for my own information I should like to ask if it is the intention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations after the conference report is disposed of to bring up the final deficiency bill carrying the emergency appropriations and those asked for by the President?

Mr. CANNON. We expect to report that bill to the House tomorrow and take it up the following day, if that is agreeable.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say that under those circumstances we will have a Saturday session. I wanted the information so the Members could be advised and govern themselves accordingly. That means we will have a Saturday session.

Mr. TABER. I would be willing if these language items in the report that are hanging can be made available to the members of the committee to allow this consent request to go through; but I do think that the members of the committee are entitled to see just what the language changes are ahead of time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Without getting into the colloquy between my friend from New York and my friend from Missouri on the conference report or any portion of it, I made an observation a moment ago that I wish to qualify. If we dispose of these two matters by Friday, then the situation would be different in relation to Saturday. I do not

feel, if we dispose of the conference report and the final deficiency bill by Friday that the legislation remaining on the program would call for a Saturday session. So I want that to appear in the RECORD, because my previous statement was a flat statement that there would be a Saturday session. There will be if we do not dispose of the final deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I want to ask just what the situation is regarding the printing of the bill. We have for the first time a one-package budget which means that we bring the entire bill with all of its 10 or more chapters to the floor at one time, not as in previous years, each department separately. There are many items in all sections in which various Members of the House are interested. My concern is, as I think expressed already by the gentleman from New York, about printed copies of the bill. Will there be printed copies of the bill and printed copies of the report available for all Members of the House when we discuss the conference report if it is brought in under the request made by the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York, which includes the inquiry of the gentleman from California, as both gentlemen are doubtless aware, that portion of the conference report on the chapter dealing with the Independent Offices appropriation to which the gentleman from New York has referred, is already in print and will be made available to the members of the committee this afternoon.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am not asking specifically about that. Like all other Members of the House, there are items in other sections of the bill that we will not see until the conference report comes to the floor. Will there be a printed copy of the bill and printed copy of the report in our hands?

Mr. CANNON. As soon as sufficient copies can be secured from the Printing Office they will be made immediately available to all Members.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Several subcommittees have had conferences with the Senate and we have come to agreements on the amounts to be allowed for most departments. But there is one very important item that has not yet been decided, that is the question of the percentage cuts contained in the Byrd-Bridges amendment adopted by the Senate which calls for a 10 percent cut in some departments of the Government, and the Thomas-Taber-Jensen amendments which also provided for reductions in the cost of government which was passed by the House, also the foreign aid item has not yet been agreed to in conference. Will the conferees come to a meeting of minds as to what those percentage cuts shall be and will that all be included in the

conference report as it comes to the House under the request the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has just made so that the membership of the House will know what each of the thousands of items in the bill are to receive when we consider the conference report in the House?

Mr. CANNON. We meet in what I trust will be the final conference tomorrow morning. At that time the matters to which the gentleman refers will be taken up and disposed of and will be included in the conference report. No report will be brought to the House that is not complete or does not include all chapters of the bill. The material and information which the gentleman desires will be carried in the report when presented to the House.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, it is customary after the full Appropriations Committee considers a bill that it lay over three legislative days in order to give the Congress and the American people an opportunity to know what is in the bill. The request of the gentleman would foreclose the Members of the House from having any time to study the bill as it comes out of conference; neither will it give the press an opportunity to inform the American people. Time is not so pressing to get out of here that we should be in such haste to pass this bill which amounts to considerably over \$30,000,000,000 without full consideration. I think the Members of Congress should know exactly what is in the conference report when it comes to the floor instead of bringing it to the floor incomplete.

Mr. CANNON. The 3 days to which the gentleman refers do not apply to conference reports. That applies to bills reported originally by the committee. Clause 2 of rule XXVIII, and that is the only provision that affects the situation, provides that a conference report shall be printed in the RECORD. There is no other provision for delay and none is customary under the practice of the House.

Mr. JENSEN. And shall lay over 1 day?

Mr. CANNON. It lies over 1 day when it is printed in the RECORD. That is why we are making this unanimous-consent request. I have conferred with the gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and he is agreeable to taking up the conference report tomorrow if copies are provided in advance to members of the committee. We hope to dispose of it on tomorrow, and on the following day take up the last deficiency bill and dispose of that in 1 day, and so complete the appropriation program for the session.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman will admit that unless the conferees agree on these percentage cuts that are in the general provisions, and the gentleman knows the amendments that were offered in the House and Senate and passed by the House and Senate, to which I referred, along with the foreign-aid item, not a single Member of Congress will know exactly what any item is going to receive unless it is agreed to by the con-

ferees before the conference report comes to the House. Let us take an item for a thousand dollars, as an example; the conferees agree under the Taber - Thomas - Jensen - Byrd-Bridges amendments that the item should be cut 5 percent, so the amount will be \$950. But the Members will not know whether it will be a 5-percent cut or a 6-percent cut or a 10-percent cut or no cut, so we are appropriating in the dark unless the conferees bring in a complete bill on every chapter together including the proposed percentage cuts to which I have referred.

Mr. CANNON. I can assure the gentleman that no Member of the House will be asked to pass upon this conference report, or any part of it, until everyone has been afforded an opportunity to familiarize himself with every feature of the report.

Mr. TABER. May I ask one more question? Does the House act first upon this conference report or does the Senate?

Mr. CANNON. The House acts first. We have the papers and vote first.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I have listened very carefully to the colloquy between the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Iowa, and I failed to hear or understand that the deficiency bill will be printed and in the hands of the Members of this House before they are called upon to vote on it.

Mr. CANNON. It will be reported tomorrow but will not be taken up until the following day. Copies will be in the hands of my friend from Idaho tomorrow, and he will have from then until the following afternoon to study the bill in detail.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. In other words, the printed copy of the conference report and the printed copy of the deficiency bill will be in the hands of the Members of Congress and can be studied by them before we are called upon to vote?

Mr. CANNON. Printed copies of both will be available to all Members of the House tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it not the gentleman's opinion that whatever the conference report may contain, it will be adopted; that there is no use talking about it?

Mr. CANNON. I trust that the conference report will be so satisfactory to all members of the Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the aisle and to all Members of the House as to meet with their complete approval.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What the gentleman means is it does not make any difference how we vote over there, the conference report will be adopted anyway; is that it?

Mr. CANNON. If this House votes down the conference report it will not be adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID ROAD ACT

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7941) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTINGTON, BUCKLEY of New York, LARCADE, FALLON, DONDERO, CUNNINGHAM, and MCGREGOR.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9430) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes," approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806), to simplify administration in the Government service, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DAWSON. I will be glad to. This is a bill that came before our committee. It had adequate hearings and it was voted out unanimously by all members of the committee with the recommendation that it be passed.

This bill is entitled a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes," approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806), to simplify administration in the Government service, and for other purposes. The bill by its provisions touches upon the question of transportation and travel for civilians in Government:

When civilian officers and employees of the United States are on duty at places designated by the heads of their respective departments or agencies as within zones from which their immediate families should be evacuated for military or other reasons which create imminent danger to life or property, or adverse living conditions seriously affecting the health, safety, or accommodations of said families, or upon transfer or assignment to duty of such civilian officers and employees to places where their immediate families are not, for the aforesaid reasons, permitted to accompany them, their immediate families and household goods may be transported at Government expense, under such regulations as the heads of their respective departments and agencies may prescribe.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman means that the man has to live up to his year contract or he is obliged to return the money to the Treasury?

Mr. DAWSON. That is right. It makes it a debt that is recoverable.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How does that differ from the procedure at the present time?

Mr. DAWSON. Well, it is not recoverable now by law.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand the present law is that you have to live 3 years abroad before the Government will pay your expenses back.

Mr. DAWSON. Different departments have entered into different contracts. Sometimes it provides that a person shall stay for the period of a year, particularly, we will say, in Guam or Okinawa and places like that, where conditions are hazardous, or where the hardships are many. Then if they break their contract, after the Government has paid their expenses there, the Government can recover the money that it paid. This bill also makes provision that the Government may enter into a contract for foreign service up to 3 years with the same provision of travel and take care of transportation. If the parties then violate their contracts with the Government then the Government is not responsible for the travel.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then all this does is to help the Government recover some money?

Mr. DAWSON. It does, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And nothing else?

Mr. DAWSON. No, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it extends from 1 year to 3 years the period in which the contract can be made?

Mr. DAWSON. It makes 3 years the maximum in which the Government might enter into a contract. That does not mean the parties have to return, but it means they can still go for another 3 years without the Government paying their transportation back. It is a matter of simplifying the contract of transportation and travel and simply gives legislative authority to what has been done and what is being done as a matter of regulation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is this a unanimous report from the gentleman's committee?

Mr. DAWSON. This was a unanimous report, and it is supported by the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Army, and by the Comptroller General.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When the gentleman states that this is a unanimous report, what he means is that there was no record vote against the report.

This bill has some merit—a little. Of course, just as practically all legislation does today, it opens the door to the

payment of additional sums by the Government to individuals, in this case who are in the Federal employ. That is about what it amounts to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman explain that point a little more thoroughly?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As to how it opens the door?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, it lets a new class of employees have expenses when they come back. But I will say to the majority leader—

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am on the minority.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will say as the ranking minority member of that committee that I can see nothing to be gained by opposing it. I have noticed over the last 8 to 10 years that this type of legislation which always increases the compensation to be paid Federal employees goes through, and I have learned that lesson. You know what the Bible says about "kicking against the pricks," and this is one of those cases and there is no use, and I am not objecting.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would say that what the gentleman from Michigan says is correct, in that it brings a new class of evacuees under the obligation of the Government of the United States to pay for their transportation, such as occurred recently in Seoul, where civilian employees of the Government had to be evacuated. This provides that those people will be given transportation home. We feel it is a moral right that they should be given that transportation home.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is a little different from what the gentleman from Illinois first stated. He said that this would be to help the Government get some money.

Mr. DAWSON. It does help the Government get some money in one of its provisions, and I will come to another provision where it is for the purpose of taking care of civilian employees of Government who are in areas which the Government deems dangerous, either for military reasons or for reasons of health or hazardous for any other reason.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much money will this cost the Government?

Mr. DAWSON. To say how much it would cost, I could not answer that, because I do not contemplate there will be any additional cost, other than the expense we are now being put to as a result of now doing what this would authorize to be done. This gives legislative authority to cut through the red tape and to do what we are now doing.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How are you getting the money to do it now? You say that you are not supposed to do it, but that you do do it. How are you doing it?

Mr. DAWSON. There are many things that are done through red tape where the authority rests generally with-

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

AUGUST 24, 1950.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CANNON, from the committee of conference, submitted the
following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 7786]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

CHAPTER I.—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to Chapter I of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

JOE B. BATES,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
EARL WILSON,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
HOMER FERGUSON,
K. S. WHERRY,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter I of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Amendment No. 1—*Federal contribution*: Appropriates \$9,800,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$11,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in unanimous agreement that this reduction shall not establish a precedent for future annual appropriations, but is recommended for the fiscal year 1951 because of the emergency situation now facing the nation.

JOE B. BATES,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
EARL WILSON,
JOHN TABER.

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER II.—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter II of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 52.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 50, and 53, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 26, 28, 35, 39, 46, 47, 48, 49, and 51.

CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
KENNETH McKELLAR,
STYLES BRIDGES,
GUY CORDON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter II of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

Amendments Nos. 2-34: Provide appropriations for the Senate, which were not included in the bill as passed by the House. Of such amendments, those numbered 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 26, and 28 would have been subject to points of order if considered originally in the House, and therefore are reported in disagreement. The conference report recommends that the House recede and concur with the remainder of such amendments.

Amendment No. 35—*Inquiries and investigations*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 36-48: Provide for or pertain to appropriations for the Senate, which were not included in the bill as passed by the House. Of such amendments, those numbered 39, 46, 47, and 48 would have been subject to points of order if considered originally in the House, and therefore are reported in disagreement. The conference report recommends that the House recede and concur with the remainder of such amendments.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Amendment No. 49, providing funds for the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, would have been subject to a point of order if considered originally in the House, and therefore is reported in disagreement.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Amendment No. 50—*Subway Transportation, Capitol and Senate Office Building*: Appropriates \$2,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51—*Senate Office Building*: Reported in disagreement, inasmuch as it would have been subject to a point of order if considered originally in the House.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Amendment No. 52—*Editing and Publishing the Index-Digest of Publications of the Temporary National Economic Committee*: Strikes out the Senate proposal.

Amendment No. 53—*Library buildings, salaries and expenses:*
Appropriates \$698,680 proposed by the Senate, instead of \$695,200
proposed by the House.

CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER III.—DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter III of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 55, 60, 62, 63, 66, 73, 77, 79, 98, 102, 104, 105, 108, 110, 114, and 118.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 56, 58, 64, 67, 69, 70, 71, 74, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 87, 88, 90, 91, 96, 99, 100, 101, 103, 109, 111, 112, 113, 115, and 116, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$77,800,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$6,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$54,449,297; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,900,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$508,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,350,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$98,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$16,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$5,150,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$11,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$24,897,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$995,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 68, 72, 92, 94, and 107.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
CLIFF CLEVINGER,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House:

PAT McCARRAN,
KENNETH McKELLAR,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate:

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter III of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Amendment No. 54—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$77,800,000, instead of \$77,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$78,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55—*Representation Allowances*: Appropriates \$675,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56—*Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund*: Provides no appropriation or language, as proposed by the Senate, instead of appropriating \$2,233,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 57—*Buildings Fund*: Appropriates \$6,500,000, instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58—*Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service*: Appropriates \$9,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$10,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 59—*Contributions to International Organizations*: Appropriates \$54,449,297, instead of \$55,178,297 as proposed by the House and \$53,753,067 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction in the House figure applies to "International Civil Aviation Organization".

Amendment No. 60—*Missions to International Organizations*: Appropriates \$1,600,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61—*International Contingencies*: Appropriates \$2,900,000, instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 62 and 63—*International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico*: Authorizes the purchase of 4 automobiles for replacement only as proposed by the House, instead of the purchase of 8 automobiles of which 6 were to be for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64—*International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Construction*: Appropriates \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,035,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 65—*American Sections, International Commissions*: Appropriates \$508,000, instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House and \$600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66—*American Sections, International Commissions*: Eliminates the Senate proposal to make \$92,000 available for the examination and survey of the Red River of the North and its tributaries.

Amendment No. 67—*International Information and Educational Activities*: Appropriates \$32,700,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$34,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 68—*International Information and Educational Activities*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 69—*International Information and Educational Activities*: Authorizes the transfer of not to exceed \$2,875,000 to other appropriations of the Department of State as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 70—*Philippine Rehabilitation*: Appropriates \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$13,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 71—*The Institute of Inter-American Affairs*: Appropriates \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 72—*The Institute of Inter-American Affairs*: Reported in disagreement.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 73—*Salaries and Expenses, General Administration*: Appropriates \$2,175,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74—*Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities*: Appropriates \$7,475,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75—*Salaries and Expenses, Antitrust Division*: Appropriates \$3,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,850,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 76—*Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals*: Appropriates \$12,847,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 77—*Fees and Expenses of Witnesses*: Appropriates \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78—*Salaries and Expenses, Claims of Persons of Japanese Ancestry*: Appropriates \$1,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 79—*Salaries and Expenses, Claims of Persons of Japanese Ancestry*: Makes available not to exceed \$250,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the House, instead of \$300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

Amendment No. 80—*Buildings and Facilities*: Appropriates \$800,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 81—*Buildings and Facilities*: Provides \$170,000 cash for replacement of a power plant at the U. S. Penitentiary,

Atlanta, Georgia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$270,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 82—*Buildings and Facilities*: Corrects total to conform with action on amendment No. 81 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY

Amendment No. 83—*Salaries and Expenses*: Makes available \$4,150,000 for the general administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,240,000 as proposed by the House.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 84—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$1,350,000, instead of \$1,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Amendment No. 85—*Seventeenth decennial census*: Appropriates \$28,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$29,500,000 as proposed by the House.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 86—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$98,500,000, instead of \$97,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$99,775,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 87—*Establishment of air-navigation facilities*: Appropriates \$27,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$32,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 88—*Establishment of air-navigation facilities*: Provides \$22,000,000 of the amount contained in Amendment No. 87 for liquidation of prior contract authorizations as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$26,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 89—*Establishment of air-navigation facilities*: Provides contract authority in an amount not to exceed \$16,000,000, instead of \$13,461,500 as proposed by the House and \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 90—*Federal-aid airport program. Federal Airport Act*: Appropriates \$37,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$45,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91—*Federal-aid airport program. Federal Airport Act*: Provides \$34,000,000 of the amount contained in Amendment No. 90 for liquidation of prior contract authority as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$42,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 92—*Air navigation development*: Reported in disagreement.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Amendment No. 93—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$3,500,000, instead of \$3,400,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 94—*Salaries and Expenses*: Reported in disagreement.

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Amendment No. 95—*Departmental Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$5,150,000, instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 96—*Field Office Service*: Appropriates \$2,155,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,050,000 as proposed by the House.

PATENT OFFICE

Amendment No. 97—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$11,500,000, instead of \$11,300,000 as proposed by the House, and \$11,530,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Amendment No. 98—*General Administrative Expenses*: Restores the House language which provides that not to exceed \$3,000,000 to be derived from the administrative funds shall be available for continuing the construction of a laboratory for testing and research work.

Amendment No. 99—*Federal-aid postwar highways*: Appropriates \$385,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$405,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 100—*Federal-aid postwar highways*: Corrects the amount to conform with action on Amendment No. 99 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Amendment No. 101: Provides a limitation of \$700,000 for improvements to buildings, grounds and other plant facilities as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$540,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 102—*Operation and Administration*: Appropriates \$1,270,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,430,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 103—*Radio Propagation and Standards*: Appropriates \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 104—*Construction of Laboratories*: Appropriates \$500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$268,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 105—*Construction of Laboratories*: Authorizes contract authority in an amount not to exceed \$5,675,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

WEATHER BUREAU

Amendment No. 106—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$24,897,000, instead of \$24,447,000 as proposed by the House and \$24,927,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 107—*Salaries and Expenses*: Reported in disagreement.

THE JUDICIARY

CUSTOMS COURT

Amendment No. 108—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$417,465 as proposed by the House, instead of \$411,465 as proposed by the Senate.

COURT OF CLAIMS

Amendment No. 109—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$575,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$587,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 110—*Repairs and Improvements*: Appropriates \$10,700 as proposed by the House, instead of \$140,700 as proposed by the Senate.

OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

Amendment No. 111—*Salaries of Clerks of Courts*: Appropriates \$4,470,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 112—*Salaries of Criers*: Appropriates \$520,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$540,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 113—*Miscellaneous Expenses*: Appropriates \$675,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$725,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 114—*Travel Expenses*: Appropriates \$725,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 115—*Administrative Office of the U. S. Courts*: Appropriates \$520,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$530,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 116—*Repairs and Improvements, District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia*: Appropriates \$7,100 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 117—*Expenses of Referees*: Appropriates \$995,000 to be derived from the referees' expense fund, instead of \$960,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,035,400 as proposed by the Senate.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Amendment No. 118—*The Institute of Inter-American Affairs*: Provides not to exceed \$600,000 for administrative expenses of the funds available to the corporation, as proposed by the House, instead of \$767,500 as proposed by the Senate.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
CLIFF CLEVINGER,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER IV.—TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter IV of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 134.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 120, 122, 123, 125, 127, 130, 131, 132, and 133, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *\$1,185,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *\$2,100,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 124:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *\$36,600,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *\$1,850,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *\$2,150,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$17,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
FREDERIC R. COUDERT,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
CARL HAYDEN,
H. M. KILGORE,
JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
OLIN D. JOHNSON,
GUY CORDON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter IV of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

Amendment No. 119—*Salaries*: Appropriates \$1,185,000, instead of \$1,160,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,207,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 120—*Miscellaneous Expenses*: Appropriates \$308,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$300,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

Amendment No. 121—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$2,100,000, instead of \$1,875,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,209,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 122—*Recoinage of Silver Coins*: Strikes out House language as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

Amendment No. 123—*Distinctive Paper for United States Currency and Securities*: Appropriates \$1,845,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,745,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

Amendment No. 124—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$36,600,000, instead of \$36,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$36,806,360 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Amendment No. 125—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$245,547,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$245,600,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

Amendment No. 126—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$1,850,000, instead of \$1,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,908,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING

Amendment No. 127—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$16,835,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,500,000 as proposed by the House.

SECRET SERVICE DIVISION

Amendment No. 128—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$2,150,000, instead of \$2,100,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

COAST GUARD

Amendment No. 129—*Acquisition, Construction and Improvements*: Appropriates \$17,000,000, instead of \$15,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$18,964,000 as proposed by the Senate.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment Nos. 130, 131, and 132—*Deficiency in Postal Revenues*: Delete the House limitation of \$401,500,000 as the maximum amount which can be drawn from the Federal Treasury for this purpose and inserts language allowing the use of an indefinite amount, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 133—*Transportation of Mails*: Inserts language to allow the use of this appropriation for payment of current and prior fiscal year settlements with foreign countries, as proposed by the Senate.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Amendment No. 134—*Administrative Expenses*: Authorizes not to exceed \$26,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$26,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
OTTO E. PASSMAN.
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
FREDERIC R. COUDERT,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER V.—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter V of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 137, 141, and 152.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 139, 144, 145, 146, 149, 154, and 155, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 135:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: *forty-five passenger motor vehicles, of which seventeen shall be for replacement only*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 136:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$5,466,700; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,971,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 140:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$9,800,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: *and including \$200,000 for transfer to the Department of Agriculture for research into utilization of plant material and vegetable sources of cortisone*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,090,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 150:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$250,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 153:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$523,100; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,582,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 142, 148, and 151.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
E. H. HEDRICK,
CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
PAT McCARRAN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter V of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 135 and 136—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$5,466,700, instead of \$5,666,700 as proposed by the Senate and \$5,066,700 as proposed by the House, including the purchase of not to exceed forty-five passenger motor vehicles, instead of not to exceed sixty-five proposed by the Senate and not to exceed seventeen proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Amendment No. 137—*Promotion and further development of vocational education*: Appropriates \$19,977,760 as proposed by the House, instead of \$23,435,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 138—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$1,971,500, instead of \$2,023,420 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,900,000 as proposed by the House.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Amendment No. 139—*Venereal diseases*: Appropriates \$14,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$14,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 140—*Tuberculosis*: Appropriates \$9,800,000 instead of \$9,600,000 as proposed by the Senate, and \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 141—*Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services*: Appropriates \$1,357,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,107,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 142—*National Institutes of Health, operating expenses*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 143: Restores the House language providing for transfer of funds to the Department of Agriculture for research into utilization of plant material and vegetable sources of cortisone, modified to make the transfer in the specific amount of \$200,000.

Amendment No. 144—*National Cancer Institute*: Appropriates \$20,686,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,086,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 145—*Mental health activities*: Appropriates \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$9,944,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 146—*National Heart Institute*: Appropriates \$14,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$14,150,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 147—*Dental health activities*: Appropriates \$2,090,000, instead of \$2,140,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,040,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 148—*Construction of research facilities*: Reported in disagreement.

SAINT ELIZABETH'S HOSPITAL

Amendment No. 149—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$2,005,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,948,000 as proposed by the House.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 150—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions*: Appropriates \$250,000, instead of \$300,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 151—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 152—*Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau*: Appropriates \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,510,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Amendment No. 153—*Salaries, Office of the General Counsel*: Appropriates \$523,100, instead of \$535,100 as proposed by the Senate and \$511,100 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 154: Inserts a separate section proposed by the Senate, making certain appropriations of the Federal Security Agency in the bill available for travel expenses and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

Amendment No. 155: Corrects a section number.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Amendment No. 156—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$8,582,500, instead of \$8,615,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$8,550,000 as proposed by the House.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
E. H. HEDRICK,
CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER VI.—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VI of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 159, 163, 170, 171, 174, 176, 185, 202, 203, 214, and 229.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 158, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 167, 168, 169, 199, 205, 206, 207, 210, 211, 213, 216, 218, 219, 226, 227, 228, 233, 235, 236, and 237, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 172:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 172, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,294,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 173:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 173, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,325,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,617,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$7,960,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 179:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 179, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,437,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 180:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,012,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$452,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,723,750; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,130,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 184:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 184, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$4,157,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 186:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$4,450,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,354,700; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 188:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,100,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 190:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 190, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$560,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,650,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,490,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 194:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 194, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$537,050; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 195:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 195, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,837,475; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 196:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 196, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,115,475; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 197:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 197, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$27,100,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 204:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 204, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$300,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 208:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 208, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$10,315,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 212:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 212, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,565,175; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 217:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 217, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,118,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 220:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 220, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$8,550,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 221:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 221, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$32,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 222:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 222, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$65,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 225:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 225, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$28,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 230:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 230, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,161,300; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 231:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 231, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,562,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 157, 166, 175, 189, 192, 198, 200, 201, 209, 215, 223, 224, 232, 234, and 238.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM G. STIGLER,
EDWARD H. KRUSE, Jr.,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
ELMER THOMAS,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
CHAN GURNEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VI of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT

Amendment No. 157: Reported in disagreement.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Amendments Nos. 158 and 159—*Economic investigations*: Strike out House language to permit economic research on farm housing as proposed by the Senate and appropriate \$2,600,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,720,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 160 and 161—*Crop and livestock estimates*: Strike out House language authorizing collection of data on farm construction as proposed by the Senate and appropriate \$2,904,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,725,000 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 162: Corrects language as proposed by the Senate.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

Amendment No. 163: Restores language establishing a working capital fund as proposed by the House.

RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

Amendment No. 164: Appropriates \$280,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$260,000 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Amendment No. 165—*Payments to States and Territories*: Inserts language proposed by the Senate in connection with the transfer of Research and Marketing Act funds.

Amendment No. 166—*Payments to States and Territories*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 167—*Payments to States and Territories*: Authorizes \$37,500 for research in Alaska as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$27,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 168—*Payments to States and Territories*: Appropriates \$12,416,208 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,406,208 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 169 and 170—*Salaries and expenses*: Correct date reference as proposed by the Senate and appropriate \$237,500 as proposed by the House, instead of \$252,500 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

Amendment No. 171: Appropriates \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,763,200 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 172—*Animal husbandry*: Appropriates \$2,294,000, instead of \$2,319,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,250,000 as proposed by the House. The amount appropriated includes \$19,000 proposed by the Senate to enable the Department to continue operation of the Morgan Horse Farm until the State Legislature can consider a proposal for State of Vermont to take it over. It is agreed unanimously by the conferees of both Houses that this activity must be disposed of by the end of the fiscal year 1951.

Amendment No. 173—*Diseases of animals*: Appropriates \$1,325,000, instead of \$1,350,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 174—*Animal disease control and eradication*: Appropriates \$7,950,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$7,952,500 as proposed by the Senate. Although Senate increase is eliminated, the conferees of both Houses agree that the Seattle stockyards should be given the same inspection service accorded similar stockyards throughout the country, within the funds approved.

Amendment No. 175—*Animal disease control and eradication*: Reported in disagreement.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

Amendments Nos. 176 and 177: Eliminate language proposed by the Senate authorizing construction of housing at Beltsville and appropriate \$1,617,500, instead of \$1,735,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,600,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

Amendment No. 178: Appropriates \$7,960,000, instead of \$8,500,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$7,750,000 as proposed by the House. This amount provides partial restoration of House cut below 1950 level of operation. Funds for research on cortisone are provided in Chapter V of the bill.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 179—*Field crops*: Appropriates \$3,437,500, instead of \$3,475,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$3,400,000 as proposed by the House. This amount includes \$30,000 for research on new types of cotton.

Amendment No. 180—*Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops*: Appropriates \$3,012,500, instead of \$3,075,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,950,000 as proposed by the House. Funds for research into new sources of cortisone are included in Chapter V of the bill.

Amendment No. 181—*Forest diseases*: Appropriates \$452,500, instead of \$455,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$450,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 182—*Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation*: Appropriates \$2,723,750, instead of \$2,767,500 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,680,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 183—*Agricultural engineering*: Appropriates \$1,130,000, instead of \$1,140,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,120,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Amendments Nos. 184 and 185—*Insect investigations*: Appropriate \$4,157,500, instead of \$4,165,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$4,100,000 as proposed by the House and restore House language authorizing the transfer of funds to the Public Health Service for studies on effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on human health.

Amendment No. 186—*Insect and plant-disease control*: Appropriates \$4,450,000, instead of \$4,651,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$4,185,900 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 187—*Foreign plant quarantines*: Appropriates \$2,354,700, instead of \$2,384,400 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,325,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 188—*Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases*: Appropriates \$2,100,000, instead of \$2,350,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$850,000 as proposed by the House. The additional contingency funds, which are provided to eliminate future deficiencies, are to be released only after both committees have approved final plans for their use.

Amendment No. 189—*Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases*: Reported in disagreement.

CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS

Amendment No. 190—*Gypsy and brown-tail moths*: Appropriates \$560,000, instead of \$590,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$539,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 191—*Forest Pest Control Act*: Appropriates \$1,650,000, instead of \$1,900,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$900,000 as proposed by the House. The additional contingency funds of \$750,000 are included to eliminate as far as possible future deficiencies.

Amendment No. 192—*Forest Pest Control Act*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 193, 194, 195, and 196—*White pine blister rust*: Appropriate \$3,490,000, instead of \$3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$3,280,000 as proposed by the House and adjust amounts to be transferred to the three agencies which carry out this program.

FOREST SERVICE

Amendment No. 197—*National forest protection and management*: Appropriates \$27,100,000, instead of \$29,320,500 as proposed by the Senate and \$26,890,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 198—*Cooperative range improvements*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 199—*Forest and range management investigations*: Appropriates \$3,030,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,995,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 200—*Forest and range management investigations*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 201—*Forest products*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 202—*Forest resources investigations*: Appropriates \$880,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 203—*Forest development roads and trails*: Appropriates \$10,348,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 204—*Acquisition of land for national forests, Weeks Act*: Appropriates \$300,000, instead of \$401,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$100,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees of both Houses agree that none of these funds shall be used to purchase lands unless they are located entirely within national forest boundaries.

Amendments Nos. 205, 206, and 207—*Farm and other private forestry cooperation*: Approve corrections proposed by the Senate in sublimitation accounts.

FLOOD CONTROL

Amendment No. 208: Appropriates \$10,315,000, instead of \$9,880,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$10,750,000 as proposed by the House. Within the funds available, special attention shall be given to the areas where work has been delayed.

Amendment No. 209: Reported in disagreement.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 210: Omits surplus heading.

Amendment No. 211—*Soil conservation operations*: Appropriates \$52,400,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$52,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 212—*Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land*: Appropriates \$1,565,175, instead of \$1,665,175 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,490,000 as proposed by the House. The amount approved includes Senate increase for the San Simon Valley project.

Amendment No. 213—*Water conservation and utilization projects*: Appropriates \$500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 214—*Conservation and use of agricultural land resources*: Appropriates \$282,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$283,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 215—*Conservation and use of agricultural land resources*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 216—*Sugar Act*: Appropriates \$63,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$60,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 217—*Market News Service*: Appropriates \$2,118,500, instead of \$2,187,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,050,000 as proposed by the House. The amount approved includes Senate increase for market news service on naval stores.

Amendment No. 218—*Marketing regulatory acts*: Appropriates \$3,495,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,550,000 as proposed by the House.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

Amendment No. 219: Appropriates \$7,204,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$6,854,000 as proposed by the House.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 220—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$8,550,000, instead of \$8,750,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$8,150,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 221—*Loan authorization*: Authorizes rural telephone loans in the amount of \$32,500,000, instead of \$40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees agree that the fees for engineering and legal services on the larger loans should be reduced. They also feel that standardization of plans should be developed to make possible further savings to the consumers. In addition, the Rural Electrification Administration is expected to exercise its power generation authority only in line with its announced policy and the law.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 222—*Loan authorization*: Authorizes \$65,000,000 for farm tenancy and housing loans, instead of \$71,350,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$56,350,000 as proposed by the House. In addition, the Farmers' Home Administration will have a carry-over of approximately \$7,000,000 from 1950 for farm housing loans, which will make a total of \$72,000,000 available for 1951.

Amendment No. 223—*Loan authorization*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 224—*Loan authorization*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 225—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$28,500,000, instead of \$29,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$27,700,000 as proposed by the House.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Amendments Nos. 226, 227, and 228—*Payments to States and Territories*: Appropriate \$27,103,498 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$27,000,000 as proposed by the House and adjust language to increase payments to Alaska and Puerto Rico.

Amendment No. 229—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$900,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$915,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 230: Appropriates \$2,161,300, instead of \$2,179,300 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,143,300 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Amendment No. 231: Appropriates \$2,562,500, instead of \$2,675,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,450,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 232: Reported in disagreement.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

Amendment No. 233: Approves language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 234: Reported in disagreement.

TRAVEL LIMITATION

Amendment No. 235: Eliminates language proposed by the House limiting funds for travel expenses, in view of Senate substitute in Amendment No. 238.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Amendment No. 236—*Administrative expenses*: Authorizes \$16,350,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$16,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 237—*Restoration of capital impairment*: Approves \$66,698,457 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$170,515,131 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 238: Reported in disagreement.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM G. STIGLER,
EDWARD H. KRUSE, Jr.,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER VII.—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 239, 240, 242, 245, 248, 250, 253, 256, 257, 258, 259, 266, 272, 280, 286, 287, 291, 292, 299, 308, and 309.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 241, 243, 244, 246, 247, 249, 255, 260, 261, 264, 267, 269, 274, 276, 282, 290, 293, 294, 297, 298, 301, 303, 304, 305, and 307, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 251:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 251, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$700,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 252:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 252, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert *Provided, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands shall be reimbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in section c, title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937, of the special fund designated the "Oregon and California Land Grant Fund" and section 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939, of the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund";* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 262:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 262, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$23,272,651; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 263:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 263, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 265:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 265, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,600,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 268:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 268, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert : *Provided, That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary. Any tribal funds advanced under this authority shall be reported to the Congress in the annual Budget for the fiscal year 1952; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment numbered 270:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 270, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$5,875,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 271:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 271, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$5,116,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 273:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 273, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$295,828,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 281:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 281, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$7,200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 283:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 283, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert *not to exceed \$100,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment numbered 296:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 296, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$7,400,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 310:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 310, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$30,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 254, 275, 277, 278, 279, 284, 285, 288, 289, 295, 300, 302, and 306.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
ALBERT GORE,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
CHAN GURNEY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 239—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$2,315,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 240—*Standardization of geographic names*: Provides no appropriation, as proposed by the House, instead of making an appropriation of \$14,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 241—*Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act*: Appropriates \$180,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 242—*Southeastern power marketing area, operation and maintenance*: Appropriates \$150,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 243 and 244—*Southwestern Power Administration, construction*: Appropriate \$8,620,000 and provide contractual authority of \$1,730,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of appropriating \$10,350,000 and providing \$6,000,000 contractual authority as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 245—*Southwestern Power Administration, operation and maintenance*: Appropriates \$760,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$660,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Southwestern Power Administration is expected to exercise its power generation and transmission authority only in line with its announced policy and the law.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 246 and 247—*Construction*: Appropriate \$39,500,000 and provide contractual authority of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of appropriating \$41,500,000 and providing contractual authority of \$21,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 248—*Operation and maintenance*: Appropriates \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$4,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 249—*Management of lands and resources*: Appropriates \$7,127,810 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$6,756,800, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 250—*Management of lands and resources*: Eliminates the Senate proposal to include express authorization to expend funds for weed control on the revested Oregon and California Railroad and Coos Bay Road lands, since such express authority is not needed.

Amendment No. 251—*Construction*: Appropriates \$700,000, instead of \$600,000 as proposed by the House and \$800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 252—*Administrative provisions*: Provides for reimbursement of all expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and Coos Bay Road lands from the special funds maintained by 25% of the receipts from such lands. Such reimbursement for current expenses is to be made entirely from 25% of current year receipts. If 25% of current receipts is inadequate also to reimburse for the \$700,000 appropriation for capital expenditures such current year deficiency can be made up from later receipts. This modifies the reimbursement proposal of both Houses.

Amendment No. 253—*Range improvements*: Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of \$350,000 on expenditure of receipts.

Amendment No. 254—*Payments to states (Proceeds of sales)*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 255—*Payments to states (Proceeds of Sales)*: Provides a limitation of \$20,000 on such payments as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 256—*Payment to Oklahoma*: Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of \$4,000 on such payment.

Amendment No. 257—*Leasing of grazing lands*: Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of \$6,000 on expenditure of receipts.

Amendment No. 258—*Payments to states (Grazing fees)*: Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of \$300 on such payments.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Amendment No. 259—*Health, education and welfare services*: Eliminates the Senate proposal to authorize expenditure for research among mixed Indians and non-Indian groups.

Amendment No. 260—*Health, education and welfare services*: Appropriates \$40,252,328 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$37,929,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 261—*Resources management*: Appropriates \$10,814,576 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$10,542,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 262—*Construction*: Appropriates \$23,272,651, instead of \$22,422,000 as proposed by the House and \$23,635,151 as proposed by the Senate. This action eliminates the sum of \$500,000 which was added by the Senate for the construction of roads and trails, but restores the sum of \$137,500 for land acquisition which was deleted by the Senate. The restoration of \$137,500 for land acquisition is made with the understanding that it is not to be expended for

the acquisition of privately owned land to be held in trust so as to extend the boundaries of Indian reservations.

Amendment No. 263—*Construction*: Provides contractual authority of \$3,500,000, instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 264—*Restriction on land acquisition*: Adopts the proposal of the Senate to limit the use of appropriations for the acquisition of land or water rights for Indians in specified states.

Amendment No. 265—*General administrative expenses*: Appropriates \$3,600,000, instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House, and \$3,644,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 266—*Administrative provisions*: Authorizes the purchase of 227 automobiles as proposed by the House, instead of 250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 267—*Tribal funds*: Appropriates \$2,437,965 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,430,965 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 268—*Tribal funds*: Authorizes the advancement of tribal funds to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year upon the designation by the governing body of the tribe and approval by the Secretary, and requires that such advances shall be reported to the Congress in the annual budget for the fiscal year 1952, thus reinstating with modification the language proposed by the House but deleted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 269—*Tribal funds*: Inserts a limitation upon the use of tribal funds for the acquisition of land or water rights in specified states, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Amendment No. 270—*General investigations*: Appropriates \$5,875,000, instead of \$5,150,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. This action provides \$50,000 for investigation of the La Prele unit, Wyoming.

Amendment No. 271—*General investigations*: Provides that of the appropriation of \$5,875,000 for general investigations the amount to be derived from the reclamation fund is \$5,116,000, instead of \$4,400,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,791,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 272—*Construction and rehabilitation*: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to authorize emergency re-construction of the La Prele unit, Wyoming, and initiation of construction on the Kennewick Division of the Yakima project, Washington.

Amendment No. 273—*Construction and rehabilitation*: Appropriates \$295,828,000, instead of \$297,467,000 as proposed by the House, and \$294,713,000 as proposed by the Senate. This action ratifies the allocation of funds for construction and rehabilitation as set forth on pages 142 and 143 (and for the Missouri Basin project, on pages 147, 148, 149, and 150) of Senate report No. 1941, accompanying H. R. 7786, including ratification of the Senate action in providing \$750,000 to initiate the work on the Folsom power facilities, Central Valley project, and including ratification of providing \$504,000 (increase in appropriation of \$228,000 together with \$276,000 to be available through reprogramming under House allowance) for construction of

the Brighton-Brush transmission line and substations, Colorado-Big Thompson project, but with the following exceptions to such ratification:

(a) In addition to \$343,000 allowed by the Senate for the Fort Peck project, Montana, \$750,000 is also allowed to complete construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations. This is in lieu of the \$1,400,000 allowed by the House and of the entire disallowance of funds for this line as proposed by the Senate.

(b) The additional sum of \$365,000 is provided for the Missouri Basin project to construct the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls transmission line and substations.

Amendment No. 274—*Construction and rehabilitation*: Provides that of the appropriation of \$295,828,000, the sum to be derived from the reclamation fund shall be \$25,135,700 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$22,897,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 275—*Construction and rehabilitation (contract authority)*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 276—*Construction and rehabilitation*: Ratifies the action of the Senate in deleting the proposal of the House to earmark \$1,000,000 for the construction of specified transmission lines in South Dakota.

Amendment No. 277—*Construction and rehabilitation (language authorizing South Dakota transmission lines)*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 278—*Construction and rehabilitation (restriction on construction of Glendo unit)*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 279—*Construction and rehabilitation (restriction on construction of Moorhead Dam)*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 280—*Construction and rehabilitation*: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to rescind the unused portion of the 1950 appropriation for construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations, Fort Peck project, Montana.

Amendment No. 281—*General administrative expenses*: Appropriates \$7,200,000, instead of \$7,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 282—*General administrative expenses*: Inserts a provision limiting expenditures for information work to not more than \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 283—*Administrative provisions*: Provides that not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for services authorized under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946, including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary. This modifies the proposals of both Houses in this connection.

Amendment No. 284—*Administrative provisions (administration of interstate compacts)*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 285—*Administrative provisions (payments to school districts)*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 286—*Administrative provisions*: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to insert a provision limiting reimbursability of certain expenditures.

Amendment No. 287—*Administrative provisions*: Authorizes expenditures for studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas pursuant to law, as proposed by the House, instead of authorizing expenditures

for such studies on a non-reimbursable basis and with an express limit on expenditures for any one reservoir area, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 288—*Administrative provisions (Reimbursability of certain expenditures)*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 289—*Transfer of Ephrata Air Force Base*: Reported in disagreement.

The Bureau of Reclamation was permitted to insert in the Senate Hearings, Part I, beginning at page 576, a statement of the Bureau's interpretation of some of the provisions of H. R. 7786 as passed by the House. Such interpretation should be considered as that sought to be established by the Bureau of Reclamation, and not necessarily as the intent of Congress. When interpretation is necessary, the Comptroller General should resolve questions in the light of all relevant factors.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Amendment No. 290—*Surveys, investigations and research*: Appropriates \$19,382,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$19,129,000 as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF MINES

Amendments Nos. 291 and 292—*Conservation and development of mineral resources*: Appropriate \$17,758,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$17,813,403 as proposed by the Senate; and eliminate the provision proposed by the Senate to authorize the reacquisition of certain properties in Montana.

Amendment No. 293—*Construction*: Appropriates \$1,268,100 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,372,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 294—*Administrative provisions*: Authorizes the purchase of 150 automobiles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 145 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 295—*Administrative provisions (Transfer of land in Minnesota)*: Reported in disagreement.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Amendment No. 296—*Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities*: Appropriates \$7,400,000, instead of \$7,250,000 as proposed by the House, and \$7,448,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 297—*Construction*: Appropriates \$19,667,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,542,000 as proposed by the House.

This action on amendments Nos. 296 and 297 will necessitate some flexibility to permit adjustment of items originally scheduled under maintenance and rehabilitation and construction.

Amendments Nos. 298 and 299—*Construction*: Provide that of the construction appropriation the sum for liquidation of prior obligations shall be \$7,935,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$8,935,000 as proposed by the House; and eliminate the proposal of the Senate to provide \$100,000 in contract authorization.

Amendment No. 300—*Construction (Provision regarding Independence National Historical Park)*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 301—*General administrative expenses*: Appropriates \$1,314,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,264,500 as proposed by the House.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Amendment No. 302—*Management of resources (Payment for information)*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 303—*Management of resources*: Appropriates \$7,082,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,157,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 304—*Investigations of resources*: Appropriates \$4,125,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 305—*Construction*: Appropriates \$2,423,450 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,401,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 306—*Migratory bird conservation fund*: Reported in disagreement.

TERRITORIES AND ISLAND POSSESSIONS

Amendment No. 307—*Administration of territories and possessions*: Appropriates \$3,392,180 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,329,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 308—*Construction of roads, Alaska*: Appropriates \$20,400,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$18,883,212 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 309—*Claims, Alaska Road Commission*: Provides no appropriation as proposed by the House, instead of appropriating \$12,893 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 310—*Construction, Alaska Railroad*: Appropriates \$30,000,000, instead of \$31,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$28,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
ALBERT GORE,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER VIII.—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VIII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 316, 330, 331, 340, 341, 343, 346, 350, 357, 359, 362, and 371.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 311, 313, 314, 320, 321, 323, 324, 326, 327, 328, 329, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 347, 360, 364, 365, 366, 368, and 372, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 312:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 312, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$187,750; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 315:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 315, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert : *Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authorization shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of \$90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of \$45,000 per annum; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment numbered 317:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 317, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$15,511,913; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 318:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 318, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$35,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 322:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 322, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,891,695; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 325:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 325, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$300; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 339:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 339, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$78,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 344:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 344, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$9,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 348:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 348, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$190,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 349:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 349, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$42,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 351:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 351, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$11,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 352:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 352, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$38,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 355:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 355, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$6,230,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 356:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 356, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,700,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 358:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 358, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,179,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 367:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 367, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$881,750,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 369:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 369, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the per centum proposed insert 5.5; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 370:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 370, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the per centum proposed insert 9; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 319, 337, 338, 342, 345, 353, 354, 361, 363, and 373.

ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT GORE,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANCIS CASE (except as
to amendment 363),
JOHN PHILLIPS (except as
to amendment 363),
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VIII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Amendment No. 311—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$3,412,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,386,000 as proposed by the House.

PHILIPPINE ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

Amendment No. 312—*Administrative Expenses*: Appropriates \$187,750, instead of \$160,000 as proposed by the House and \$215,500, as proposed by the Senate.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 313—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$670,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$695,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 314—*Construction of Memorials and Cemeteries*: Appropriates \$8,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$8,680,000 as proposed by the House.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Amendment No. 315—*Payment of Fees to Contractors*: Restores provision in the House bill, amended to clarify intent. In connection with this provision the conferees wish it understood that they are aware that these contracts contain a cancellation clause and that they are expecting the Commission to take immediate advantage of that clause.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 316 and 317—*Salaries and Expenses*: Authorize the expenditure of \$50,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (Hatch Act), as proposed by the House, instead of \$80,000 as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate \$15,511,913, instead of \$15,261,913 as proposed by the House and \$15,761,913 as proposed by the Senate.

COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

Amendment No. 318—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$35,000, instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,000 as proposed by the Senate. Re-appropriation of unobligated balances totaling \$30,000 provides a total of \$65,000 for this purpose.

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 319—*Salaries and Expenses*: Reported in disagreement.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 320 and 321—*Salaries and Expenses*: Authorize the expenditure of \$256,500 for travel expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$247,500 as proposed by the House; and appropriates \$4,013,300 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,938,300 as proposed by the House.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 322 and 323—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$3,891,695, instead of \$3,866,695 as proposed by the House and \$3,916,695 as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the words "to the Bureau of Trade Practice Conferences" as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Amendments Nos. 324 and 325—*Salaries*: Appropriate \$32,689,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$34,500,000 as proposed by the House; and authorizes the expenditure of \$300 for newspapers and periodicals, instead of \$600 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 326—*Sites and Planning, Public Buildings Outside the District of Columbia*: Appropriates \$22,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$28,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 327, 328, and 329—*Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act*: Appropriate \$605,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$633,608,240 as proposed by the House; strikes out the provision of the House to the effect that not to exceed \$25,000,000 may be expended in accordance with the purposes of the Act of July 23, 1946 through purchase contracts negotiated with operators as proposed by the Senate; and provides a contract authorization of \$125,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the House. In connection with this activity the conferees wish to go on record as being in accord with the so-called "buy American policy" which was enacted in 1933. The conferees are of the opinion that this policy should continue in full force, and that every assistance should be extended by the government to the development of our domestic sources of raw materials. We point out that domestic development means double protection—a stock pile immediately acquired and the source of supply proved.

Amendments Nos. 330 and 331—*Alaska Public Works*: Strike out the proposal of the Senate authorizing a contract authorization in the amount of \$4,000,000; and restores the provision of the House requiring that a certificate from the Secretary of Defense that the installation of such facility will be of value in connection with national defense.

Amendments Nos. 332 and 333—*Advance Planning of Non-Federal Public Works*: Appropriate \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$28,000,000 as proposed by the House; and provides a contract authorization in the sum of \$27,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$32,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 334—*Grants for Plan Preparation, Water Pollution Control*: Appropriates \$750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 335—*Administrative Expenses, Water Pollution Control*: Appropriates \$52,285 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$60,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 336—*Virgin Islands Public Works*: Appropriates \$1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 337 and 338—*Public Works Advance Planning*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 339—*Operating Expenses*: Appropriates \$78,500,000, instead of \$76,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$82,725,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 340—*Purchase and Distribution of Typewriters*: Restores the two paragraphs contained in the House Bill relating to the acquisition and distribution of typewriters.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Amendments Nos. 341 and 342—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriate \$4,200,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$4,900,000 as proposed by the Senate; and reports in disagreement the proposal of the Senate relating to expenses of inspections of projects financed through loans to educational institutions authorized by Title 4 of the Housing Act of 1950.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 343—*Annual Contributions*: Appropriates \$7,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$9,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 344—*Administrative Expenses*: Appropriates \$9,000,000, instead of \$8,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 345—*General Expenses*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 346—*Railroad Safety*: Appropriates \$1,000,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,016,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 347—*Locomotive Inspection*: Appropriates \$718,600, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$700,000 as proposed by the House.

MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 348—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$190,000, instead of \$175,000 as proposed by the House and \$227,800 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Amendments Nos. 349 and 350—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriate \$42,500,000, instead of \$40,890,630 as proposed by the House and \$44,225,630 as proposed by the Senate; and restores the provision of the House providing that no part of the appropriation shall be available for the operation of a field office outside the continental or territorial limits of the United States.

Amendment No. 351—*Construction and Equipment*: Provides a contract authorization of \$11,000,000, instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$12,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Amendments Nos. 352 and 353—*Maintenance and Operation of Properties*: Appropriate \$38,000, instead of \$35,000 as proposed by the House and \$39,600 as proposed by the Senate; and reports in disagreement the provision of the Senate waiving the provisions of Section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950.

PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 354—*Eligibility of Persons Who Collaborated With the Enemy*: Reported in disagreement. Any recommendation submitted by the committee in connection with this amendment should in no way be considered justification for continuation of this activity beyond April 30, 1951, the statutory termination date for this part of the program.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 355—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$6,230,000, instead of \$6,130,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,330,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Amendment No. 356—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$2,700,000, instead of \$2,606,490 as proposed by the House and \$2,770,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 357—*Paleontological Investigations*: Strikes out the provision of the Senate proposing an appropriation of \$20,000.

Amendment No. 358—*Salaries and Expenses, National Gallery of Art*: Appropriates \$1,179,000, instead of \$1,158,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TARIFF COMMISSION

Amendment No. 359—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$1,290,700 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,340,700 as proposed by the Senate.

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Amendment No. 360—*Salaries and Expenses*: Appropriates \$826,900, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$820,000 as proposed by the House.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Amendment No. 361—*Ship Construction*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 362—*Operating-Differential Subsidies*: Appropriates \$26,450,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$30,108,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 363—*Limitation on Number of Ships Receiving Operating-Differential Subsidy*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 364—*Maritime Training*: Strikes out the provision of the House appropriating \$3,342,660, and inserts the proposal of the Senate appropriating \$4,348,520 including pay of cadet-midshipmen and other trainees as proposed by the Senate. For several years there has been disagreement in the two Houses as to the justice and desirability of providing the \$65 monthly allowance for cadet-midshipmen. It has been pointed out that similar payments are made to cadets at the Military Academy and midshipmen at the Naval Academy. It also has been pointed out that the obligation to serve on the part of the two latter groups is greater than it is in the case of cadets attending the Maritime Academy. It is recommended that the subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses having the subject in charge, or certain members thereof, conduct a study of the problem with a view to submitting a recommendation thereon by the beginning of the next regular session of the Congress.

Amendment No. 365—*State Marine Schools*: Strikes out the proposal of the House containing an appropriation of \$668,000 together with an unobligated balance of not to exceed \$25,000, and inserts the proposal of the Senate appropriating \$1,102,050, including pay of cadet-midshipmen at \$65 per month.

Amendment No. 366—*Vessel Operating Functions*: Corrects statute reference as proposed by the Senate.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 367—*Administration, Medical, Hospital and Domiciliary Services*: Appropriates \$881,750,000, instead of \$875,847,795 as proposed by the House and \$887,621,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 368—*Limitation on Educational and Training Institutions*: Strikes out the proposal of the House regarding the eligibility of educational institutions for the training of veterans, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 369 and 370—*Payment for Technical and Clerical Services for the Preparation of Plans and Specifications*: Authorize the

use of not to exceed 5.5 per cent of appropriation and contract authorizations, instead of 4 per cent as proposed by the House and 6.7 per cent as proposed by the Senate, in connection with projects supervised by the Veterans Administration; and authorizes the use of not to exceed 9 per cent where such projects are under the supervision of other government agencies, instead of 7 per cent as proposed by the House and 10 per cent as proposed by the Senate.

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 371—*Administrative Expenses*: Appropriates \$600,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 372—*Section 110*: Excepts certain corporations from the general provisions of Title I, Chapter VIII, as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Amendment No. 373—*Public Housing Administration*: Reported in disagreement.

ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT GORE,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANCIS CASE
(except as to amendment 363),
JOHN PHILLIPS
(except as to amendment 363),
JOHN TABER
(except as to amendment 363),
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER IX.—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter IX of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 384 and 395.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 382, 385, 386, 389, 391, 392, 394, 396, and 397, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 379:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 379, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,525,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 380:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 380, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: *(for replacement only) in the current fiscal year of three hundred and fifty passenger motor vehicles and one motorboat (to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable) and the purchase (not to exceed one, to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable), maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment numbered 381:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 381, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following: *: Provided further, That the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control shall be available for payments to school districts as authorized by law; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment numbered 383:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 383, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$198,811,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 387:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 387, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$383,408,250; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 390:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 390, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$66,422,400; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 393:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 393, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$432,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 388 and 398.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
ALBERT GORE,
E. H. HEDRICK,
W. F. NORRELL,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
KARL STEFAN,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ELMER THOMAS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
CHAN GURNEY,
GUY CORDON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter IX of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Amendment No. 374—*Cemeterial Expenses*: Appropriates \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 375—*Entombment of an Unknown American Serviceman, World War II*: Deletes provision of the House providing funds incident to the selection and burial of an unknown American serviceman of World War II, as proposed by the Senate.

SIGNAL CORPS

Amendment No. 376—*Alaska Communication System*: Appropriates \$2,877,920 for construction in Alaska as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 377—*Alaska Communication System*: Deletes provision of the House limiting to \$28,000 construction costs per housing unit and substitutes provision establishing an average cost of \$24,000 per unit, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 378—*Alaska Communication System*: Enlarges provision of the House pertaining to inclusion of equipment in housing units, as proposed by the Senate.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Amendment No. 379—*Administrative Expense Limitation*: Authorizes a limitation of \$1,525,000 instead of \$1,450,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 380—*Administrative Provisions*: Provides for the purchase of 350 passenger motor vehicles, one motor boat and one airplane instead of only 350 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the House and 500 passenger motor vehicles, two motor boats and one airplane as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 381—*Administrative Provisions*: Provides for payments to school districts.

Amendment No. 382—*Rivers and Harbors*: Provides authority for investigations and for plans and specifications for authorized projects, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 383—*Rivers and Harbors*: Appropriates \$198,811,500, instead of \$185,878,000 as proposed by the House and \$221,244,500 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed upon is 10 percent below the amount approved by the Senate. The Senate had approved \$1,800,000 for planning and \$2,585,000 for examinations and surveys, which amounts are included in the lump sum appropriation for rivers and harbors. Since the appropriation has been reduced 10 percent below the Senate figure, the amounts for planning and examinations and surveys are likewise reduced by the amount of 10 percent below the amounts approved by the Senate.

Amendment No. 384—*Old River, Cleveland, Ohio*: Deletes provision of the Senate providing \$75,000 for dredging.

Amendment No. 385—*Alteration of Bridges over Navigable Waters*: Appropriates \$900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 386—*Flood Control*: Corrects language.

Amendment No. 387—*Flood Control*: Appropriates \$383,408,250, instead of \$341,055,000 as proposed by the House and \$436,933,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed upon is 12 percent below the amount approved by the Senate. The Senate had approved \$3,565,000 for planning and \$6,500,000 for preliminary examinations, surveys and contingencies which amounts are included in the lump sum appropriation for flood control. Since the appropriation has been reduced 12 percent below the Senate figure the amounts for planning, preliminary examinations, surveys and contingencies are likewise reduced by the amount of 12 percent below the amounts approved by the Senate.

With respect to Amendments Nos. 383, 387, 390 and 393, the conferees are agreed that obligation and expenditure of funds shall be made under the criteria set forth in the letter of the President and the Corps of Engineers, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 21, 1950.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In my message of July 19 to the Congress, I announced that I was directing the executive agencies—

"* * * to conduct a detailed review of Government programs, for the purpose of modifying them wherever practicable to lessen the demand upon services, commodities, raw materials, manpower, and facilities which are in competition with those needed for national defense. The Government, as well as the public, must exercise great restraint in the use of those goods and services which are needed for our increased defense efforts."

In order to adjust the programs of the Federal Government, I am writing to you and the heads of the other agencies whose programs involve substantial use of materials and other resources needed for the defense effort. Please reexamine your programs, giving particular attention, to the extent applicable, to the following:

(1) All civil public works, both direct Federal programs and grant-in-aid programs, should be screened with the objective, as far as practical, of deferring, curtailing, or slowing down those projects which do not directly contribute to defense or to civilian requirements essential in the changed international situation set forth in my message.

(2) Consistent with the restrictive policy already in force for housing credit, other credit programs should be tightened. The only exceptions should be those which directly contribute to meeting our defense and international responsibilities.

(3) Procurement of supplies and equipment should be held to minimum amounts, especially purchases of motor vehicles, typewriters, and other

equipment using critical materials. Inventories should be reduced to the lowest practical levels, and excess supplies and equipment should be made available immediately to the General Services Administration.

In addition, I shall expect that in the reexamination of the programs of your agency you will give first priority to those activities which contribute directly to national defense, including requests of other agencies for assistance.

I am asking the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to work closely with you in this review and to report to me on the steps which you have taken in revising your program to meet these objectives.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

TENTATIVE CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER OF JULY 21, 1950

The civil-works program of the Corps of Engineers will be reviewed to insure that no new projects are initiated unless they make an important contribution to the war effort and that only those projects now under construction which meet one or more of the following specific criteria will be continued during the period of partial mobilization.

SPECIFIC CRITERIA

1. The project includes the development of power.
2. The project provides industrial or municipal water supply in critical areas.
3. The project is a dam and reservoir project where closure is under way or has been effected and should be completed to a point of useful operation.
4. The project is an important harbor or waterway.
5. The project protects important industries or major food-producing areas.
6. The project can be completed in the 1951 working season, and where termination costs would constitute an appreciable economic loss, the work in place would be damaged if not protected and if relatively small amounts of additional work will make the project fully effective.
7. The project involves almost entirely the movement of earth such as channel improvements or levees and does not compete in the use of critical materials.
8. Maintenance of completed projects, advance planning of selected authorized projects and the survey program should be continued.

With respect to those projects that meet the above criteria for continuation of construction, each individual feature of the project will be examined to determine whether it can be deferred without detriment to the major purpose of the project or to the work in place.

The conferees are further agreed that no construction or planning of any new project appropriated for in this chapter shall be started unless certified by the President as necessary to the war effort and amounts allowed for construction herein shall be available for reallocation to any project appropriated for in this chapter as the Corps of Engineers find necessary to meet the exigencies of the war effort and to maintain economical construction schedules.

Amendment No. 388—*Mandan, North Dakota, and James River*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 389—*Flood Control General (Emergency Fund)*: Appropriates \$2,700,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 390—*Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries*: Appropriates \$66,422,400, instead of \$65,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$66,778,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 391—*Emergency Fund for Flood Control on Tributaries of the Mississippi River*: Appropriates \$450,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 392—*Flood Control, Sacramento River, California*: Appropriates \$2,524,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 393—*Flood Control, Roseville, Ohio*: Appropriates \$432,000, instead of \$540,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 394—*Miscellaneous Civil Works*: Appropriates \$16,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,000 as proposed by the House.

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

Amendment No. 395—*Maintenance and Operation*: Appropriates \$2,395,000 from the Soldiers' Home Trust Fund as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,363,240 as proposed by the Senate.

PANAMA CANAL

Amendment No. 396—*Maintenance and Operation*: Appropriates \$13,251,700 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$14,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 397—*Civil Government*: Appropriates \$3,849,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,925,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 398—*General Provisions*: Reported in disagreement.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
ALBERT GORE,
E. H. HEDRICK,
W. F. NORRELL,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
KARL STEFAN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER X.—DEFENSE

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 408, 409, 441, and 455.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 452, 453, 454, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, and 466, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 399, 417, 418, 451, 456, and 467.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
M. E. TYDINGS,
CHAN GURNEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Amendment No. 399—*Salaries and expenses*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 400—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Amendment No. 401—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$11,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,000,000 as proposed by the House. While the House recedes as to the amount, which is \$100,000 below the budget estimates, the Senate agrees to the position of the House as stated in House Report No. 1797, 81st Congress providing no funds for the President's Committee on Religion and Welfare in the Armed Forces.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Amendment No. 402—*Contingencies of the Army*: Appropriates \$51,878,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$51,978,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL STAFF CORPS

Amendment No. 403—*Field Exercises*: Appropriates \$5,350,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 404—*Pay of the Army*: Appropriates \$1,447,660,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,448,660,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 405—*Travel of the Army*: Appropriates \$76,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$75,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 406—*Finance Service*: Appropriates \$29,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$28,410,000 as proposed by the House.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Amendment No. 407—*Welfare of enlisted men*: Appropriates \$8,362,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 408—*Subsistence of the Army*: Strikes out the phrase "without unduly increasing future United States market prices" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 409—*Subsistence of the Army*: Strikes out the word "highly" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 410—*Regular supplies of the Army*: Appropriates \$107,247,258 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 411—*Clothing and equipage*: Appropriates \$93,853,365 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$90,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 412—*Incidental expenses of the Army*: Appropriates \$101,998,313 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$95,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TRANSPORTATION CORPS

Amendment No. 413—*Transportation Service, Army*: Appropriates \$289,960,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$290,000,000 as proposed by the House.

SIGNAL CORPS

Amendment No. 414—*Signal service of the Army*: Appropriates \$158,248,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$157,500,000 as proposed by the House.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 415—*Medical and hospital department*: Appropriates \$54,883,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$54,913,000 as proposed by the House.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Amendment No. 416—*Engineer service, Army*: Appropriates \$304,187,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$300,176,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 417—*Engineer service, Army*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 418—*Military construction, Army*: Reported in disagreement.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 419—*Ordnance service and supplies, Army*: Appropriates \$647,327,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$621,559,000 as proposed by the House.

CHEMICAL CORPS

Amendment No. 420—*Chemical service, Army*: Appropriates \$37,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$36,000,000 as proposed by the House.

ARMY TRAINING

Amendment No. 421—*Army training*: Appropriates \$7,830,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,930,000 as proposed by the House.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Amendment No. 422—*Maintenance and operation*: Appropriates \$5,120,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,200,000 as proposed by the House.

CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

Amendment No. 423—*Army National Guard*: Appropriates \$210,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$212,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 424—*Organized Reserves*: Appropriates, \$114,525,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$115,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 425—*Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps*: Appropriates \$24,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

DEPARTMENTAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 426—*Office of Secretary of the Army*: Appropriates \$3,368,271 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,265,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 427—*Office of Chief of Staff*: Appropriates \$6,576,239 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$6,354,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 428—*Adjutant General's Office*: Appropriates \$9,777,200 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$9,477,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 429—*Office of the Inspector General*: Appropriates \$203,880 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$197,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 430—*Office of the Judge Advocate General*: Appropriates \$595,375 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$577,100 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 431—*Office of the Chief of Finance*: Appropriates \$1,483,202 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,437,800 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 432—*Office of the Quartermaster General*: Appropriates \$6,981,504 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$6,767,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 433—*Office of the Chief of Transportation*: Appropriates \$2,940,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,850,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 434—*Office of the Chief Signal Officer*: Appropriates \$2,455,821 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,379,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 435—*Office of Chief of Special Services*: Appropriates \$58,636 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$56,800 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 436—*Office of the Provost Marshal General*: Appropriates \$116,038 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$112,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 437—*Office of the Surgeon General*: Appropriates \$2,475,873 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 438—*Office of Chief of Engineers*: Appropriates \$3,751,026 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,636,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 439—*Office of Chief of Ordnance*: Appropriates \$4,137,696 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,776,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 440—*Office of Chief, Chemical Corps*: Appropriates \$817,707 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$792,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 441—*Office of Chief of Chaplains*: Appropriates \$131,100 as proposed by the House, instead of \$128,478 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 442—*Contingent expenses, Department of the Army*: Appropriates \$9,970,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$9,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Amendment No. 443—*Navy Personnel, General expenses*: Appropriates \$60,533,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$60,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 444—*Military Personnel, Marine Corps*: Appropriates \$200,923,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$200,301,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 445—*Marine Corps Troops and Facilities*: Appropriates \$82,354,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$80,699,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 446—*Aircraft and facilities*: Appropriates \$532,226,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$536,226,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 447—*Ships and facilities*: Appropriates \$411,782,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$415,282,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 448—*Ordnance and facilities*: Appropriates \$181,665,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$177,088,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 449—*Medical Care*: Appropriates \$37,862,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$38,212,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 450—*Civil Engineering*: Appropriates \$34,778,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$35,178,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 451—*Public Works*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 452—*Research*: Appropriates \$43,083,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$43,383,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 453—*Service-wide supply and finance*: Appropriates \$209,292,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$200,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 454—*Service-wide operations*: Appropriates \$99,281,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$94,261,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 455—*Island Governments*: Appropriates \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,785,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Amendment No. 456—*Acquisition and construction of real property*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 457—*Maintenance and operation*: Appropriates \$1,027,662,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,010,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 458—*Air National Guard*: Adds words "or State-owned" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 459—*Air National Guard*: Strikes out words "State or" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 460—*Air National Guard*: Strikes out word "thereof" and adds words "of a State" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 461—*Salaries and expenses, administration*: Appropriates \$58,545,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$55,620,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 462: Strikes out Section 626 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 463: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 464: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 465: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 466: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 467: Reported in disagreement.

GEORGE H. MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER X-A.—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X-A of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 468, and agree to the same.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. McGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT McCARRAN,
STYLES BRIDGES (except
amendment 508),
CHAN GURNEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X-A of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 468: Strikes out provision, proposed by the House to reduce appropriations by \$600,000,000, in view of action on amendment No. 508.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. McGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER X-B.—FOREIGN AID

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X-B of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 479.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 470, 484, 487, and 489, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 469:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 469, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

CHAPTER X-A—FOREIGN AID

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 480, 481, 482, 483, 485, 486, and 488.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOE B. BATES,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X-B of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

FOREIGN AID

Amendment No. 469—*Foreign Aid*: Corrects title of chapter.

Amendment No. 470—*Funds Appropriated to the President*: Inserts title.

Amendments Nos. 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, and 477—*Economic Cooperation*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 478—*Assistance to the Republic of Korea*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 479—*International Children's Welfare Work*: Deletes provision of the Senate appropriating \$12,500,000.

Amendments Nos. 480, 481, 482, and 483—*International Development*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 484—*Mutual Defense Assistance*: Appropriates \$1,678,023,729 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 485 and 486—*Government and Relief in Occupied Areas*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 487—*Department of State*: Inserts title.

Amendment No. 488—*Government in Occupied Areas of Germany*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 489—*Aid to Palestine Refugees*: Appropriates \$27,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOE B. BATES,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER XI.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter XI of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 491, 492, 494, and 509.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 490, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, and 510, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 493:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 493, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: *Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with the initiation, operation, and administration of agricultural price support programs and no funds (other than funds for administrative expenses) available for price support, surplus removal, and available under Section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), with respect to agricultural commodities shall be subject to apportionment pursuant to this section.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 508:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 508, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

SEC. 1114. Appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations and reauthorizations made by this Act for departments and agencies in the executive branch of the government shall, without impairing national

defense, be reduced in the amount of not less than \$550,000,000 through the apportionment procedure provided for in Section 1111 of this Act.

And the Senate agree to the same.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. McGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT McCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES (except
amendment 508),
CHAN GURNEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter XI of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

SECTION 1111

Amendment No. 490: Adds clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 491 and 492: Reinstate language of the House relating to reserves to be established in apportionment of funds.

Amendment No. 493: Provides that funds available for price support programs and available under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act shall not be subject to apportionment.

Amendment No. 494: Strikes out a proposal of the Senate to exempt appropriations for transportation of mail from apportionment.

Amendments Nos. 495 and 496: Add clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 497: Exempts funds under Titles I, IV, and X of the Social Security Act from apportionment.

Amendments Nos. 498 and 499: Exempt funds of the House, Senate, and Architect of the Capitol from apportionment.

Amendments Nos. 500, 501, 502, and 503: Add clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

SECTION 1112

Amendments Nos. 504, 505, 506, and 507: Limit the annual leave provision to civilian employees, extend the limiting date to June 30, 1951, includes the District of Columbia government within the provision and exempts personnel inducted into military service, all as proposed by the Senate.

SECTION 1114

Amendment No. 508: Provides for reduction of \$550,000,000 in appropriations and authorizations carried in the bill.

SECTION 1115

Amendment No. 509: Strikes out a provision proposed by the Senate to limit the price paid for typewriters in view of the fact a similar provision had been included in Chapter VIII of the bill.

SECTION 1116

Amendment No. 510: Prohibits, as proposed by the Senate, payment of retired military personnel who engaged in selling supplies to the Government.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. McGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

○

BILLS INTRODUCED

18. HOUSING LOANS. S. 4091, by Sen. Maybank, to strengthen the national defense by affording further relief to persons in the military service of the U. S. through the suspension of the enforcement of civilian liabilities or obligations secured by home mortgages or by similar security arising out of the ownership of certain residential real property; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 13441). Sen. Maybank inserted a statement explaining the bill (pp. 13441-2).
19. COFFEE. H. R. 9520, by Rep. Burnside, W. Va., to aid in the promotion and development of coffee production throughout the world; to Foreign Affairs Committee (p. 13592).
H. R. 9528, by Rep. Angell, Oreg., relating to the prevention of unreasonable and unconscionable speculation and profiteering in coffee, and relating to the stabilization of the price of coffee to consumers at a reasonable level; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 13592).
20. FOREIGN TRADE. H. R. 9521, to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 13592).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

21. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Noland, Ind., inserted Secretary Brannan's recent Carlisle, Ind., speech, "Farmers in a Changing World", discussing the progress of agriculture and the benefits of farm credit, price-support, and production-adjustment programs (pp. A6390-2).
22. SURPLUS FOODS. Rep. Fulton, Pa., inserted a New York Times article urging distribution of surplus commodities to needy persons of foreign countries (p. A6371).
Extension of remarks of Rep. Gwinn, N. Y., criticized the disposition of surplus CCC commodities at a loss to the Government while the Army buys foods on the open market (p. A6402).
23. FOREST ROADS. Sen. Morse inserted an International Woodworker editorial urging the building of access roads to forest timber (p. A6387).
24. TAXATION. Rep. Flood, Pa., inserted a Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer article favoring an excess-profits tax, to provide equity in economic controls, in defense measures, and in tax laws (pp. A6387-8).
25. EXPENDITURES. Rep. Rich, Pa., inserted a News Bulletin article criticizing Government expenditures (pp. A6400-1).
26. EMERGENCY POWERS. Rep. LeFevre, N. Y., inserted a New York Herald Tribune editorial favoring economic controls (pp. A6393-4).
27. COMMODITY EXCHANGES. Sen. Gillette inserted newspaper articles discussing speculation in the synthetic and natural rubber markets (pp. A6380, A6383-4).

oOo

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS for Aug. 25: Contract renegotiation, H. Ways and Means (Cooper, Sol. Off., and Seniors, CCC, to testify) (ex.); Conferences on defense production and Federal-Aid Road bills (ex.); H. Public Lands, H. R. 5506, Palisades Dam and reservoir project, Idaho; and S. Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, freight absorption and pricing practices.

Conference Report -- Agricultural Appropriations for 1951
(Reported August 24, 1950)
Funds and Principal Language Changes

Amend- ment No.	Item	Increases and Decreases	
		Senate Compared with House	Conference Report Compared with House Bill
	RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946:		
157 & 166	House consolidated funds for sections 10a and 10b of the Act with regular appropriations for the research agencies which have been performing the work by allotment from the RMA appropriation. Senate concurred and also transferred the appropriation for Section 9, Title I, to the Office of Experiment Stations. Conferees report amendments in disagreement	-\$5,000,000:	*
	BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS:		
158	Economic investigations: House committee report earmarked \$15,000 for economic research on farm housing and farm construction. Senate disapproved such earmarking and deleted the words "farm structures" from the language. Conferees agree with views of the Senate	Senate struck	House recedes
159	Partial restoration of House cut below 1950 level: of operations	+30,000:	Senate recedes
	Provision for State estimates on farm production expenditures and net farm income	+90,000:	Senate recedes
	Crop and livestock estimates:		
160	Language authorizing collection of data on farm construction as provided by title V of the Housing Act of 1949	Senate struck	House recedes
161	Restoration of House cut below 1950 level of operations	+179,000:	+\$179,000
	AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION:		
	OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR:		
162	Language revised by deleting "Advisory Committee" and inserting "advisory committees"	Senate inserted	House agrees
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER:		
163	Senate deleted language and funds establishing a non-expendable working capital fund. Conferees agree with views of the House	-300,000:	Senate recedes
164	RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA	+20,000:	+20,000

* Reported in disagreement.

Amend- ment No.	Item	Increases and Decreases	
		Senate Compared with House	Conference Report Compared with House Bill
	OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS:		
	Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico:		
165	Senate inserted the words "where applicable" pertaining to payments made to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico	Senate inserted	House recedes
166	Senate inserted language transferring section 9 funds in the amount of \$5,000,000 from the RMA appropriation. (See amendment No. 157)	+5,000,000:	*
167 & 168	Alaska Station Act of June 20, 1936	+10,000:	+10,000
	Salaries and expenses:		
169	Senate corrected date of Department of Agriculture Organic Act which was erroneously shown in House Bill	Senate inserted	House agrees
170	Administration of grants and coordination of research with States	+15,000:	Senate recedes
	BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS:		
171	Restoration of House cut below the 1950 level of operations	+263,200:	Senate recedes
	BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY:		
172	Animal husbandry:		
	Research on light horse breeding at the U. S. Morgan Horse Farm, Middlebury, Vermont. Conferee report states that it is agreed unanimously by the conferees of both houses that the Morgan Horse Farm must be disposed of by the end of the fiscal year 1951	+19,000:	+19,000
	Partial restoration of House cut for repairs, reconditioning, and replacement of research facilities and equipment	+50,000:	+25,000
173	Diseases of animals:		
	Partial restoration of House cut for repairs, reconditioning, and replacement of research facilities and equipment	+50,000:	+25,000
174	Animal disease control and eradication:		
	Public stockyards inspection service at Seattle, Washington	+2,500:	Senate recedes
175	Language authorizing not to exceed \$30,000 (Budget estimate \$40,000) for the acquisition of land and construction of four buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry. Conferees report amendment in disagreement	Senate struck	*

* Reported in disagreement.

Amend- ment No.	Item	Increases and Decreases	
		Senate Compared with House	Conference Report Compared with House Bill
	BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY:		
176 & 177	House deleted funds and language authorizing not to exceed \$100,000 for construction of ten or more housing units for employees, and \$25,000 for alterations to the physiological laboratory at the Agricultural Research Center. Senate restored that part of the language authorizing the construction of ten or more housing units for employees. <u>Conferees</u> agreed to delete Senate language authorizing construction of the housing units for employees	+100,000:	Senate recedes
	Partial restoration of House cut for repairs and reconditioning of physical facilities at field stations	+35,000:	+17,500
	BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY:		
178	Cortisone research (House provided \$140,000 as a transfer from Public Health Service). <u>Conferees</u> agree with views of the House to provide funds by transfer from the Public Health Service	+140,000:	Senate recedes
	Partial restoration of House cut below 1950 level of operations	+610,000:	+210,000
	BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING:		
179	Field crops: Research on American-Egyptian extra-long staple cotton and development of new hybrid cottons of the American upland type	+40,000:	+30,000
	Partial restoration of House cut for repairs and reconditioning of physical facilities at field stations	+35,000:	+7,500
180	Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: Cortisone research (House provided \$60,000 as a transfer from Public Health Service). <u>Conferees</u> agree with views of the House to provide funds by transfer from the Public Health Service	+60,000:	Senate recedes
	Research on gladiolus and for partial restoration of House cut for repairs and reconditioning of physical facilities at field stations ..	+65,000:	+62,500
181	Forest diseases: Partial restoration of House cut for repairs and reconditioning of physical facilities at field stations	+5,000:	+2,500

Amend- ment No.	Item	Increases and Decreases	
		Senate Compared with House	Conference Report Compared with House Bill
	BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING: Cont.		
182	Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: Partial restoration of House cut: For repairs and reconditioning of physical facilities at field stations and to accel- erate the preparation of soil maps	+87,500:	+43,750
183	Agricultural engineering: Partial restoration of House cut for farm elec- trification research	+20,000:	+10,000
	BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE:		
184	Insect investigations: Partial restoration of House cut: To strengthen research program at selected lo- cations and for investigations of new chemicals: and methods for protecting man and animals against injurious insect pests	+65,000:	+57,500
185	House inserted language requiring the transfer of \$50,000 to Public Health Service. Senate deleted language. <u>Conferees</u> agreed to restore House language	Senate struck	Senate recedes
186	Insect and plant disease control: Restoration of House cut below 1950 level of operations, excluding pay adjustment costs	+465,100:	+264,100
187	Foreign plant quarantines: Restoration of House cut below 1950 level of operations	+59,400:	+29,700
	Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases:		
188	Partial restoration of contingency fund deleted by House. <u>Conferee</u> report states that the additional contingency funds are to be re- leased only after both committees have approv- ed final plans for their use	+1,500,000:	+1,250,000
189	House deleted language pertaining to establish- ment of a contingency fund. Senate restored language revised to make contingency fund available for fiscal year 1951 only instead of until December 31, 1951, and to eliminate ref- erence to the purchase of airplanes. <u>Conferees</u> report amendment in disagreement	Senate restored	*
	CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS:		
190	Gypsy and brown-tail moths: Restoration of House cut below 1950 level of operations	+50,500:	+20,500

* Reported in disagreement.

Amend- ment No.	Item	Increases and Decreases	
		Senate Compared with House	Conference Report Compared with House Bill
	CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS: Cont.		
	Forest Pest Control Act:		
191	Partial restoration of contingency fund deleted by the House. <u>Conferee</u> report states that the additional contingency funds are included to eliminate as far as possible future deficiencies:	+1,000,000:	+750,000
192	<u>House</u> deleted language pertaining to establishment of a contingency fund. <u>Senate</u> restored language revised to make contingency fund available for fiscal year 1951 only instead of until December 31, 1951, and to eliminate reference to the purchase of airplanes. <u>Conferees</u> report amendment in disagreement	Senate restored	*
193	White pine blister rust:		
	Restoration of House cut below 1950 level of operations	+420,000:	+210,000
194	Control operations by Department of Interior ...	+56,600:)	
195	Control operations by Forest Service	+219,350:)	
196	Leadership, general coordination of program, and cooperative control operations by Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine	+144,050:)	+210,000
	<u>Conferee</u> report states that amounts to be transferred to the three agencies which carry out this program are to be adjusted within revised total.		
	FOREST SERVICE:		
	Salaries and expenses:		
197	National forest protection and management:		
	<u>Senate</u> partially restored House cut to provide \$250,013 for pay adjustment costs and \$2,180,487 for management and development activities on the national forests	+2,430,500:	+210,000
198	Cooperative range improvements:		
	<u>Senate</u> inserted a new item appropriating receipts for the construction and maintenance of range improvements (Budget Amendment submitted after Bill was passed by House). <u>Conferees</u> report amendment in disagreement	+750,000:	*
199	Forest and range management investigations:		
	Additional research at the Bartlett Experimental Forest in New Hampshire	+35,000:	+35,000
200	<u>Senate</u> inserted language providing that \$55,000 shall be available for investigations and experiments at the Bartlett Experimental Forest. <u>Conferees</u> report amendment in disagreement ...	Senate inserted	*

* Reported in disagreement.

Amend- ment No.	Item	Increases and Decreases	
		Senate Compared with House	Conference Report Compared with House Bill
	FOREST SERVICE: Cont.		
	Salaries and expenses: Cont.		
	Forest products:		
201	Senate inserted language providing for the es- tablishment of a forest utilization unit in the Southwest. <u>Conferees</u> report amendment in disagreement	Senate inserted	*
	Forest resources investigations:		Senate
202	To continue present rate of forest surveys	+120,000	recedes
203	Forest development roads and trails	+1,652,000	Senate recedes
204	Acquisition of lands for national forests (Weeks Act):		
	For restoration of acquisition program to 1950 level of operations. <u>Conferee</u> report states that conferees of both Houses agree that none of these funds shall be used to purchase lands unless they are located entirely within nation- al forest boundaries	+301,000	+200,000
	Farm and other private forestry cooperation:		
	Senate changed amounts of limitations for the purpose of making limitations in the Bill con- sistent with the program amounts approved by the House.		
	<u>Revised Amounts</u>		
205	Cooperative Farm Forestry Act (Norris-Doxey) \$785,034		House agrees
206	Clark-McNary Act: Section 4 449,200		House agrees
207	Section 5 65,766		House agrees
	FLOOD CONTROL:		
208	Senate reduction to defer installation of works of improvement. <u>Conferee</u> report states that within the funds available, special attention shall be given to the areas where work has been delayed .	-870,000	-435,000
209	Senate inserted language authorizing not to exceed: \$7,880,000 of the amount made available by the Bill for gully control, floodwater detention and floodwater structures authorized by Section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944. <u>Conferees</u> report amendment in disagreement	Senate inserted	*

* Reported in disagreement.

Amend- ment No.	Item	Increases and Decreases	
		Senate Compared with House	Conference Report Compared with House Bill
	SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE:		
210	House inserted the centerheading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES"	Senate struck	House recedes
	Soil conservation operations:		
211	Reduction in amount allowed by House for assistance to new soil conservation districts estimated to be organized in 1951	-500,000:	-500,000
	LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND:		
212	For construction on San Simon Valley project ...	+75,175:	+75,175
	For improvement of undeveloped project lands ...	+100,000:	Senate recedes
213	WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS	+100,000:	+100,000
	PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION:		
	CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES:		
214	Conservation payments to farmers	+500,000:	Senate recedes
215	Senate deleted language permitting payments to the Soil Conservation Service for technical services, of not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the Agricultural Conservation Program for any county. <u>Conferees</u> report amendment in disagreement	Senate struck	*
	SUGAR ACT:		
216	Conditional payments to sugar growers on the 1950 sugar crop	+3,750,000:	+3,750,000
	MARKETING SERVICES:		
217	Market news service:		
	For establishing market news on naval stores ..	+12,000:	+12,000
	To implement the first year of a program for development of market news and reporting services in the critical marketing areas	+125,000:	+56,500
	Marketing regulatory acts:		
218	Senate reduction to eliminate increase to carry out the second year of the three-year program to post and supervise all eligible stockyards.	-55,000:	-55,000
	FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION:		
219	Partial restoration of House cut to provide for adequate servicing of insurance contracts and for loss adjustment work	+350,000:	+350,000

* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No.	Item	Increases and Decreases	
		Senate Compared with House	Conference Report Compared with House Bill
	RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION:		
220	Salaries and expenses (Rural telephone program)	+600,000:	+400,000
221	Loan authorization (Rural telephone program)	+15,000,000:	+7,500,000
	FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION:		
	Loan authorizations:		
222	Farm housing loans	+15,000,000:	+8,650,000
223	Senate inserted language authorizing distribution: of \$3,500,000 farm ownership loans without re- gard to farm population and prevalence of ten- ancy. <u>Conferees</u> report amendment in disagree- ment	Senate inserted	*
224	House eliminated language on a point of order authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to make loans under public-debt transaction auth- orities. <u>Senate</u> restored language. <u>Conferees</u> report amendment in disagreement	Senate restored	*
225	Salaries and expenses: Partial restoration to provide for increased activities contemplated under the farm housing loan program	+1,300,000:	+800,000
	EXTENSION SERVICE:		
	Payments to States:		
226	Senate restored Budget language and House cut for: the further development of cooperative extension: work in Alaska. <u>Conferees</u> agree with views of the Senate	+32,150:	+32,150
227	Senate inserted language and partially restored House cut for the further development of exten- sion programs in Puerto Rico. <u>Conferees</u> agree with views of the Senate	+71,348:	+71,348
228	Total for payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico	+103,498:	+103,498
229	Salaries and expenses	+15,000:	Senate recedes
230	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY: Senate increase provided \$30,000 for pay adjust- ment costs in the Secretary's immediate office, and \$6,000 to meet increased workload in the Office of Hearings Examiners	+36,000:	+18,000
	OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR:		
231	Partial restoration of House cut for increased activities contemplated in the farm housing and rural telephone programs (see Nos. 221 and 222) ..	+225,000:	+112,500

* Reported in disagreement.

Amend- ment No.	Item	Increases and Decreases	
		Senate Compared with House	Conference Report Compared with House Bill
	OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR: Cont.		
232	House deleted language on point of order providing: for certain transfers to this appropriation not to exceed \$212,700. Senate inserted revised language with limitation of \$207,000 on total amount of transfers to this appropriation. Conferees report amendment in disagreement	Senate inserted	*
	OFFICE OF INFORMATION:		
233	Senate inserted language to restrict exhibits and motion picture work to programs authorized by Congress	Senate inserted	House agrees
234	House deleted language on point of order author- izing transfer of agency funds to the Office of Information to prepare and distribute exhibits and motion pictures. Senate restored language with amendments to restrict informational activi- ties to programs authorized by Congress. Con- ferees report amendment in disagreement	Senate restored	*
235	House inserted provision relating to limitation on: travel expenses. Senate struck and substituted revised language under Title IV (See No. 238) ..	Senate struck	House recedes
	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION:		
236	Administrative expense limitation	+350,000:	+350,000
237	Senate reduced the amount required by CCC for restoration of capital impairment from \$170,515,131 to \$66,698,457 in conformance with appraisal committee report (S. Doc. 161, 81st Congress)	Senate revised	House agrees
	GENERAL PROVISIONS (TITLE IV):		
238	Senate inserted language providing for depositing \$791,888 of the funds appropriated for travel into the surplus fund of the Treasury. (See No. 235). Conferees report amendment in disagreement:	Senate inserted	*
	CHAPTER XI-GENERAL PROVISIONS:		
493	House inserted language exempting price support funds from apportionment. Senate revised lang- uage to also exempt from apportionment funds for surplus removal and related operations with respect to agricultural commodities.		

* Reported in disagreement.

Amend- ment No.	Item	Increases and Decreases	
		Senate Compared with House	Conference Report Compared with House Bill
	CHAPTER XI-GENERAL PROVISIONS: Cont.		
493	<u>Conferees</u> agreed on revised language, as follows:		
	"Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with the initiation, operation, and administration of agricultural price support programs and no funds (other than funds for administrative expenses) available for price support, surplus removal, and available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 612 (c)), with respect to agricultural commodities shall be subject to apportionment pursuant to this section.";	Senate inserted	
508	In lieu of Chapter X-A (Taber-Thomas amendment) and the Byrd-Bridges amendment, the <u>Conferees</u> have agreed to the following amendment:		
	"Sec. 1114. Appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations and reauthorizations made by this Act for departments and agencies in the executive branch of the government shall, without impairing national defense, be reduced in the amount of not less than \$550,000,000 through the apportionment procedure provided for in Section 1111 of this Act.";		

In addition to the changes by the conferees relating to Agriculture, the following are among the changes made by the conferees in other chapters: Provides (\$605,000,000 (Senate figure; House, \$633,608,240) for stockpiling of strategic and critical materials, and provides contract authorizations of \$125,000,000 (Senate figure; House, \$100,000,000). In connection with this item, the conference report states: "The conferees wish to go on record as being in accord with the so-called 'buy-American policy' which was enacted in 1933. The conferees are of the opinion that this policy should continue in full force, and that every assistance should be extended by the Government to the development of our domestic sources of raw materials."

Regarding the flood-control and rivers-and-harbors appropriations, the report states: "The conferees are further agreed that no construction or planning of any new project appropriated for in this chapter shall be started unless certified by the President as necessary to the war effort and amounts allowed for construction herein shall be available for reallocation to any project appropriated for in this chapter as the Corps of Engineers find necessary to meet the exigencies of the war effort and to maintain economical construction schedules."

The items for ECA and the point-4 program were reported in disagreement.

The provision inserted by the Senate establishing a formula for determining the price that may be paid in the purchase of typewriters by the Government was deleted.

1-31-57

Dear Mr. [Name obscured]

I have your letter of [Date obscured] regarding [Subject obscured]

I am sorry that I cannot give you a more definite answer at this time.

Sincerely,
[Signature obscured]

I am sure that you will understand my position.

Very truly yours,
[Signature obscured]

defense legislation, and the matter of safety may be worked out, as was indicated by one of the previous speakers by moving some of the military planes out of Bolling Field and the Naval Air Station, and when we realize also that when it comes to defending the Capital, it will not be the long-range bombers that will be used for defense, but the defense fighters and interceptor planes, and when we realize the fact that the defense fighters and interceptor planes can go to and from a continental type of airfield without difficulty, you realize why it is well to settle that question by the adoption of this amendment.

At this hour when Members are constantly coming into the well of the House and saying they are going to defer non-essential and nondefense items, we can, by adopting my amendment, meet the arguments that have been advanced in that respect.

We can save a vast amount of money because the amount of land necessary to purchase the width of the runways and the length of the runways is vastly different between the international type and the continental type of airfield.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] briefly.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman answered the question I was going to ask him as to the difference of cost between the two types of construction.

Mr. SASSCER. It would make a vast difference.

Mr. FALLON. I had one further observation, if the gentleman will permit, with regard to the time element of traveling between the Friendship Airport and the city of Washington. I think the gentleman from Texas had in mind the old road rather than the new road, for when the new highway is constructed it will greatly facilitate travel.

Mr. SASSCER. And in that same connection I call attention to the afternoon traffic going across the bridges into Virginia. If to accommodate my friend from Virginia you locate the airport beyond the metropolitan area think of the difficulty to be encountered in bucking the traffic across the bridges into Washington.

I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand the gentleman to tell us that the amendment would restrict the type and class of airport that the CAA could construct to take care of the additional traffic into the metropolitan Washington area?

Mr. SASSCER. That is in substance correct. It would authorize the building of a continental type airport rather than international airport.

Mr. HARRIS. Would the gentleman explain the difference between the continental type and the international type?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. I can cover the subject in one minute without taking three. As I understand, the continental type airport is the type of field adequate for traffic between various cities within the continental limits of the United States. The international type of airport such as the one in Baltimore with its long runways is geared to international traffic.

I think there is probably little justification for the international type airport here. I can readily see in a flight from New York or Pittsburgh to Washington a person might not want to lose the five or ten-minute differential between an airport in this area and the one at Friendship; but a person coming from London, Paris, Singapore, or some great distance would find that the added ten minutes would make relatively no difference.

Mr. HARRIS. Could the gentleman tell the committee what the length of the runways in the airport at Friendship is?

Mr. SASSCER. Yes; it think they are a little under 10,000 feet.

Mr. HARRIS. About 9,000 feet, I understand.

Mr. SASSCER. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. And the runways here at Washington and in New York are something like seven thousand feet.

Mr. SASSCER. I think that is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that the international airport takes care of the same size and type of traffic that flies in from San Francisco, or continental flights in here coming from London and other places overseas?

Mr. SASSCER. As I understand, the national airport is sort of betwixt and between, that it is probably more adequate for intercity flying, but a little less than good for continental flying.

Mr. HARRIS. But it is a fact that flights from across the water come into the Washington National Airport almost daily. Is not that right?

Mr. SASSCER. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. It would be necessary for a municipal airport which might be constructed within the area of Friendship Airport to take care of traffic that might come in from overseas as well as traffic that might come from San Francisco.

Mr. SASSCER. I think that is about the limitation. This field is either necessary or not necessary. If it is restricted to international traffic then there is no justification for building a duplication of the international field at Friendship which can be reached in a few minutes longer. Personally I see no justification, with the National Airport adequate for continental flying, for building it. They can move out some of this military air traffic.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if we are really trying to solve the problem as far as air transportation is concerned as it relates to the District of Columbia area, I certainly feel the House would be making a great mistake to put a limiting amendment like this into the legislation.

What the gentleman from Maryland has said might be true today but certainly not true tomorrow or 2 years from now, or 3 years hence, or 5 years hence.

Our purpose is to undertake to give some degree of security to aviation in this area as it grows in the future. We all know that it is going to grow rapidly. In my opinion there would be certain conflicts that would occur and probably prove very costly. For example, a company such as American Airlines or TWA which operates both continental and international flights might want to have the headquarters division at a given city in order that it might more economically carry on its operation. It is possible that this kind of amendment would compel them to have a part of their maintenance building, equipment, and crews in one airport area and a part in another, and perhaps to maintain two sets of each. I think it is unworkable and in the long run would not enable Congress to meet this problem but will make it more complex. We do have one international airport at Baltimore. Who here can say that we may not in 3 or 5 years from now need two airports to take care of international transportation? No one at the present time is in position to say that 10 years hence we may not need in this area two airports to accommodate international transportation.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it not true also that this country does not now have in operation jet-transport planes, while Great Britain and Canada are making fast progress in that field? Would it not be rather unwise for us to put a limitation on the development of that kind of an airport when in all probability we will need long runways to accommodate jet transports?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Certainly, if you want to solve the problem the way to solve it is not to limit the bill as the amendment would do.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that in the development of various types of aircraft there is required longer runways? For instance, the B-36's and the C-97's require approximately 8,000- or 9,000-foot runways. Who knows but what it might become necessary to use these transport facilities, both at Friendship and any other airport developed around here? With the restrictive language you may very likely prohibit the construction of something that will be very badly needed.

Mr. BECKWORTH. It would be contrary to the very ill we seek to cure. One of the things that has been emphasized about the National Airport is that it has some 600 acres only, yet is not subject to being enlarged. Why do you want to enlarge it? In order to accommodate additional traffic and perhaps larger and faster planes. In order to have long runways to meet this problem it is con-

templated perhaps 4,000 acres of land where the site is to be located will be sought, certainly if not sought immediately, to have the kind of option that will assure that much acreage if needed. This sort of amendment would, in a sense, be contrary to the idea of seeking adequate land for the necessary enlargements from time to time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This new airport, I believe the gentleman said a while ago, is to be self-sustaining?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It is hoped it will be, but no one can guarantee that.

Mr. GROSS. What are we going to do with the present facilities at the National Airport?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It is contemplated they will be in full use all along.

Mr. GROSS. With a \$14,000,000 airport located close by?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It is certainly contemplated it will be needed and needed badly. It is needed now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would not be more advisable for the House today to vote on authorization of funds to provide bomb shelters here in the District of Columbia rather than to authorize funds for a commercial airport which may not be completed for some years?

Here is the reason I emphasize that: We are about to perpetrate a devastating job on civilian defense here in the District of Columbia if we approve tomorrow or next day the recommendations of the House Appropriations Committee in a bill reported out today carrying \$17,000,000 supplemental funds, all but \$1,000,000,000 of which are for national defense.

There is an item in that bill under the caption "Office of Civilian Defense for the District of Columbia." The District of Columbia Commissioners, with the backing of W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, charged with preparing national plans for civilian defense, asked for the meager sum of \$290,000. This request was cut to \$30,000—\$30,000 for the Office of Civilian Defense for the fiscal year 1951. This is the Nation's Capital. Oh, I wonder if it is realized how damaging such action, if approved by the House, will be in the various States in the Union, the 48 States now looking to our National Government for advice and counsel in this matter of civilian defense against atomic bombs and poison gas attack?

Think of it—\$30,000 for our Nation's Capital. It is most unfortunate, and I hope that the House tomorrow or the next day, acting on this bill, will see to it that the full amount is restored. It is most necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair [Mr. MURDOCK], Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 456) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, pursuant to House Resolution 821, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further study and investigation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further consideration of this bill be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CHOCTAW NATION OF INDIANS IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6209) to authorize the commutation of the annual appropriation for fulfilling various treaties with the Choctaw Nation of Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 3, after line 13, insert:

"Sec. 5. The approval of the commutation as provided in section 2 and the deposit to the credit of the Choctaw Nation of the amount specified in section 1 shall constitute a full and complete discharge of all rights, claims, and demands of any nature whatsoever, whether tangible or intangible and whether or not cognizable in law or in equity, against the United States arising out of any of the annuity provisions of the treaties referred to in section 1."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES MILITARY RESERVATION AT FORT SCHUYLER, N. Y.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 210) to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States Military Reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, after "direction", insert "together with such easements for highway or other purposes, over that portion of such reservation which is not herein authorized to be conveyed to the State of New York, as may be necessary for the proper use and enjoyment of the portion so conveyed and as may be determined by agreement between the Secretary of the Navy and the appropriate officials of the State of New York."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "or" and insert "and."

Page 2, line 16, strike out all after "education" down to and including "park" in line 18.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this has unanimous approval.

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; in accordance with the direction of the committee of which a quorum was present.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the general appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2991)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

CHAPTER I. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter I of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

JOE B. BATES,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
EARL WILSON,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
HOMER FERGUSON,
K. S. WHERRY,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter I of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Amendment No. 1—Federal contribution: Appropriates \$9,800,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$11,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in unanimous agreement that this reduction shall not establish a precedent for future annual appropriations, but is recommended for the fiscal year 1951 because of the emergency situation now facing the nation.

JOE B. BATES,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
EARL WILSON,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER II. LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter II of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for

other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 52.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 50, and 53, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 26, 28, 35, 39, 46, 47, 48, 49, and 51.

CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
STYLES BRIDGES,
GUY CORDON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter II of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH Senate

Amendments Nos. 2-34: Provide appropriations for the Senate, which were not included in the bill as passed by the House. Of such amendments, those numbered 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 26, and 28 would have been subject to points of order if considered originally in the House, and therefore are reported in disagreement. The conference report recommends that the House recede and concur with the remainder of such amendments.

Amendment No. 35—Inquiries and investigations: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 36-48: Provide for or pertain to appropriations for the Senate, which were not included in the bill as passed by the House. Of such amendments, those numbered 39, 46, 47, and 48 would have been subject to points of order if considered originally in the House, and therefore are reported in disagreement. The conference report recommends that the House recede and concur with the remainder of such amendments.

Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures

Amendment No. 49, providing funds for the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, would have been subject to a point of order if considered originally in the House, and therefore is reported in disagreement.

Architect of the Capitol

Amendment No. 50—Subway Transportation, Capitol and Senate Office Building: Appropriates \$2,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51—Senate Office Building: Reported in disagreement, inasmuch as

it would have been subject to a point of order if considered originally in the House.

Library of Congress

Amendment No. 52—Editing and Publishing the Index-Digest of Publications of the Temporary National Economic Committee: Strikes out the Senate proposal.

Amendment No. 53—Library buildings, salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$698,680 proposed by the Senate, instead of \$695,200 proposed by the House.

CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER III. DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND THE JUDICIARY

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter III of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 55, 60, 62, 63, 66, 73, 77, 79, 98, 102, 104, 105, 108, 110, 114, and 118.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 56, 58, 64, 67, 69, 70, 71, 74, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 87, 88, 90, 91, 96, 99, 100, 101, 103, 109, 111, 112, 113, 115, and 116, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$77,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$54,449,297"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$508,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$98,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$16,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$11,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$24,897,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$995,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 68, 72, 92, 94, and 107.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
CLIFF CLEVINGER,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter III of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Amendment No. 54—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$77,800,000, instead of \$77,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$78,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55—Representation Allowances: Appropriates \$675,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56—Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund: Provides no appropriation or language, as proposed by the Senate, instead of appropriating \$2,233,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 57—Buildings Fund: Appropriates \$6,500,000, instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58—Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service: Appropriates \$9,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$10,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 59—Contributions to International Organizations: Appropriates \$54,449,297, instead of \$55,178,297 as proposed by the House and \$53,753,067 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction in the House figure applies to "International Civil Aviation Organization".

Amendment No. 60—Missions to International Organizations: Appropriates \$1,600,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61—International Contingencies: Appropriates \$2,900,000, instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 62 and 63—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: Authorizes the purchase of 4 automobiles for replacement only as proposed by the House, instead of the purchase of 8 automobiles of which 6 were to be for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Construction: Appropriates \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,035,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 65—American Sections, International Commissions: Appropriates \$508,000, instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House and \$600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66—American Sections, International Commissions: Eliminates the Senate proposal to make \$92,000 available for the examination and survey of the Red River of the North and its tributaries.

Amendment No. 67—International Information and Educational Activities: Appropriates \$32,700,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$34,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 68—International Information and Educational Activities: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 69—International Information and Educational Activities: Authorizes the transfer of not to exceed \$2,875,000 to other appropriations of the Department of State as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 70—Philippine Rehabilitation: Appropriates \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$13,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 71—The Institute of Inter-American Affairs: Appropriates \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 72—The Institute of Inter-American Affairs: Reported in disagreement.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration

Amendment No. 73—Salaries and Expenses, General Administration: Appropriates \$2,175,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74—Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities: Appropriates \$7,475,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75—Salaries and Expenses, Antitrust Division: Appropriates \$3,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,850,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 76—Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals: Appropriates \$12,847,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 77—Fees and Expenses of Witnesses: Appropriates \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78—Salaries and Expenses, Claims of Persons of Japanese Ancestry: Appropriates \$1,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 79—Salaries and Expenses, Claims of Persons of Japanese Ancestry: Makes available not to exceed \$250,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the House, instead of \$300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal prison system

Amendment No. 80—Buildings and Facilities: Appropriates \$800,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 81—Buildings and Facilities: Provides \$170,000 cash for replacement of a power plant at the U. S. Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$270,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 82—Buildings and Facilities: Corrects total to conform with action on amendment No. 81 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of alien property

Amendment No. 83—Salaries and Expenses: Makes available \$4,150,000 for the general administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,240,000 as proposed by the House.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 84—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$1,350,000, instead of \$1,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of the Census

Amendment No. 85—Seventeenth decennial census: Appropriates \$28,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$29,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Civil Aeronautics Administration

Amendment No. 86—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$98,500,000, instead of \$97,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$99,775,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 87—Establishment of air navigation facilities: Appropriates \$27,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$32,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 88—Establishment of air navigation facilities: Provides \$22,000,000 of the amount contained in Amendment No. 87 for liquidation of prior contract authorizations as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$26,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 89—Establishment of air navigation facilities: Provides contract authority in an amount not to exceed \$16,000,000, instead of \$13,461,500 as proposed by the House and \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 90—Federal-aid airport program. Federal Airport Act: Appropriates \$37,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$45,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91—Federal-aid airport program. Federal Airport Act: Provides \$34,000,000 of the amount contained in Amendment No. 90 for liquidation of prior contract authority as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$42,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 92—Air navigation development: Reported in disagreement.

Civil Aeronautics Board

Amendment No. 93—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$3,500,000, instead of \$3,400,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 94—Salaries and Expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce

Amendment No. 95—Departmental Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$5,150,000, instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 96—Field Office Service: Appropriates \$2,155,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,050,000 as proposed by the House.

Patent Office

Amendment No. 97—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$11,500,000, instead of \$11,300,000 as proposed by the House, and \$11,530,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Public Roads

Amendment No. 98—General Administrative Expenses: Restores the House language which provides that not to exceed \$3,000,000 to be derived from the administrative funds shall be available for continuing the construction of a laboratory for testing and research work.

Amendment No. 99—Federal-aid postwar highways: Appropriates \$385,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$405,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 100—Federal-aid postwar highways: Corrects the amount to conform with action on Amendment No. 99 as proposed by the Senate.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 101: Provides a limitation of \$700,000 for improvements to buildings, grounds and other plant facilities as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$540,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 102—Operation and Administration: Appropriates \$1,270,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,430,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 103—Radio Propagation and Standards: Appropriates \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 104—Construction of Laboratories: Appropriates \$500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$268,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 105—Construction of Laboratories: Authorizes contract authority in an amount not to exceed \$5,675,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Weather Bureau

Amendment No. 106—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$24,897,000, instead of \$24,447,000 as proposed by the House and \$24,927,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 107—Salaries and Expenses: Reported in disagreement.

THE JUDICIARY

Customs court

Amendment No. 108—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$417,465 as proposed by the House, instead of \$411,465 as proposed by the Senate.

Court of Claims

Amendment No. 109—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$575,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$587,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 110—Repairs and improvements: Appropriates \$10,700 as proposed by the House, instead of \$140,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Other courts and services

Amendment No. 111—Salaries of clerks of courts: Appropriates \$4,470,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 112—Salaries of criers: Appropriates \$520,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$540,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 113—Miscellaneous expenses: Appropriates \$675,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$725,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 114—Travel expenses: Appropriates \$725,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 115—Administrative Office of the United States Courts: Appropriates \$520,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$530,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 116—Repairs and improvements, District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia: Appropriates \$7,100 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 117—Expenses of referees: Appropriates \$995,000 to be derived from the referees' expense fund, instead of \$960,000 as proposed by the House, and \$1,035,400 as proposed by the Senate.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Department of State

Amendment No. 118—The Institute of Inter-American Affairs: Provides not to exceed \$600,000 for administrative expenses of the funds available to the corporation, as proposed by the House, instead of \$767,500 as proposed by the Senate.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
JOHN TABER.

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER IV. TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter IV of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 134.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 120, 122, 123, 125, 127, 130, 131, 132, and 133, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,185,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 124: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$36,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,850,000" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$17,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANTFIELD,
FREDERIC R. COUDERT,
JOHN TABER.

Managers on the Part of the House.

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
CARL HAYDEN,
H. M. KILGORE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
GUY CORDON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter IV of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Office of Administrative Services

Amendment No. 119—Salaries: Appropriates \$1,185,000, instead of \$1,160,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,207,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 120—Miscellaneous expenses: Appropriates \$303,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$300,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Accounts

Amendment No. 121—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$2,100,000, instead of \$1,875,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,209,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 122—Recoinage of silver coins: Strikes out House language as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of the Public Debt

Amendment No. 123—Distinctive paper for United States currency and securities: Appropriates \$1,845,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,745,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Customs

Amendment No. 124—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$36,600,000, instead of \$36,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$36,806,360 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Internal Revenue

Amendment No. 125—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$245,547,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$245,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Narcotics

Amendment No. 126—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$1,850,000, instead of \$1,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,908,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Engraving and Printing

Amendment No. 127—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$16,835,000 as proposed

by the Senate, instead of \$15,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Secret Service Division

Amendment No. 128—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$2,150,000, instead of \$2,100,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Coast Guard

Amendment No. 129—Acquisition, Construction and Improvements: Appropriates \$17,000,000, instead of \$15,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$18,964,000 as proposed by the Senate.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment Nos. 130, 131, and 132—Deficiency in Postal Revenues: Delete the House Limitation of \$401,500,000 as the maximum amount which can be drawn from the Federal Treasury for this purpose and inserts language allowing the use of an indefinite amount, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 133—Transportation of Mails: Inserts language to allow the use of this appropriation for payment of current and prior fiscal year settlements with foreign countries, as proposed by the Senate.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Amendment No. 134—Administrative Expenses: Authorizes not to exceed \$26,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$26,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
FREDERIC R. COUDERT,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER V. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter V of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 137, 141, and 152.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 139, 144, 145, 146, 149, 154, and 155, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 135: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "forty-five passenger motor vehicles, of which seventeen shall be for replacement only"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 136: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,466,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,971,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 140: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and agree to the same with an amendment, as

follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$9,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "and including \$200,000 for transfer to the Department of Agriculture for research into utilization of plant material and vegetable sources of cortisone"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,090,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 150: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 153: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$523,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,582,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 142, 148, and 151.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
E. H. HEDRICK,
CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
PAT MCCARRAN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
CHAN GURNEY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter V of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Food and Drug Administration

Amendments Nos. 135 and 136—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$5,466,700, instead of \$5,666,700 as proposed by the Senate and \$5,066,700 as proposed by the House, including the purchase of not to exceed 45 passenger motor vehicles, instead of not to exceed 65 proposed by the Senate and not to exceed 17 proposed by the House.

Office of Education

Amendment No. 137—Promotion and further development of vocational education:

Appropriates \$19,977,760 as proposed by the House, instead of \$23,435,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 138—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$1,971,500, instead of \$2,023,420 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 139—Venereal diseases: Appropriates \$14,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$14,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 140—Tuberculosis: Appropriates \$9,800,000 instead of \$9,600,000 as proposed by the Senate, and \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 141—Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services: Appropriates \$1,357,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,107,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 142—National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 143—Restores the House language providing for transfer of funds to the Department of Agriculture for research into utilization of plant material and vegetable sources of cortisone, modified to make the transfer in the specific amount of \$200,000.

Amendment No. 144—National Cancer Institute: Appropriates \$20,686,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,086,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 145—Mental health activities: Appropriates \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$9,944,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 146—National Heart Institute: Appropriates \$14,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$14,150,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 147—Dental health activities: Appropriates \$2,090,000, instead of \$2,140,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,040,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 148—Construction of research facilities: Reported in disagreement.

Saint Elizabeth's Hospital

Amendment No. 149—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$2,005,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,948,000 as proposed by the House.

Social Security Administration

Amendment No. 150—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions: Appropriates \$250,000, instead of \$300,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 151—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 152—Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: Appropriates \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,510,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Administrator

Amendment No. 153—Salaries, Office of the General Counsel: Appropriates \$523,100, instead of \$535,100 as proposed by the Senate and \$511,100 as proposed by the House.

General provisions

Amendment No. 154: Inserts a separate section proposed by the Senate, making certain appropriations of the Federal Security Agency in the bill available for travel expenses and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

Amendment No. 155: Corrects a section number.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Amendment No. 156—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$8,582,500, instead of

\$8,615,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$8,550,000 as proposed by the House.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
E. H. HEDRICK,
CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER VI. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter VI of the bill (H. R. 7786) "making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 159, 163, 170, 171, 174, 176, 185, 202, 203, 214, and 229.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 158, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 167, 168, 169, 199, 205, 206, 207, 210, 211, 213, 216, 218, 219, 226, 227, 228, 233, 235, 236, and 237, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 172: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 172, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,294,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 173: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 173, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,617,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,960,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 179: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 179, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,437,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 180: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,012,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$452,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,723,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the

amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 184: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 184, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,157,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 186: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,354,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 188: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 190: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 190, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$560,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,490,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 194: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 194, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$537,050"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 195: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 195, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,837,475"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 196: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 196, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,115,475"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 197: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 197, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$27,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 204: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 204, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 208: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 208, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,315,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 212: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 212, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,565,175"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 217: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 217, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,118,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 220: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 220, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 221: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 221, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$32,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 222: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 222, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$85,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 225: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 225, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$28,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 230: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 230, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,161,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 231: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 231, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,562,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 157, 166, 175, 189, 192, 198, 200, 201, 209, 215, 223, 224, 232, 234, and 238.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM G. STIGLER,
EDWARD H. KRUSE, Jr.
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
ELMER THOMAS,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
CHAN GURNEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VI of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Research and Marketing Act

Amendment No. 157: Reported in disagreement.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Amendments Nos. 158 and 159—Economic investigations: Strike out House language to permit economic research on farm housing as proposed by the Senate and appropriate \$2,600,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,720,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 160 and 161—Crop and livestock estimates: Strike out House language authorizing collection of data on farm construction as proposed by the Senate and appropriate \$2,904,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,725,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of the Administrator, Agricultural Research Administration

Amendment No. 162: Corrects language as proposed by the Senate.

Working capital fund, agricultural research center

Amendment No. 163: Restores language establishing a working capital fund as proposed by the House.

Research on agricultural problems of Alaska

Amendment No. 164: Appropriates \$280,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$260,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Experiment Stations

Amendment No. 165—Payments to States and Territories: Inserts language proposed by the Senate in connection with the transfer of Research and Marketing Act funds.

Amendment No. 166—Payments to States and Territories: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 167—Payments to States and Territories: Authorizes \$37,500 for research in Alaska as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$27,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 168—Payments to States and Territories: Appropriates \$12,416,208 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,406,208 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 169 and 170—Salaries and expenses: Correct date reference as proposed by the Senate and appropriate \$237,500 as proposed by the House, instead of \$252,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics

Amendment No. 171: Appropriates \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,763,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Animal Industry

Amendment No. 172—Animal husbandry: Appropriates \$2,294,000, instead of \$2,319,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,250,000 as proposed by the House. The amount appropriated includes \$19,000 proposed by the Senate to enable the Department to continue operation of the Morgan Horse Farm until the State Legislature can consider a proposal for State of Vermont to take it over. It is agreed unanimously by the conferees of both Houses that this activity must be disposed of by the end of the fiscal year 1951.

Amendment No. 173—Diseases of animals: Appropriates \$1,325,000, instead of \$1,350,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 174—Animal disease control and eradication: Appropriates \$7,950,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$7,952,500 as proposed by the Senate. Although Senate increase is eliminated, the conferees of both Houses agree that the Seattle stock-

yards should be given the same inspection service accorded similar stockyards throughout the country, within the funds approved.

Amendment No. 175—Animal disease control and eradication: Reported in disagreement.

Bureau of Dairy Industry

Amendments Nos. 176 and 177: Eliminate language proposed by the Senate authorizing construction of housing at Beltsville and appropriate \$1,617,500, instead of \$1,735,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry

Amendment No. 178: Appropriates \$7,960,000, instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$7,750,000 as proposed by the House. This amount provides partial restoration of House cut below 1950 level of operation. Funds for research on cortisone are provided in Chapter V of the bill.

Bureau of Plant Industry

Amendment No. 179—Field crops: Appropriates \$3,437,500, instead of \$3,475,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$3,400,000 as proposed by the House. This amount includes \$30,000 for research on new types of cotton.

Amendment No. 180—Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: Appropriates \$3,012,500, instead of \$3,075,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,950,000 as proposed by the House. Funds for research into new sources of cortisone are included in Chapter V of the bill.

Amendment No. 181—Forest diseases: Appropriates \$452,500, instead of \$455,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$450,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 182—Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: Appropriates \$2,723,750, instead of \$2,767,500 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,680,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 183—Agricultural engineering: Appropriates \$1,130,000, instead of \$1,140,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,120,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine

Amendments Nos. 184 and 185—Insect investigations: Appropriate \$4,157,500, instead of \$4,165,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$4,100,000 as proposed by the House and restore House language authorizing the transfer of funds to the Public Health Service for studies on effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on human health.

Amendment No. 186—Insect and plant-disease control: Appropriates \$4,450,000, instead of \$4,651,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$4,185,900 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 187—Foreign plant quarantines: Appropriates \$2,354,700, instead of \$2,384,400 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,325,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 188—Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases: Appropriates \$2,100,000, instead of \$2,350,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$850,000 as proposed by the House. The additional contingency funds, which are provided to eliminate future deficiencies, are to be released only after both committees have approved final plans for their use.

Amendment No. 189—Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases: Reported in disagreement.

Control of forest pests

Amendment No. 190—Gypsy and brown-tail moths: Appropriates \$560,000, instead of \$590,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$539,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 191—Forest Pest Control Act: Appropriates \$1,650,000, instead of \$1,900,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$900,000 as proposed by the House. The additional contingency funds of \$750,000 are included to eliminate as far as possible future deficiencies.

Amendment No. 192—Forest Pest Control Act: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 193, 194, 195, and 196—White pine blister rust: Appropriate \$3,490,000, instead of \$3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$3,280,000 as proposed by the House and adjust amounts to be transferred to the three agencies which carry out this program.

Forest Service

Amendment No. 197—National forest protection and management: Appropriates \$27,100,000, instead of \$29,320,500 as proposed by the Senate and \$26,890,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 198—Cooperative range improvements: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 199—Forest and range management investigations: Appropriates \$3,030,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,995,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 200—Forest and range management investigations: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 201—Forest products: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 202—Forest resources investigations: Appropriates \$880,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 203—Forest development roads and trails: Appropriates \$10,348,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 204—Acquisition of land for national forests, Weeks Act: Appropriates \$300,000, instead of \$401,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$100,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees of both Houses agree that none of these funds shall be used to purchase lands unless they are located entirely within national forest boundaries.

Amendments Nos. 205, 206, and 207—Farm and other private forestry cooperation: Approve corrections proposed by the Senate in sublimitation accounts.

Flood Control

Amendment No. 208: Appropriates \$10,315,000, instead of \$9,880,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$10,750,000 as proposed by the House. Within the funds available, special attention shall be given to the areas where work has been delayed.

Amendment No. 209: Reported in disagreement.

Soil Conservation Service

Amendment No. 210. Omits surplus heading.

Amendment No. 211—Soil conservation operations: Appropriates \$52,400,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$52,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 212—Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land: Appropriates \$1,565,175, instead of \$1,665,175 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,490,000 as proposed by the House. The amount approved includes Senate increase for the San Simon Valley project.

Amendment No. 213—Water conservation and utilization projects: Appropriates \$500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House.

Production and Marketing Administration

Amendment No. 214—Conservation and use of agricultural land resources: Appropriates \$282,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$283,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 215—Conservation and use of agricultural land resources: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 216—Sugar Act: Appropriates \$63,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$60,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 217—Market News Service: Appropriates \$2,118,500, instead of \$2,187,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,050,000 as proposed by the House. The amount ap-

proved includes Senate increase for market news service on naval stores.

Amendment No. 218—Marketing regulatory acts: Appropriates \$3,495,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,550,000 as proposed by the House.

Federal crop insurance

Amendment No. 219: Appropriates \$7,204,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$6,854,000 as proposed by the House.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendment No. 220—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$3,550,000, instead of \$3,750,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$3,150,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 221—Loan authorization: Authorizes rural telephone loans in the amount of \$32,500,000, instead of \$40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees agree that the fees for engineering and legal services on the larger loans should be reduced. They also feel that standardization of plans should be developed to make possible further savings to the consumers. In addition, the Rural Electrification Administration is expected to exercise its power generation authority only in line with its announced policy and the law.

Farmers' Home Administration

Amendment No. 222—Loan authorization: Authorizes \$65,000,000 for farm tenancy and housing loans, instead of \$71,350,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$56,350,000 as proposed by the House. In addition, the Farmers' Home Administration will have a carry-over of approximately \$7,000,000 from 1950 for farm housing loans, which will make a total of \$72,000,000 available for 1951.

Amendment No. 223—Loan authorization: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 224—Loan authorization: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 225—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$23,500,000, instead of \$29,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$27,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Extension Service

Amendments Nos. 226, 227, and 228—Payments to States and Territories: Appropriates \$27,103,493 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$27,000,000 as proposed by the House and adjust language to increase payments to Alaska and Puerto Rico.

Amendment No. 229—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$900,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$915,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 230: Appropriates \$2,161,300, instead of \$2,179,300 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,143,300 as proposed by the House.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 231: Appropriates \$2,562,500, instead of \$2,675,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,450,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 232: Reported in disagreement.

Office of Information

Amendment No. 233: Approves language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 234: Reported in disagreement.

Travel limitation

Amendment No. 235: Eliminates language proposed by the House limiting funds for travel expenses, in view of Senate substitute in Amendment No. 233.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 236—Administrative expenses: Authorizes \$16,350,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$16,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 237—Restoration of capital impairment: Approves \$66,698,457 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$170,515,131 as proposed by the House.

General provisions

Amendment No. 238: Reported in disagreement.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM G. STIGLER,
EDWARD H. KRUSE, Jr.,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER VII. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter VII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 239, 240, 242, 245, 248, 250, 253, 256, 257, 258, 259, 263, 272, 280, 286, 287, 291, 292, 299, 308, and 309.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 241, 243, 244, 246, 247, 249, 255, 260, 261, 264, 267, 269, 274, 276, 282, 290, 293, 294, 297, 298, 301, 303, 304, 305, and 307, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 251: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 251, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 252: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 252, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment, insert "Provided, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the re-vested Oregon and California Railroad and re-conveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands shall be reimbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in section c, title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937, of the special fund designated the 'Oregon and California Land Grant Fund' and section 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939, of the special fund designated the 'Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund'"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 262: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 262, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$23,272,651"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 263: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 263, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 265: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 265, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 268: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 268, and agree to the same with an amendment, as

follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert "Provided, That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary. Any tribal funds advanced under this authority shall be reported to the Congress in the annual Budget for the fiscal year 1952"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 270: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 270, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 271: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 271, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,116,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 273: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 273, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$295,828,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 281: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 281, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 283: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 283, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment, insert "not to exceed \$100,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 296: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 296, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 310: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 310, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$30,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 254, 275, 277, 278, 279, 284, 285, 288, 289, 295, 300, 302, and 306.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
ALBERT GORE,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
EEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
CHAN GURNEY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes

of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 239—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$2,315,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 240—Standardization of geographic names: Provides no appropriation, as proposed by the House, instead of making an appropriation of \$14,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 241—Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act: Appropriates \$180,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 242—Southeastern power marketing area, operation and maintenance: Appropriates \$150,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 243 and 244—Southwestern Power Administration, construction: Appropriate \$8,620,000 and provide contractual authority of \$1,730,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of appropriating \$10,350,000 and providing \$6,000,000 contractual authority as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 245—Southwestern Power Administration, operation and maintenance: Appropriates \$760,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$660,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Southwestern Power Administration is expected to exercise its power generation and transmission authority only in line with its announced policy and the law.

Bonneville Power Administration

Amendments Nos. 246 and 247—Construction: Appropriate \$39,500,000 and provide contractual authority of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of appropriating \$41,500,000 and providing contractual authority of \$21,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 248—Operation and maintenance: Appropriates \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$4,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Land Management

Amendment No. 249—Management of lands and resources: Appropriates \$7,127,810 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$6,756,800, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 250—Management of lands and resources: Eliminates the Senate proposal to include express authorization to expend funds for weed control on the re-vested Oregon and California Railroad and Coos Bay Road lands, since such express authority is not needed.

Amendment No. 251—Construction: Appropriates \$700,000, instead of \$600,000 as proposed by the House and \$800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 252—Administrative provisions: Provides for reimbursement of all expenditures in connection with the re-vested Oregon and California Railroad and Coos Bay Road lands from the special funds maintained by 25% of the receipts from such lands. Such reimbursement for current expenses is to be made entirely from 25% of current year receipts. If 25% of current receipts is inadequate also to reimburse for the \$700,000 appropriation for capital expenditures such current year deficiency can be made up from later receipts. This modifies the reimbursement proposal of both Houses.

Amendment No. 253—Range improvements: Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of \$350,000 on expenditure of receipts.

Amendment No. 255—Payments to states (proceeds of sales): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 255—Payments to states (proceeds of sales): Provides a limitation of \$20,000 on such payments as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 256—Payment to Oklahoma: Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of \$4,000 on such payment.

Amendment No. 257—Leasing of grazing lands: Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of \$6,000 on expenditure of receipts.

Amendment No. 258—Payments to states (Grazing fees): Eliminates the Senate proposal to insert a limitation of \$300 on such payments.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 259—Health, education and welfare services: Eliminates the Senate proposal to authorize expenditure for research among mixed Indians and non-Indian groups.

Amendment No. 260—Health, education and welfare services: Appropriates \$40,252,328 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$37,929,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 261—Resources management: Appropriates \$10,814,576 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$10,542,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 262—Construction: Appropriates \$23,272,651, instead of \$22,422,000 as proposed by the House and \$23,635,151 as proposed by the Senate. This action eliminates the sum of \$500,000 which was added by the Senate for the construction of roads and trails, but restores the sum of \$137,500 for land acquisition which was deleted by the Senate. The restoration of \$137,500 for land acquisition is made with the understanding that it is not to be expended for the acquisition of privately owned land to be held in trust so as to extend the boundaries of Indian reservations.

Amendment No. 263—Construction: Provides contractual authority of \$3,500,000, instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 264—Restriction on land acquisition: Adopts the proposal of the Senate to limit the use of appropriations for the acquisition of land or water rights for Indians in specified states.

Amendment No. 265—General administrative expenses: Appropriates \$3,600,000, instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House, and \$3,644,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 266—Administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of 227 automobiles as proposed by the House, instead of 250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 267—Tribal funds: Appropriates \$2,437,965 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,430,965 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 268—Tribal funds: Authorizes the advancement of tribal funds to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year upon the designation by the governing body of the tribe and approval by the Secretary, and requires that such advances shall be reported to the Congress in the annual budget for the fiscal year 1952, thus reinstating with modification the language proposed by the House but deleted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 269—Tribal funds: Inserts a limitation upon the use of tribal funds for the acquisition of land or water rights in specified states, as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Reclamation

Amendment No. 270—General investigations: Appropriates \$5,875,000, instead of \$5,-

150,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. This action provides \$50,000 for investigation of the La Prele unit, Wyoming.

Amendment No. 271—General investigations: Provides that of the appropriation of \$5,875,000 for general investigations the amount to be derived from the reclamation fund is \$5,116,000, instead of \$4,400,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,791,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 272—Construction and rehabilitation: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to authorize emergency reconstruction of the La Prele unit, Wyoming, and initiation of construction on the Kennewick Division of the Yakima project, Washington.

Amendment No. 273—Construction and rehabilitation: Appropriates \$295,828,000, instead of \$297,467,000 as proposed by the House, and \$294,713,000 as proposed by the Senate. This action ratifies the allocation of funds for construction and rehabilitation as set forth on pages 142 and 143 (and for the Missouri Basin project, on pages 147, 148, 149, and 150) of Senate report No. 1941, accompanying H. R. 7786, including ratification of the Senate action in providing \$750,000 to initiate the work on the Folsom power facilities, Central Valley project, and including ratification of providing \$504,000 (increase in appropriation of \$228,000 together with \$276,000 to be available through reprogramming under House allowance) for construction of the Brighton-Brush transmission line and substations, Colorado-Big Thompson project, but with the following exceptions to such ratification:

(a) In addition to \$343,000 allowed by the Senate for the Fort Peck project, Montana, \$750,000 is also allowed to complete construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations. This is in lieu of the \$1,400,000 allowed by the House and of the entire disallowance of funds for this line as proposed by the Senate.

(b) The additional sum of \$365,000 is provided for the Missouri Basin project to construct the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls transmission line and substations.

Amendment No. 274—Construction and rehabilitation: Provides that of the appropriation of \$295,828,000, the sum to be derived from the reclamation fund shall be \$25,135,700 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$22,897,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 275—Construction and rehabilitation (contract authority): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 276—Construction and rehabilitation: Ratifies the action of the Senate in deleting the proposal of the House to earmark \$1,000,000 for the construction of specified transmission lines in South Dakota.

Amendment No. 277—Construction and rehabilitation (language authorizing South Dakota transmission lines): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 278—Construction and rehabilitation (restriction on construction of Glendo unit): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 279—Construction and rehabilitation (restriction on construction of Moorhead Dam): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 280—Construction and rehabilitation: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to rescind the unused portion of the 1950 appropriation for construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations, Fort Peck project, Montana.

Amendment No. 281—General administrative expenses: Appropriates \$7,200,000, instead of \$7,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 282—General administrative expenses: Inserts a provision limiting expenditures for information work to not more than \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 283—Administrative provisions: Provides that not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for services authorized under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946, including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary. This modifies the proposals of both Houses in this connection.

Amendment No. 284—Administrative provisions (administration of interstate compacts): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 285—Administrative provisions (payments to school districts): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 286—Administrative provisions: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to insert a provision limiting reimbursability of certain expenditures.

Amendment No. 287—Administrative provisions: Authorizes expenditures for studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas pursuant to law, as proposed by the House, instead of authorizing expenditures for such studies on a non-reimbursable basis and with an express limit on expenditures for any one reservoir area, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 288—Administrative provisions (Reimbursability of certain expenditures): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 289—Transfer of Ephrata Air Force Base: Reported in disagreement.

The Bureau of Reclamation was permitted to insert in the Senate Hearings, Part I, beginning at page 576, a statement of the Bureau's interpretation of some of the provisions of H. R. 7786 as passed by the House. Such interpretation should be considered as that sought to be established by the Bureau of Reclamation, and not necessarily as the intent of Congress. When interpretation is necessary, the Comptroller General should resolve questions in the light of all relevant factors.

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 290—Surveys, investigations and research: Appropriates \$19,382,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$19,129,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Mines

Amendments Nos. 291 and 292—Conservation and development of mineral resources: Appropriate \$17,758,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$17,813,403 as proposed by the Senate; and eliminate the provision proposed by the Senate to authorize the reacquisition of certain properties in Montana.

Amendment No. 293—Construction: Appropriates \$1,268,100 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,372,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 294—Administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of 150 automobiles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 145 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 295—Administrative provisions (Transfer of land in Minnesota): Reported in disagreement.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 296—Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities: Appropriates \$7,400,000, instead of \$7,250,000 as proposed by the House, and \$7,448,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 297—Construction: Appropriates \$19,667,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,542,000 as proposed by the House.

This action on amendments Numbered 296 and 297 will necessitate some flexibility to permit adjustment of items originally scheduled under maintenance and rehabilitation and construction.

Amendments Nos. 298 and 299—Construction: Provide that of the construction appropriation the sum for liquidation of prior

obligations shall be \$7,935,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$8,935,000 as proposed by the House; and eliminate the proposal of the Senate to provide \$100,000 in contract authorization.

Amendment No. 300—Construction (Provision regarding Independence National Historical Park): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 301—General administrative expenses: Appropriates \$1,314,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,264,500 as proposed by the House.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Amendment No. 302—Management of resources (Payment for information): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 303—Management of resources: Appropriates \$7,082,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,157,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 304—Investigations of resources: Appropriates \$4,125,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 305—Construction: Appropriates \$2,423,450 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,401,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 306—Migratory bird conservation fund: Reported in disagreement.

Territories and island possessions

Amendment No. 307—Administration of territories and possessions: Appropriates \$3,392,180 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,329,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 308—Construction of roads, Alaska: Appropriates \$20,400,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$18,883,212 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 309—Claims, Alaska Road Commission: Provides no appropriation as proposed by the House, instead of appropriating \$12,893 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 310—Construction, Alaska Railroad: Appropriates \$30,000,000, instead of \$31,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$28,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
ALBERT GORE,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER VIII. INDEPENDENT OFFICES

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter VIII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 316, 330, 331, 340, 341, 343, 346, 350, 357, 359, 362, and 371.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 311, 313, 314, 320, 321, 323, 324, 326, 327, 328, 329, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 347, 360, 364, 365, 366, 368, and 372, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 312: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 312, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$187,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 315: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 315, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amend-

ment insert ": *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authorization shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of \$90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of \$45,000 per annum"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 317: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 317, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$15,511,913"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 318: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 318, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 322: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 322, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,891,695"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 325: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 325, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 339: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 339, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$78,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 344: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 344, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$9,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 348: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 348, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$190,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 349: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 349, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$42,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 351: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 351, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$11,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 352: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 352, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$38,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 355: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 355, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by

said amendment insert "\$6,230,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 356: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 356, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 358: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 358, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,179,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 367: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 367, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$881,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 369: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 369, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the per centum proposed insert "5.5"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 370: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 370, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the per centum proposed insert "9"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 319, 337, 338, 342, 345, 353, 354, 361, 363, and 373.

ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT GORE,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANCIS CASE

(except as to amendment 363),

JOHN PHILLIPS

(except as to amendment 363),

JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter VIII of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Bureau of the Budget

Amendment No. 311—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$3,412,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,386,000 as proposed by the House.

Philippine Alien Property Custodian

Amendment No. 312—Administrative Expenses: Appropriates \$187,750, instead of \$180,000 as proposed by the House and \$215,500, as proposed by the Senate.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 313—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$670,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$695,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 314—Construction of Memorials and Cemeteries: Appropriates \$8,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,680,000 as proposed by the House.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Amendment No. 315—Payment of Fees to Contractors: Restores provision in the House bill, amended to clarify intent. In connection with this provision the conferees wish it understood that they are aware that these contracts contain a cancellation clause and that they are expecting the Commission to take immediate advantage of that clause.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 316 and 317—Salaries and Expenses: Authorize the expenditure of \$50,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (Hatch Act), as proposed by the House, instead of \$80,000 as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate \$15,511,913, instead of \$15,261,913 as proposed by the House and \$15,761,913 as proposed by the Senate.

COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

Amendment No. 318—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$35,000, instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,000 as proposed by the Senate. Re-appropriation of unobligated balances totaling \$30,000 provides a total of \$65,000 for this purpose.

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 319—Salaries and Expenses: Reported in disagreement.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 320 and 321—Salaries and Expenses: Authorize the expenditure of \$256,500 for travel expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$247,500 as proposed by the House; and appropriates \$4,013,300 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,938,300 as proposed by the House.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 322 and 323—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$3,891,695, instead of \$3,866,695 as proposed by the House and \$3,916,695 as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the words "to the Bureau of Trade Practice Conferences" as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Amendments Nos. 324 and 325—Salaries: Appropriate \$32,689,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$34,500,000 as proposed by the House; and authorizes the expenditure of \$300 for newspapers and periodicals, in stead of \$600 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 326—Sites and Planning, Public Buildings Outside the District of Columbia: Appropriates \$22,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$28,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 327, 328, and 329—Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: Appropriate \$605,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$633,608,240 as proposed by the House; strikes out the provision of the House to the effect that not to exceed \$25,000,000 may be expended in accordance with the purposes of the act of July 23, 1946 through purchase contracts negotiated with operators as proposed by the Senate; and provides a contract authorization of \$125,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the House. In connection with this activity the conferees wish to go on record as being in accord with the so-called "buy American policy" which was enacted in 1933. The conferees are of the opinion that this policy should continue in full force, and that every assistance should be extended by the government to the development of our domestic sources of raw materials. We point out that domestic development means double protec-

tion—a stock pile immediately acquired and the source of supply proved.

Amendments Nos. 330 and 331—Alaska Public Works: Strike out the proposal of the Senate authorizing a contract authorization in the amount of \$4,000,000; and restores the provision of the House requiring that a certificate from the Secretary of Defense that the installation of such facility will be of value in connection with national defense.

Amendments Nos. 332 and 333—Advance Planning of Non-Federal Public Works: Appropriate \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$28,000,000 as proposed by the House; and provides a contract authorization in the sum of \$27,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$32,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 334—Grants for Plan Preparation, Water Pollution Control: Appropriates \$750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 335—Administrative Expenses, Water Pollution Control: Appropriates \$52,285 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$60,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 336—Virgin Islands Public Works: Appropriates \$1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 337 and 338—Public Works Advance Planning: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 339—Operating Expenses: Appropriates \$78,500,000, instead of \$76,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$82,725,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 340—Purchase and Distribution of Typewriters: Restores the two paragraphs contained in the House Bill relating to the acquisition and distribution of typewriters.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Office of the Administrator

Amendments Nos. 341 and 342—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriate \$4,200,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$4,900,000 as proposed by the Senate; and reports in disagreement the proposal of the Senate relating to expenses of inspections of projects financed through loans to educational institutions authorized by Title 4 of the Housing Act of 1950.

Public Housing Administration

Amendment No. 343—Annual Contributions: Appropriates \$7,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$9,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 344—Administrative Expenses: Appropriates \$9,000,000, instead of \$8,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 345—General Expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 346—Railroad Safety: Appropriates \$1,000,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,016,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 347—Locomotive Inspection: Appropriates \$718,600, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$700,000 as proposed by the House.

MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 348—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$190,000, instead of \$175,000 as proposed by the House and \$227,800 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Amendments Nos. 349 and 350—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriate \$42,500,000, instead of \$40,890,630 as proposed by the House and \$44,225,630 as proposed by the Senate; and restores the provision of the House providing that no part of the appropriation shall be available for the operation of a field office

outside the continental or territorial limits of the United States.

Amendment No. 351—Construction and Equipment: Provides a contract authorization of \$11,000,000, instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$12,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Amendments Nos. 352 and 353—Maintenance and Operation of Properties: Appropriate \$8,000, instead of \$35,000 as proposed by the House and \$39,600 as proposed by the Senate; and reports in disagreement the provision of the Senate waiving the provisions of Section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950.

PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 354—Eligibility of Persons Who Collaborated With the Enemy: Reported in disagreement. Any recommendation submitted by the committee in connection with this amendment should in no way be considered justification for continuation of this activity beyond April 30, 1951, the statutory termination date for this part of the program.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 355—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$6,230,000, instead of \$6,130,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,330,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Amendment No. 356—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$2,700,000, instead of \$2,606,490 as proposed by the House and \$2,770,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 357—Paleontological Investigations: Strikes out the provision of the Senate proposing an appropriation of \$20,000.

Amendment No. 358—Salaries and Expenses, National Gallery of Art: Appropriates \$1,179,000, instead of \$1,158,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TARIFF COMMISSION

Amendment No. 359—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$1,290,700 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,340,700 as proposed by the Senate.

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Amendment No. 360—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates \$26,900, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the House.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Amendment No. 361—Ship Construction: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 362—Operating-Differential Subsidies: Appropriates \$26,450,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$30,108,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 363—Limitation on Number of Ships Receiving Operating-Differential Subsidy: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 364—Maritime Training: Strikes out the provision of the House appropriating \$3,342,660, and inserts the proposal of the Senate appropriating \$4,348,520 including pay of cadet-midshipmen and other trainees as proposed by the Senate. For several years there has been disagreement in the two Houses as to the justice and desirability of providing the \$65 monthly allowance for cadet-midshipmen. It has been pointed out that similar payments are made to cadets at the Military Academy and midshipmen at the Naval Academy. It also has been pointed out that the obligation to serve on the part of the two latter groups is greater than it is in the case of cadets attending the Maritime Academy. It is recommended that the subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses having the subject in charge, or certain members thereof, conduct a study of the problem with a view to submitting a recommendation thereon by the beginning of the next regular session of the Congress.

Amendment No. 365—State Marine Schools: Strikes out the proposal of the House containing an appropriation of \$668,000 together with an unobligated balance of not to exceed \$25,000, and inserts the proposal of the Senate appropriating \$1,102,050, including pay of cadet-midshipmen at \$63 per month.

Amendment No. 366—Vessel Operating Functions: Corrects statute reference as proposed by the Senate.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 367—Administration, Medical, Hospital and Domiciliary Services: Appropriates \$381,750,000, instead of \$375,847,795 as proposed by the House and \$387,621,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 368—Limitation on Educational and Training Institutions: Strikes out the proposal of the House regarding the eligibility of educational institutions for the training of veterans, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 369 and 370—Payment for Technical and Clerical Services for the Preparation of Plans and Specifications: Authorize the use of not to exceed 5.5 per cent of appropriation and contract authorizations, instead of 4 per cent as proposed by the House and 6.7 per cent as proposed by the Senate, in connection with projects supervised by the Veterans Administration; and authorizes the use of not to exceed 9 per cent where such projects are under the supervision of other government agencies, instead of 7 per cent as proposed by the House and 10 per cent as proposed by the Senate.

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 371—Administrative expenses: Appropriates \$600,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 372—Section 110: Excepts certain corporations from the general provisions of Title I, Chapter VIII, as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II. CORPORATIONS

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Amendment No. 373—Public Housing Administration: Reported in disagreement.

ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT GORE,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANCIS CASE

(except as to amendment 363),

JOHN PHILLIPS

(except as to amendment 363),

JOHN TABER

(except as to amendment 363),

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER IX. CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter IX of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 384 and 395.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 382, 385, 386, 389, 391, 392, 394, 396, and 397, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 379: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 379, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by

said amendment insert "\$1,525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 380: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 380, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following "(for replacements only) in the current fiscal year of three hundred and fifty passenger motor vehicles and one motorboat (to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable) and the purchase (not to exceed one, to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable), maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 381: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 381, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following "Provided further, That the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control shall be available for payments to school districts as authorized by law"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 383: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 383, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$198,811,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 387: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 387, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$383,408,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 390: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 390, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$66,422,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 393: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 393, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$432,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 388 and 393.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
ALBERT GORE,
E. H. HEDRICK,
W. F. NORRELL,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
KARL STEFAN,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ELMER THOMAS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
CHAN GURNEY,
GUY CORDON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter IX of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
Quartermaster Corps

Amendment No. 374—Cemeterial Expenses: Appropriates \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 375—Entombment of an Unknown American Serviceman, World War II: Deletes provision of the House providing funds incident to the selection and burial of an unknown American serviceman of World War II, as proposed by the Senate.

SIGNAL CORPS

Amendment No. 376—Alaska Communication System: Appropriates \$2,877,920 for construction in Alaska as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 377—Alaska Communication System: Deletes provision of the House limiting to \$28,000 construction costs per housing unit and substitutes provision establishing an average cost of \$24,000 per unit, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 378—Alaska Communication System: Enlarges provision of the House pertaining to inclusion of equipment in housing units, as proposed by the Senate.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Amendment No. 379—Administrative Expense Limitation: Authorizes a limitation of \$1,525,000, instead of \$1,450,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 380—Administrative Provisions: Provides for the purchase of 350 passenger motor vehicles, one motor boat and one airplane, instead of only 350 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the House and 500 passenger motor vehicles, two motor boats and one airplane as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 381—Administrative Provisions: Provides for payments to school districts.

Amendment No. 382—Rivers and Harbors: Provides authority for investigations and for plans and specifications for authorized projects, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 383—Rivers and harbors: Appropriates \$198,811,500 instead of \$185,878,000 as proposed by the House and \$221,244,500 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed upon is 10 percent below the amount approved by the Senate. The Senate had approved \$1,800,000 for planning and \$2,585,000 for examinations and surveys, which amounts are included in the lump sum appropriation for rivers and harbors. Since the appropriation has been reduced 10 percent below the Senate figure, the amounts for planning and examinations and surveys are likewise reduced by the amount of 10 percent below the amounts approved by the Senate.

Amendment No. 384—Old River, Cleveland, Ohio: Deletes provision of the Senate providing \$75,000 for dredging.

Amendment No. 385—Alteration of bridges over navigable waters: Appropriates \$900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 386—Flood control: Corrects language.

Amendment No. 387—Flood control: Appropriates \$383,408,250, instead of \$341,055,000 as proposed by the House and \$436,933,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed upon is 12 percent below the amount approved by the Senate. The Senate had approved \$3,565,000 for planning and \$6,500,000 for preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies which amounts are included in the lump sum appropriation for flood control. Since the appropriation has

been reduced 12 percent below the Senate figure the amounts for planning, preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies are likewise reduced by the amount of 12 percent below the amounts approved by the Senate.

With respect to amendments Nos. 383, 387, 390, and 393, the conferees are agreed that obligation and expenditure of funds shall be made under the criteria set forth in the letter of the President and the Corps of Engineers, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 21, 1950.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In my message of July 19 to the Congress, I announced that I was directing the executive agencies " * * * to conduct a detailed review of Government programs, for the purpose of modifying them wherever practicable to lessen the demand upon services, commodities, raw materials, manpower, and facilities which are in competition with those needed for national defense. The Government, as well as the public, must exercise great restraint in the use of those goods and services which are needed for our increased defense efforts."

In order to adjust the programs of the Federal Government, I am writing to you and the heads of the other agencies whose programs involve substantial use of materials and other resources needed for the defense effort. Please reexamine your programs, giving particular attention, to the extent applicable, to the following:

(1) All civil public works, both direct Federal programs and grant-in-aid programs, should be screened with the objective, as far as practical, of deferring, curtailing, or slowing down those projects which do not directly contribute to defense or to civilian requirements essential in the changed international situation set forth in my message.

(2) Consistent with the restrictive policy already in force for housing credit, other credit programs should be tightened. The only exceptions should be those which directly contribute to meeting our defense and international responsibilities.

(3) Procurement of supplies and equipment should be held to minimum amounts, especially purchases of motor vehicles, typewriters, and other equipment using critical materials. Inventories should be reduced to the lowest practical levels, and excess supplies and equipment should be made available immediately to the General Services Administration.

In addition, I shall expect that in the re-examination of the programs of your agency you will give first priority to those activities which contribute directly to national defense, including requests of other agencies for assistance.

I am asking the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to work closely with you in this review and to report to me on the steps which you have taken in revising your program to meet these objectives.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

TENTATIVE CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER OF JULY 21, 1950

The civil-works program of the Corps of Engineers will be reviewed to insure that no new projects are initiated unless they make an important contribution to the war effort and that only those projects now under construction which meet one or more of the following specific criteria will be continued during the period of partial mobilization.

SPECIFIC CRITERIA

1. The project includes the development of power.
2. The project provides industrial or municipal water supply in critical areas.
3. The project is a dam and reservoir project where closure is under way or has been effected and should be completed to a point of useful operation.
4. The project is an important harbor or waterway.
5. The project protects important industries or major food-producing areas.
6. The project can be completed in the 1951 working season, and where termination costs would constitute an appreciable economic loss, the work in place would be damaged if not protected, and if relatively small amounts of additional work will make the project fully effective.
7. The project involves almost entirely the movement of earth such as channel improvements or levees and does not compete in the use of critical materials.
8. Maintenance of completed projects, advance planning of selected authorized projects, and the survey program should be continued.

With respect to those projects that meet the above criteria for continuation of construction, each individual feature of the project will be examined to determine whether it can be deferred without detriment to the major purpose of the project or to the work in place.

The conferees are further agreed that no construction or planning of any new project appropriated for in this chapter shall be started unless certified by the President as necessary to the war effort and amounts allowed for construction herein shall be available for reallocation to any project appropriated for in this chapter as the Corps of Engineers find necessary to meet the exigencies of the war effort and to maintain economical construction schedules.

Amendment No. 388—Mandan, North Dakota, and James River: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 389—Flood Control General (Emergency Fund): Appropriates \$2,700,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 390—Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries: Appropriates \$66,422,400 instead of \$65,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$66,778,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 391—Emergency Fund for Flood Control on Tributaries of the Mississippi River: Appropriates \$450,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 392—Flood Control, Sacramento River, California: Appropriates \$2,524,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 393—Flood Control, Roseville, Ohio: Appropriates \$432,000, instead of \$540,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 394—Miscellaneous Civil Works: Appropriates \$16,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,000 as proposed by the House.

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

Amendment No. 395—Maintenance and Operation: Appropriates \$2,395,000 from the Soldiers' Home Trust Fund as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,363,240 as proposed by the Senate.

PANAMA CANAL

Amendment No. 396—Maintenance and Operation: Appropriates \$13,251,700 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$14,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 397—Civil Government: Appropriates \$3,849,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,925,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 398—General Provisions: Reported in disagreement.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
ALBERT GORE,
E. H. HEDRICK,
W. F. NORRELL,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
KARL STEFAN,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER X. DEFENSE

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter X of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 408, 409, 441, and 455.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 452, 453, 454, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, and 466, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 399, 417, 418, 451, 456, and 467.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
M. E. TYDINGS,
CHAN GURNEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

National Security Resources Board

Amendment No. 399—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 400—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Amendment No. 401—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$11,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,000,000 as pro-

posed by the House. While the House recedes as to the amount, which is \$100,000 below the budget estimates, the Senate agrees to the position of the House as stated in House Report No. 1797, 81st Congress providing no funds for the President's Committee on Religion and Welfare in the Armed Forces.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY *Office of the Secretary of the Army*

Amendment No. 402—Contingencies of the Army: Appropriates \$51,878,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$51,978,000 as proposed by the House.

General Staff Corps

Amendment No. 403—Field Exercises: Appropriates \$5,350,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 404—Pay of the Army: Appropriates \$1,447,660,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,448,660,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 405—Travel of the Army: Appropriates \$76,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$75,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 406—Finance Service: Appropriates \$29,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$28,410,000 as proposed by the House.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Amendment No. 407—Welfare of enlisted men: Appropriates \$8,362,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 408—Subsistence of the Army: Strikes out the phrase "without unduly increasing future United States market prices" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 409—Subsistence of the Army: Strikes out the word "highly" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 410—Regular supplies of the Army: Appropriates \$107,247,258 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 411—Clothing and equipment: Appropriates \$93,853,365 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$90,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 412—Incidental expenses of the Army: Appropriates \$101,998,313 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$95,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TRANSPORTATION CORPS

Amendment No. 413—Transportation Service, Army: Appropriates \$289,960,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$290,000,000 as proposed by the House.

SIGNAL CORPS

Amendment No. 414—Signal service of the Army: Appropriates \$158,248,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$157,500,000 as proposed by the House.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 415—Medical and hospital department: Appropriates \$54,883,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$54,913,000, as proposed by the House.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Amendment No. 416—Engineer service, Army: Appropriates \$304,187,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$300,176,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 417—Engineer Service, Army: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 418—Military construction, Army: Reported in disagreement.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 419—Ordnance service and supplies, Army: Appropriates \$647,327,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$621,559,000 as proposed by the House.

Chemical Corps

Amendment No. 420—Chemical service, Army: Appropriates \$37,300,000 as proposed

by the Senate, instead of \$36,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Army training

Amendment No. 421—Army training. Appropriates \$7,830,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,930,000 as proposed by the House.

United States Military Academy

Amendment No. 422—Maintenance and operation: Appropriates \$5,120,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Civilian components

Amendment No. 423—Army National Guard: Appropriates \$210,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$212,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 424—Organized Reserves: Appropriates \$114,525,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$115,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 425—Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps: Appropriates \$24,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Department salaries and expenses

Amendment No. 426—Office of Secretary of the Army: Appropriates \$3,368,271 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,265,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 427—Office of Chief of Staff: Appropriates \$6,576,239 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$6,354,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 428—Adjutant General's Office: Appropriates \$9,777,200 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$9,477,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 429—Office of the Inspector General: Appropriates \$203,880 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$197,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 430—Office of the Judge Advocate General: Appropriates \$595,375 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$577,100 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 431—Office of the Chief of Finance: Appropriates \$1,483,202 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,437,800 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 432—Office of the Quartermaster General: Appropriates \$6,981,504 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$6,767,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 433—Office of the Chief of Transportation: Appropriates \$2,940,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,850,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 434—Office of the Chief Signal Officer: Appropriates \$2,455,821 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,379,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 435—Office of Chief of Special Services: Appropriates \$58,636 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$56,800 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 436—Office of the Provost Marshal General: Appropriates \$116,038 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$112,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 437—Office of the Surgeon General: Appropriates \$2,475,873 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 438—Office of Chief of Engineers: Appropriates \$3,751,026 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,636,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 439—Office of Chief of Ordnance: Appropriates \$4,137,696 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,776,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 440—Office of Chief, Chemical Corps: Appropriates \$817,707 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$792,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 441—Office of Chief of Chaplains: Appropriates \$131,100 as proposed by the House, instead of \$128,478 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 442—Contingent expenses, Department of the Army: Appropriates \$9,970,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$9,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Amendment No. 443—Navy Personnel, General expenses: Appropriates \$60,533,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$60,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 444—Military Personnel, Marine Corps: Appropriates \$200,923,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$200,301,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 445—Marine Corps Troops and Facilities: Appropriates \$82,354,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$80,699,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 446—Aircraft and facilities: Appropriates \$532,226,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$536,226,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 447—Ships and facilities: Appropriates \$411,782,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$415,282,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 448—Ordnance and facilities: Appropriates \$181,665,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$177,088,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 449—Medical Care: Appropriates \$37,862,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$38,212,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 450—Civil Engineering: Appropriates \$34,778,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$35,178,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 451—Public Works: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 452—Research: Appropriates \$43,083,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$43,383,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 453—Service-wide supply and finance: Appropriates \$209,292,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$200,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 454—Service-wide operations: Appropriates \$99,281,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$94,261,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 455—Island Governments: Appropriates \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,785,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Amendment No. 456—Acquisition and construction of real property: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 457—Maintenance and operation: Appropriates \$1,027,662,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,010,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 458—Air National Guard: Adds words "or State-owned" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 459—Air National Guard: Strikes out words "State or" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 460—Air National Guard: Strikes out word "thereof" and adds words "of a State" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 461—Salaries and expenses, administration: Appropriates \$58,545,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$55,620,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 462: Strikes out Section 626 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 463: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 464: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 465: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 466: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 467: Reported in disagreement.

GEORGE H. MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER X—A. GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter X—A of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 468, and agree to the same.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. MCGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES
(except amendment 508),
CHAN GURNEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X—A of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 468: Strikes out provision, proposed by the House to reduce appropriations by \$600,000,000, in view of action on amendment No. 508.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. MCGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER X—B. FOREIGN AID

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter X—B of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 479.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 470, 484, 487, and 489, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 469: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 469, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "CHAPTER X—A—FOREIGN AID"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 480, 481, 482, 483, 485, 486, and 488.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOE B. BATES,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter X—B of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

FOREIGN AID

Amendment No. 469, Foreign Aid: Corrects title of chapter.

Amendment No. 470, Funds Appropriated to the President: Inserts title.

Amendments Nos. 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, Economic Cooperation: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 478, Assistance to the Republic of Korea: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 479, International Children's Welfare Work: Deletes provision of the Senate appropriating \$12,500,000.

Amendments Nos. 480, 481, 482, 483, International Development: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 484, Mutual Defense Assistance: Appropriates \$1,678,023,729 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 485 and 486, Government and Relief in Occupied Areas: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 487, Department of State: Inserts title.

Amendment No. 488, Government in Occupied Areas of Germany: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 489, Aid to Palestine Refugees: Appropriates \$27,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOE B. BATES,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,

Manager on the Part of the House.

CHAPTER XI. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to chapter XI of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 491, 492, 494 and 509.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 490, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507 and 510, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 493: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 493, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with the initiation, operation, and administration of agricultural price support programs and no funds (other than funds for administrative expenses) available for price support, surplus removal, and available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), with respect to agricultural commodities shall be subject to apportionment pursuant to this section."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 508: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 508, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "Sec. 1114. Appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations and reauthorizations made by this Act for departments and agencies in the executive branch of the government shall, without impairing national defense, be reduced in the amount of not less than \$550,000,000 through the apportionment procedure provided for in Section 1111 of this Act."; and the Senate agree to the same.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. MCGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES
(except amendment
508),

CHAN GURNEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to Chapter XI of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

SECTION 1111

Amendment No. 490: Adds clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 491 and 492: Reinstates language of the House relating to reserves to be established in apportionment of funds.

Amendment No. 493: Provides that funds available for price support programs and available under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act shall not be subject to apportionment.

Amendment No. 494: Strikes out a proposal of the Senate to exempt appropriations for transportation of mail from apportionment.

Amendments Nos. 495 and 496: Add clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 497: Exempts funds under Titles I, IV, and X of the Social Security Act from apportionment.

Amendments Nos. 498 and 499: Exempt funds of the House, Senate, and Architect of the Capitol from apportionment.

Amendments Nos. 500, 501, 502, and 503: Add clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

SECTION 1112

Amendments Nos. 504, 505, 506, and 507: Limit the annual leave provision to civilian employees, extend the limiting date to June 30, 1951, includes the District of Columbia government within the provision and exempts personnel inducted into military service, all as proposed by the Senate.

SECTION 1114

Amendment No. 508: Provides for reduction of \$550,000,000 in appropriations and authorizations carried in the bill.

SECTION 1115

Amendment No. 509: Strikes out a provision proposed by the Senate to limit the price paid for typewriters in view of the fact a similar provision had been included in Chapter VIII of the bill.

SECTION 1116

Amendment No. 510: Prohibits, as proposed by the Senate, payment of retired military personnel who engaged in selling supplies to the Government.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
E. H. HEDRICK,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
C. C. MCGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
KARL STEFAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks on two subjects.)

[Mr. HOLIFIELD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. MITCHELL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

KICK RED RUSSIA OUT OF UN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, are we going to let Communist Russia wreck the UN, and with it any hopes for collective action to halt aggression anywhere and at any time? That is exactly what the conspirators at the Kremlin have been trying to do ever since the UN organization was established. Better to kick them out and keep them out until they demonstrate by their actions that they have abandoned forever their mad dreams of world conquest.

When we alone possessed the A-bomb, we came forward with a plan for inspection and control, to be administered by the UN, which would protect all nations from this terrible weapon. Why did Russia refuse? Because the fanatics of the Politburo were looking forward to the day when they would also have this weapon in superior quality, which they would then use to blackmail or crush all other nations into submission.

Why have the Russians taken so many walks?

Why have they used the paralyzing power of the veto more than 40 times?

All the evidence is in, and from it we draw certain, inescapable conclusions.

Russia is a totalitarian state, with a total disregard of the rights of other states.

It is now clear that her purpose in joining the UN was not to cooperate but to sabotage.

The Russians will not play ball in this league, unless they are permitted to win every game.

It is only on rare occasions, such as the time the Russians were absent and the United States took concerted action to condemn and oppose the invasion of South Korea that the UN has been able to make any progress.

All other steps to halt Russian expansionism have been undertaken on the initiative of the United States and with the cooperation of some other nations. These effective measures could not have been put into operation through the instrumentality of the United Nations because the Russians would have vetoed such action.

I say, therefore, that the UN itself is in danger as long as the present regime in Russia is permitted to represent that country in the United Nations.

It is the bull in the china shop of diplomacy, and this metaphor is open to several interpretations.

Foremost is the fact that the UN will degenerate into a sounding board of echoes, incapable of service to the cause of peace until it cleans its house of the wrecker known as red Russia.

After exercising every forbearance, after giving the Soviet Union every opportunity to mend its ways, we find it openly contemptuous of all those civilized standards of behavior among na-

tions that are honestly trying to stop aggression.

Why are we sacrificing our young men in Korea?

Why are we diverting so much money and effort to defense in a way that will call for sacrifices from all of us?

Everyone knows that the answer is the clear and present danger from red Russian imperialism.

Why, then, are our leaders so timid in calling this menace by its true name?

Why do they honor with debate, in the Security Council, that nation whose avowed purpose is to destroy us?

Diplomacy has its cherished fictions, but none more tragic than this hope, this illusion, that somehow communism will reform or collapse.

I would like to see the Communists repent sincerely or be cast out by the Russian people, but to anticipate either is beyond the most wishful of thinking.

We are faced with an ugly and perilous fact that must be dealt with courageously.

Russia has walked out of the UN before as a threat to the UN.

This time it must be ejected on the UN's terms.

The motley crew of Communist sympathizers, fellow travelers, confused idealists, and the faint of heart generally will wring their hands claiming that this will ruin the UN.

I say that such action will save it from ruin.

Without Red Russia we shall have the majority of nations in this world working together to build, not destroy, an international organization genuinely dedicated to peace. There is no place in such a body for any nation that engages in the cynical and deadly practice of undermining the security and the sovereignty of any other nation. Aggression is not limited to direct attack. Russia is employing the devious tactics of arming and encouraging satellites to attack a neighbor or by the expedient of boring from within. Stripped of their deceptions, the world recognizes these evasive maneuvers for what they really are, definite acts of aggression.

I am not advocating a preventive war against Communist Russia.

But I share the rising tide of resentment felt by most people who have observed the deliberate and arrogant sabotage of the UN by a succession of delegates from Moscow, even as the Politburo, with an ill-concealed hand, is stirring up trouble all over the globe.

The UN must be saved from slow strangulation. Free it from the grip of Stalin's agents who would destroy it by every throttling pressure from veto to filibuster, to a twisting of every fact, and deliberate suffocation by lies and propaganda.

The time has come for us to seize the initiative and put an end to such lawlessness.

I believe that this Congress should pass a resolution of censure against the leaders of the Soviet Union.

And I further propose that our delegates to the United Nations be instructed to take action leading to the disqualification of the Soviet Union as a member of the UN because the Soviet Government has forfeited its right to par-

ticipate in the deliberations of the world assembly by its persistent sabotage of that organization.

The masters of Red Russia are the aggressors against all the people of this earth, including their own.

They must be banished from the United Nations before they ruin it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which were made by the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, Dr. A. FERNÓ-ISERN, on July 4, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that the Public Printer estimates the cost to be \$246.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] a speech that he made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business on September 1, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on the eleventh anniversary of the invasion of Poland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to further revise my remarks made on August 22, 1950, in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A6313 beginning with the word "people" in the last line of paragraph 6 in column 1, by adding: "I think potatoes and some other highly perishable vegetables should not have the benefit of any support prices."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two

instances and include appropriate material.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter to the New York Times.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a newspaper article.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1192. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2324. An act for the relief of Maria Balsam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2648. An act for the relief of Carlo Fava; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2922. An act for the relief of Chieko Murata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3018. An act for the relief of W. F. Stelner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3037. An act for the relief of Nicholas Yialouris (also known as Nicholas Gialouris or Nicolaos Gialouris or Nick Yialouris); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3121. An act for the relief of Mario Juan Blas Besso-Pianetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3136. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the town of Mills, Wyo., a sewage system located in such town; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 3250. An act for the relief of Marne Post No. 28, American Legion, New Martinsville, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3254. An act to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration Hospital at Buffalo, N. Y., as the Buffalo Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 3321. An act for the relief of Zena (Zenobia) Symeonides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3434. An act for the relief of Mikiko Anzai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3546. An act to extend the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 3672. An act to amend section 3 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make the exclusion from such act of temporary employees of the Senate and House of Representatives inapplicable to such employees with one or more years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3768. An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 3807. An act to authorize the President to appoint Col. Henry A. Byroade as Director of the Bureau of German Affairs, Department of State, without affecting his military status and perquisites; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3910. An act relating to the assignment of surplus clerks in the Postal Transportation Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3917. An act for the relief of Basilio Gorgone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3965. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

81ST CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. CON. RES. 272

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 25, 1950

Mr. CANNON submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

- 1 *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate*
- 2 *concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives*
- 3 *in the enrollment of H. R. 7786, the General Appropriation*
- 4 *Bill, 1951, is authorized and directed to correct chapter and*
- 5 *section numbers.*

81ST CONGRESS
2^D Session

H. CON. RES. 272

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Authorizing correction of chapter and section numbers in the enrollment of H. R. 7786.

By Mr. CANNON

AUGUST 25, 1950

Considered and agreed to

member patrons on some basis related to their sales to or purchases from the corporation during the taxable year, if (A) the allocation or distribution is conditional (1) upon profits or margins being earned by the corporation from all its operations or a class of its operations during its fiscal year, or (2) upon income attributable to the resale of the producer's product along with products or a class or classes of products of some other producers less any deductions determination of which is within the discretion of the corporation, or (B) the amount of the allocation or distribution can be determined only with reference to the amount of the profits, margins, or income earned, or (C) the amount of the allocation or distribution can be determined only after declaration or payment of dividends on any class of stock of the corporation or only after the fixing of sums to be transferred to capital, reserves, or surplus.

"(6) Member of cooperative corporation: For the purposes of this chapter, a person shall be considered a member of a cooperative corporation only if such person is entitled to exercise voting rights and meets such requirements for membership as are prescribed by the cooperative."

"(c) Information returns required of cooperatives: The Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting between section 148 and 149 a new section as follows:

"Sec. 148A. Information by cooperatives.

"(a) Payments of patronage dividends, refunds, or rebates: Every association organized and operated as a cooperative shall, when required by the Commissioner, render a correct return, duly verified under oath, of its payments of patronage dividends, rebates, or refunds, stating the name and address of each member in the association, and the amount of payments paid to each member and patron.

"(b) Accumulated earnings and profits: When requested by the Commissioner, every association organized and operated as a cooperative shall forward to him a correct statement of accumulated earnings and profits, including patronage dividends, rebates, or refunds allocated to, but not paid in cash to, members and patrons, and the names and addresses of members and patrons who would be entitled to the same if divided or distributed, and the amounts that would be payable to each."

"(d) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments and repeals made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after June 30, 1950."

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON APPROPRIATION BILL ON MONDAY

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], when he intends to bring up the conference report on the omnibus appropriation bill?

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, it is a privileged matter. If there is no objection, I see no reason why we cannot bring it up right away.

Mr. WHERRY. I would appreciate it if it were brought up on Monday. There are several Senators whom I should like to see on the floor when the report is brought up for consideration.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Georgia if he is willing to agree that we take up the conference report on the appropriation bill on Mon-

day. I think consideration of it will require only a few moments. I have been assured by the leaders that it will take only a short time. If it takes any considerable amount of time, we can defer action on it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it is a privileged matter.

Mr. McKellar. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Why can we not act upon it now?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it would be perfectly agreeable to the junior Senator from Nebraska to have the Senate act upon it now; but, several Senators are not now on the Senate floor who should be here when discussion is had of the report. I am not sure that they can be brought back to the floor so late in a Friday session. While I am in total agreement with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee that consideration of the report will not take much time, I believe we should defer action until Monday, unless the Senator should wish to ask for a quorum call and get the absent Senators back to the Chamber.

Mr. GEORGE. No, Mr. President, I would not ask for a quorum call this late in the afternoon.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McKellar. As the Senator knows, there are 11 chapters to the bill. There were subcommittees which dealt with each chapter, and the chairmen of those subcommittees ought to be present. I think they should be notified before we proceed to consider the report. In my judgment it will be impossible to notify all of them so they can be here this afternoon.

Mr. GEORGE. I am merely apprehensive that we may get into a long discussion of the budget on Monday.

Mr. McKellar. I hope not.

Mr. GEORGE. But, of course, the conference report is a privileged matter, and I shall yield to the Senator from Tennessee to bring it up.

Mr. McKellar. That is very kind of the Senator. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets on Monday the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consideration of the conference report on the omnibus appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am submitting a concurrent resolution providing that there be a thorough investigation of the entire Federal judiciary. If the facts in the Bridges case are as they have been stated to me, Judges William Orr and William Healy should be impeached and thrown out of office. If on the other hand, the facts are otherwise, those judges should be retained. During the last 18 years there have been appointed too many judges who have

simply been politicians, some of them utterly devoid of the attributes of a good, fair, honest judge. Some of them were members of subversive organizations before they were appointed. Others have simply been political hacks with enough influence to be appointed and confirmed. Certainly all of us are familiar with one case, argued upon this floor, which stinks to high heaven. Also, we should find out whether judges who are not even citizens of the United States have been appointed. If there are any judges who, while our boys are dying on the field of battle, to protect the skins of all our people, are sympathizers with Russian communism, the quicker this committee, to be composed of representatives of the House and Senate, finds that out and the quicker steps are taken to impeach and get rid of all judges of that sort, the better.

I hope, Mr. President, that we may have prompt action on this concurrent resolution, and that sufficient money be given to the committee so that a fair, honest, impartial, and thorough investigation can be made immediately, because I believe that the people of the United States are entitled to have on the bench good, fair, honest, capable judges who believe in the American system of government.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 103), submitted by Mr. LANGER, was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee of six be appointed, three by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and three by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House, to make a thorough investigation of the entire Federal judiciary with a view to ascertaining whether any of the Federal judges are Communists, sympathizers of Russian communism, believers in Marxism system of government, members of subversive organizations, whether they are real Americans and citizens of the United States, and still fit, because of age or otherwise, to properly conduct their duties as Federal judges of the United States Government, with full authority to recommend impeachment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now call attention to an article entitled "Court Rules 2 to 1—Bridges Free—Prosecutor Says 'God Help America'—Will Quit." The article appears on the front page of today's issue of the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGES FREE—PROSECUTOR SAYS "GOD HELP AMERICA"—WILL QUIT

SAN FRANCISCO, August 24.—CIO Longshore Leader Harry Bridges today was ordered freed in \$25,000 bail pending his appeal on a perjury conviction, and in Washington the Government's special prosecutor who had handled the Bridges' case, F. Joseph Donohue, announced he would resign Friday.

He would not amplify his remarks except to say:

"God help America."

The \$25,000 bail was the amount Australia-born Bridges had furnished while awaiting decision on his appeal from a Federal Court conviction and sentence of 5 years' imprisonment on August 5.

He was convicted in April of perjury and conspiracy to defraud at the time he obtained his United States citizenship in 1945. A jury found he lied when he swore he was not a member of the Communist Party.

Bridges will be freed after papers in the case are signed at 10 a. m. Friday.

In a 2 to 1 ruling the Court of Appeals held that the Government's effort to jail Bridges was "novel and startling."

Voting for Bridges' release on bail were Judges William E. Orr and William Healy. Judge Clifton Mathews dissented.

"It is our purpose neither to minimize, on the one hand, nor to exaggerate, on the other, the possible implications of Bridges' utterances as disclosed in the Government showing," the majority opinion said.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a marked portion of page 19 of the hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary, on September 27, 1949, on the nomination of Judge Minton.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From 1900 to 1909 there were seven Republicans and two Democrats on the Supreme Court. From 1910 to 1916 there were six Republicans and three Democrats. From 1917 to 1921 there were five Republicans and four Democrats. From 1922 to 1932 there were six Republicans and three Democrats. From 1933 to 1937 there were five Republicans and four Democrats. In 1938 there were four Republicans and five Democrats. In 1939 and 1940 there were three Republicans and six Democrats. From 1941 to 1946 there were two Republicans and seven Democrats, and for the last 3 years there has been one Republican and eight Democrats. That just shows that we are losing the equitable balance by continually receiving what somebody has termed "appointment of government by cronies."

Senator FERGUSON. The last three appointments were all Democrats.

Senator JENNER. And the picture is much worse than that. That is referring only to the Supreme Court. When you get into the breakdown of actual judges, Mr. Truman has carried on the Roosevelt tradition of appointing political partisans to the bench, and of the 192 Federal judges appointed since 1933, up to date, 184 of the 192 have been Democrats, and only 8 Republicans.

PROTECTION OF INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES—PERMISSION TO SUBMIT MINORITY VIEWS DURING RECESS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for permission for myself and some of my colleagues to file with the clerk of the Senate minority views on the so-called McCarran bill, Senate bill 4037, to protect the internal security of the United States, and for other purposes. It is the so-called anti-Communist bill, which now is on the Senate Calendar.

The reason for making this request is in order that the minority views may be submitted and printed. The delay in submitting them arises from the fact that we were unable to obtain the majority report on the bill until so late that we shall not be able to complete the minority views until tomorrow.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the minority views may be filed tomorrow, during the recess of the Senate, if the Senate is not in session at that time, in order that the minority views may be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks in reference to the pending railway case.

As the Senate knows, the press ticker has informed us this afternoon that the President of the United States has issued an order seizing the railroads of the country at 5 p. m. next Sunday and placing their operation, or token operation, under the Army.

I think the action of the President is a great mistake and an unfortunate precedent to establish in this national emergency. I do not think it should have occurred until all other possible procedures for settlement of the case had been completely exhausted. I most respectfully say that I do not think all possible procedures had been exhausted.

I happen to be one who believes that labor disputes should be kept away from the White House if there is any possible way of doing so. I think labor disputes in this country should be settled by procedures and machinery outside of the White House except in those rare instances when no other course is available. However, judging from the past experience we have had I recognize that there are rare emergency occasions when it becomes necessary for the President of the United States to take jurisdiction of the case. Nevertheless, when that is done, I think it is very important that before the President takes any so-called enforcement action in respect to the dispute—and seizure is that kind of action—the White House should hand down a decision in accordance with what it thinks a fair settlement of the dispute should be. I think the American people are entitled to know that. I think the American people are entitled to know the facts about any labor dispute which results in action as drastic and significant as is the action taken today by the President of the United States in the railway case.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think it is very important that labor and industry recognize that whenever a case goes to the White House it is to be expected that the White House will finally render on that case a decision in behalf of the American people. Under such circumstances it is to be expected that the White House will make clear to both sides to the dispute that their failure to settle the case by the peaceful procedures which are available to them is not going to stop their Government at the executive level from calling upon them, as the last step in the case, to abide by a fair decision in respect to the issues.

That has not been done in this case, Mr. President, and that is why I think the order of seizure is a very bad precedent.

Let us consider some of the steps in this case. I shall not pass judgment on

the merits of the respective positions of the parties on the various issues, because I have not studied the record. Nevertheless, all of us are familiar with some of the steps of procedure which have been followed in this case. We know that the dispute is of many months' standing—in fact, some 17 months. We know that it involves wages and conditions of employment. We know that an emergency board's report was handed down on those issues, and we know that the brotherhoods—for their own reasons, and I am not going to pass judgment on the propriety of their reasons—refused to accept the recommendations of the Emergency Board. They had a right, under the law, to refuse to accept those recommendations; and that refusal on their part came prior to the Korean war.

Under the Railway Labor Act they were entitled to 30 days for further negotiations, after their refusal to accept the recommendations of the Emergency Board. The history of the Railway Labor Act, its spirit and intent—yes, its very language—leaves no room for doubt that it was planned under that act that if during the so-called cooling-off period of 30 days following the issuance of an Emergency Board's report the parties could not negotiate a settlement between them, either side would then be free to resort to economic action by way either of a strike or a lock-out.

In this case, the brotherhoods made perfectly clear that they would not accept those recommendations. Again I am not going to render a judgment here this afternoon on the wisdom of their decision. I only wish to point out that they had the right to reach that conclusion if they wanted to. They would have had a right to strike under the Railway Labor Act. Then a new condition developed which did not exist during the 17 months of negotiations on this case. It was a condition which was not in the picture when the Emergency Board held its hearings and made its recommendations. That new condition was the outbreak of the Korean war. In my judgment, Mr. President, that changed things materially. It placed new obligations, I think, on both parties to the dispute. Those obligations are great moral obligations, great patriotic obligations. I think as the result of the outbreak of the Korean war both sides owed a duty to the American people to reach a settlement by way of the peaceful procedures of mediation and conciliation. They did not do it. A strike was threatened, and then the brotherhoods—and I want to be very careful to understate this situation, but by way of that understatement, nevertheless, to report it accurately—I think it is an understatement to say that at that point the brotherhoods sent to the President of the United States a telegram which made very clear that if the case were not settled on a basis which they considered to be fair, and if the President of the United States did not order the railroads seized by the Government, they would call a strike. I think, by way of interpretation of their message to the White House it is fair to say that they had the right to

ROSETTE SELINA ROMANO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7095) for the relief of Rosette Selina Romano, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Rosette Selina Romano, native and citizen of Italy, shall be considered to be the native-born daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Antonio Romano, United States citizens.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "native-born daughter" and insert "alien natural-born child."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH UMBERTO MONTALBAN-TROY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8136) for the relief of Joseph Umberto Montalban-Troy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Joseph Umberto Montalban-Troy, of Boise, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of \$10 and the head tax of \$8.

Sec. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the non-preference category of the first available Canadian immigration quota.

Sec. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the said Joseph Umberto Montalban-Troy may be naturalized as a citizen of the United States by taking the oath of allegiance, in the manner prescribed in the naturalization laws, before any court having jurisdiction of the naturalization of aliens.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "visa fee of \$10 and the head tax of \$8" and insert "required visa fee and head tax."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "Canadian."

Page 2, line 3, after the word "quota" insert "for Italy."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. OLGA KOWALIK AND CZESLAWA KOWALIK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9144) for the relief of Mrs. Olga Kowalik and Czeslawa Kowalik.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of the immigration laws prescribing annual quotas, the aliens Mrs. Olga Kowalik and Czeslawa Kowalik shall be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. Upon the admission of such aliens to the United States for permanent residence, the Secretary of

State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to make appropriate deduction of two numbers from the quota for Poland.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, notwithstanding the residence requirements of paragraph (1) of subsection 2 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1951), Mrs. Olga Kowalik and her daughter, Czeslawa Kowalik, residing at a Polish refugee camp located at Tengerum Arusha, Tanganyika, East Africa, shall be deemed to be eligible displaced persons as defined in section 2 (c) of the said act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTINA SHALFIEFF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9434) for the relief of Christina Shalfeiff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Christina Shalfeiff shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Private Calendar.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 24, 1950.)

Mr. TABER (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman of our committee if it would not be possible to agree to dispense with the further reading of the statement at this time. It has been printed in the RECORD and is available to all Members. It is almost impossible for the Members to hear as the Clerk reads, and I do not see that it serves any useful purpose to have it read now.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur in the suggestion of the gentleman from New York, and in view of the fact that the conference report has been

printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for this morning, and that the reading of it at this time would merely consume time unnecessarily, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this bill contain any funds for the arming of the North Atlantic Pact nations?

Mr. CANNON. There is \$1,200,000,000.

Mr. TABER. That is \$1,600,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. Four hundred million dollars of it is for the liquidation of contracts. The principal amount for that purpose is carried in the deficiency bill which will follow the conference report.

Mr. RICH. But you do have in this bill \$1,600,000,000 for the arming of these North Atlantic Pact nations?

Mr. CANNON. It is \$1,200,000,000. Four hundred million dollars is for the liquidation of contracts.

Mr. RICH. Several days ago we made a request on the floor of the House that any bill which came back here for our own support should not contain any money for the arming of these North Atlantic Pact nations. I just want you to know it makes no difference what is in the bill—I am against it, because I believe in principle that that is the wrong thing. If we are going to get peace in this world, you cannot do it by arming everybody. I just want you to know that.

Mr. CANNON. I am certain this conference report meets with the warm approval of my friend from Pennsylvania, because it effects unprecedented retrenchments.

Mr. RICH. No, it cannot meet with my approval, because neither the committee nor anybody should bring a bill here which is to arm ourselves and for the support of the departments of Government, and contain gifts which go to arm any foreign country. I am against it to the nth degree and I want you to know it.

Mr. CANNON. When we have friends and depend upon them to help us, it is imperative that we see that they have in their hands the implements with which to make that help effective.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some information on this civil functions section of the bill. The appropriation, as I understand it, was increased from \$185,878,000 to \$221,244,500, is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. The budget estimate for that chapter was \$334,857,500. It passed the House with a drastic reduction to the sum of \$630,820,000. The Senate raised it to \$763,464,620. But in conference we again reduced it to \$687,043,270, which is \$147,000,000 less than the budget and \$56,000,000 less than the Senate figures.

Mr. RANKIN. What page is that on?

Mr. CANNON. I am reading from a tabulation which I will include with my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. I am looking at the bill. It seems to me these bills ought to be so written that the Members of Congress could examine them and find out what is in them.

Mr. CANNON. It is written as they have always been written.

Mr. RANKIN. No; it is not, anything of the kind.

Mr. CANNON. It is written precisely as such bills have always been written. Furthermore it is accompanied by a report and a statement by the House managers. I trust the gentleman will find time to peruse the bill and the report and we will have additional tabulations in the RECORD for further analysis.

Mr. RANKIN. You have this amendment No. 383 under civil functions, which, as I understand it, gives the administration the right to use this money on any projects which have been approved by the Congress, is that right?

Mr. CANNON. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. That includes the Tennessee-Tombigbee, and also the Demopolis Dam, does it not?

Mr. CANNON. The President must certify that all projects are essential to national defense before he can spend money on them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker we present here the most complete and comprehensive résumé of annual Federal expenditures ever presented at one time since the adoption of the budgetary system.

The estimate submitted to the Congress by the President for the entire operation of the Government for the fiscal year 1951 aggregated \$38,452,358,148. We submit a conference report today providing \$36,153,490,425. In other words, the conference report which we submit today, notwithstanding the fact that we are unexpectedly at war, is \$2,288,867,723 below the budget estimates, an unprecedented reduction in a war budget.

Summarizing the whole fiscal situation, Mr. Speaker, we provide in this

general appropriation bill for expenditures of \$36,153,490,425; we carry in the deficiency appropriation bill, reported yesterday, and which we hope to take up in the House today, \$16,771,184,479. These two bills with the permanent appropriations of \$6,557,462,804 which, under the statutes are automatic, including such items as interest on the national debt, aggregate \$59,482,037,708. In brief, we are spending for the fiscal year for all purposes, as projected at this date, a total budget of \$59,482,037,708, or in round figures, \$60,000,000,000.

At this point I shall insert in the RECORD comparative tables indicating House and Senate action and agreements in conference in relation to the budget estimates:

Comparison of conference agreement with budget estimates

	Budget estimate	Conference agreement	Difference
Appropriations.....	\$35,581,208,648	\$33,934,345,425	-\$1,646,863,223
Contract authority.....	2,261,149,500	2,170,145,000	-91,004,500
Borrowing authority.....	610,000,000	599,000,000	-11,000,000
Total.....	38,452,358,148	36,703,490,425	-1,748,867,723
General reduction.....		-550,000,000	-550,000,000
Net total.....	38,452,358,148	36,153,490,425	-2,298,867,723

Appropriations, 1951

	Budget estimate	Passed by House	Passed by Senate	Conference	Conference as compared with budget	Conference as compared with House	Conference as compared with Senate
Chapter I. District.....	\$12,000,000	\$10,800,000	\$12,000,000	\$10,800,000	-\$1,200,000	-\$1,200,000	-\$1,200,000
Chapter II. Legislative.....	87,820,747	56,322,450	69,308,211	69,180,211	-18,640,536	+\$12,857,761	-128,000
Chapter III. State, Justice.....	1,185,612,897	1,110,870,462	1,066,260,732	1,065,627,962	-119,984,935	-45,242,500	-632,770
Chapter IV. Treasury, Post Office.....	2,813,379,100	2,754,105,000	2,760,305,360	2,757,846,000	-55,533,100	+\$3,741,000	-2,459,360
Chapter V. Labor, Federal Security.....	2,463,008,500	2,271,099,614	2,276,942,274	2,272,428,614	-190,579,886	+\$1,329,000	-4,413,660
Chapter VI. Agriculture.....	810,626,946	764,032,701	780,336,504	773,208,924	-37,418,022	+\$9,176,223	-7,127,580
Chapter VII. Interior.....	674,971,505	622,134,130	617,061,433	620,396,325	-54,575,180	-\$1,737,805	-\$3,334,892
Chapter VIII. Independent offices.....	8,466,982,724	8,021,827,007	8,018,289,977	7,996,140,947	-470,841,777	-25,686,060	-22,149,030
Chapter IX. Civil functions.....	834,867,500	630,820,000	763,464,620	687,043,270	-147,824,230	+\$6,222,870	-76,421,750
Chapter X. Defense.....	13,376,865,000	12,910,702,390	13,294,581,821	13,294,299,443	-82,565,557	+\$383,597,143	-282,378
Chapter XI. Foreign aid.....	4,855,073,729		4,599,873,729	4,387,373,729	-467,700,000	4,387,373,729	-212,500,000
Total.....	35,581,208,648	29,152,713,664	34,258,324,661	33,934,345,425	-1,646,863,223	+\$4,781,631,761	-323,979,236

Bill as passed House, \$29,152,713,664; estimates not considered by House, +\$5,248,427,480; total, \$34,401,141,144, conference total, \$33,922,445,425, difference, -\$478,695,719.

Contract authorizations

	Budget estimate	Passed by House	Passed by Senate	Conference	Conference as compared with budget	Conference as compared with House	Conference as compared with Senate
Chapter I. District.....							
Chapter II. Legislative.....							
Chapter III. State, Justice.....	\$91,036,500	\$58,786,500	\$69,650,000	\$62,325,000	-\$28,711,500	+\$3,538,500	-\$7,325,000
Chapter IV. Treasury, Post Office.....							
Chapter V. Labor, Federal Security.....	161,211,000	154,288,000	154,288,000	154,288,000	-6,923,000		
Chapter VI. Agriculture.....							
Chapter VII. Interior.....	44,750,000	38,250,000	37,870,000	36,230,000	-8,520,000	-2,020,000	-1,640,000
Chapter VIII. Independent Offices.....	578,367,000	510,517,000	537,017,000	531,517,000	-46,850,000	+\$21,000,000	-5,500,000
Chapter IX. Civil functions.....							
Chapter X. Defense.....	1,385,785,000	1,385,785,000	1,385,785,000	1,385,785,000			
Chapter XI. Foreign aid.....							
Total.....	2,261,149,500	2,147,626,000	2,184,610,000	2,170,145,000	-91,004,500	+\$22,518,500	-14,465,000

Bill as passed the House, \$2,147,626,500; estimates not considered by the House, \$300,000,000; total, \$2,447,626,500; conference amount, \$2,170,145,000; difference, \$277,481,500.

Borrowing authority

	Budget estimate	Passed by House	Passed by Senate	Conference	Conference as compared with budget	Conference as compared with House	Conference as compared with Senate
Chapter VI. Agriculture.....	\$610,000,000	\$520,350,000	\$550,350,000	\$536,500,000	-\$73,500,000	+\$16,150,000	-\$14,036,000
Chapter X-B. Foreign aid.....			100,000,000	62,500,000	+\$62,500,000	+\$62,500,000	-37,506,000
Total.....	610,000,000	520,350,000	650,350,000	599,000,000	-11,000,000	+\$78,650,000	-51,536,000

Due to the fact that we are now engaged in a war which is taxing our resources, and which necessarily disorganizes routine and requires complete readjustment of all budgetary processes, it is impossible to draw didactic comparisons with former years or budgets.

It is to be noted, however, that in one respect this is one of the most extraordinary conference reports ever submitted to the House in the fiscal history of the Nation, in that it reflects the most complete agreement between the two Houses ever reported on the annual supply bills since the adoption of the budgetary system.

This voluminous bill, consisting of nearly 500 pages, embracing expenditures for every branch of the Federal Government, comprising thousands of items, provides for the operation of the Government in both peace and war. The House and the Senate conferees have reached complete agreement upon every item with the exception of one small provision. No record of such complete agreement between House and Senate managers and between the two Houses is to be found in the previous annals of the committee or the Congress.

Of course, we bring back to the House in technical disagreement those items which under the rules cannot be included in a conference report but must be submitted for a separate vote, but on all of them there was complete accord by the several committees of conference.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the one item in disagreement?

Mr. CANNON. The \$130,000 which the other body inserted in the bill for the Bird Dog Committee which both Houses agreed should be liquidated at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and which they now attempt to continue regardless of the agreement. It is all the more unjustifiable and untenable because it attempts to support a joint committee with expenditures from the contingent fund of one House—characterized by their own majority leader as an absurd proposal.

With that single exception there is complete agreement of the managers on the part of the two Houses on every item in the omnibus bill.

Incidentally less time was spent in actual conference between the two Houses on this bill than has been spent in conference on the annual supply bills within the recollection of the committee staff.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. On page 212 of the bill there is provided \$350,000,000 for rural electrification. That is right, is it not?

Mr. CANNON. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. And also \$40,000,000 for the rural telephone program.

Mr. CANNON. Thirty-two million five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. RANKIN. Thirty-two million five hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. CANNON. Yes. The House figure on that, as the gentleman will note on page 212, amendment No. 221, if he

has the bill with the Senate amendments before him, was \$25,000,000. The Senate increased the figure to \$40,000,000. In conference we agreed upon \$32,500,000.

Mr. RANKIN. There is no restriction in this bill on these rural power associations' building steam plants where necessary, is there?

Mr. CANNON. None whatever. On the contrary, we included in the bill, both in the chapter on Agricultural appropriations and the chapter on Interior appropriations, explicit provision nullifying any effort on the part of reports to the other body to establish restrictions.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further at that point?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. There was some question that generating plants could be established only when it could show that the co-ops could not obtain power at a reasonable cost elsewhere. The other body attempted to put that language in. That has been stricken; is that right?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman read the statement of the managers on amendment No. 221, he will find a complete exposition of that subject. The language to which the gentleman referred was included in the committee report to the other body, but in conference we adopted language which so clarifies the situation that there is no possibility of any interpretation which could be construed as limitation.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. This language, then, will let the Administrator decide that question of reasonable rates.

Mr. CANNON. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. That also applies to the construction of transmission lines, does it not?

Mr. CANNON. That is true.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there are two features of this conference report which may be especially noted. In the consideration of estimates of appropriations for the support of the defense program, for the prosecution of the war, both committees, meeting separately and meeting in conference, resolved every doubt in favor of liberality and adequacy on war expenditures and preparations for national defense.

On the other hand, just as insistently, if not more so, the committee attempted to resolve every doubt on nondefense items against the proposed expenditure. And I am but relating the circumstances when I say that every nickel of the \$2,300,000,000 which we saved through reduction of appropriations is stained with blood and sweat, because we had to fight to hold it from the clutch of voracious interests which sought to spend it, and more, on nondefense projects, which could make no possible contribution to the winnings of the war or the avoidance of future wars.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I will take five additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The country is in the gravest danger. That is the unanimous opinion of the military authorities. We are today in danger not merely of war, but of extermination. We carry the largest debt men ever dreamed of and we face the heaviest expenditure ever required of a nation. In addition to that our national revenues are declining. For the fiscal year ending June 30 last, the Federal Government collected in revenues \$1,500,000,000 plus, less than collected the previous year.

At the same time the sale of Government bonds is declining. For the last month more bonds were cashed than were sold. So in time of great national danger, with declining revenues, with mounting expenditures, increasing difficulty in floating Government loans, there are interests in the country which insist on spending money for unnecessary nondefense purposes. They fought bitterly to the last ditch for expenditures which even if we had no debt and if we were not at war would be unwarranted. With the debt which we are carrying and with the war which we are now waging, and with the possibility of other and more terrible wars in the future, we barely saved \$2,000,000,000. It is to be hoped that the Nation will realize that we cannot have business as usual or politics as usual—that all must sacrifice and lessen the pressure on Congress for projects which can be eliminated or deferred.

Mr. Speaker, may I add that it is fortunate that we were proceeding this year under the one-package appropriation bill. Had we not had the omnibus appropriation bill this year—had we been reporting out every week or two separate supply bills, most of them would have become law months ago and the programs they implemented would have been in effect long before the war opened. But with all appropriations in one bill, we were in position to readjust plans and expenditures to meet the changed conditions thrust upon us by the war. As it is, every expenditure has been reconsidered and readjusted. All plans and programs have been brought down to date. The funds which under the old system would have already been spent and committed to peacetime purposes and conditions are now available for the needs of the day and the hour. The omnibus appropriation bill is one of the few fortuitous features of this unhappy war.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us the conference report on the general appropriation bill. I am not going to do much more than to describe some of the major items that are involved and to perhaps answer any questions that may be raised with reference to them.

There is complete agreement on most items with reference to amount. There are three or four items in disagreement that will probably require some little

discussion, although I do not think that it should take too long.

As far as the regular departments are concerned, the only items where I was particularly disappointed in the result were the Agricultural chapter and the Department of the Interior chapter where too often the high figure of either House or Senate has been taken. This resulted in those chapters being away above the highest figures in almost every case. But in most of the other chapters we did reasonably well.

In connection with the items at the end of the bill, which were put in by the Senate, it was necessary to yield to the Senate on most of the items relating to the military because of the war situation. In connection with the items relating to foreign relief, the conference reports back an agreement upon \$2,250,000,000 for ECA. That is a very liberal figure, but, everything considered, I think we should be glad we were able to get a \$200,000,000 reduction from the Senate figure.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman might state that there was an effort to reduce that more than we did.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. We reserved some of it.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. Of course, there is a situation there that is very distressing. In yesterday's Times-Herald there was an article which I think would be profitable for the House to read. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert the article at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. The article reads as follows:

MARSHALL PLAN PRESS AGENTS GIVEN FREE VISITS TO EUROPE
(By Philip Wardin)

Young Americans can join the Navy and see the world through a porthole but if they prefer luxury they can become Marshall plan press agents at a good salary and see the world first class, with expenses paid by the taxpayers.

A survey reveals that the Economic Cooperation Administration information office has been giving several of its employees free visits to Europe and the Middle East this summer.

Robert Mullen, director of ECA information, left yesterday on a tour of Europe. He originally mapped a \$7,500 round-the-world trip, but later postponed part of it—a visit to the Orient—until fall.

Mullen has sent an heiress to the J. P. Morgan banking fortune to London for a convention of clubwomen—to get new propaganda material on the Marshall plan to influence American clubwomen.

He sent an inexperienced youth, hired as a "picture expert" tripping to Paris and London to see the sights and get new pictures for propaganda purposes here.

Despite the fact that ECA now has 73 American press employees in Paris alone and 56 more in the various 16 Marshall plan missions in Europe plus 222 Europeans on these staffs, ECA sent a former woman reporter to

Paris last week to get "human interest" stories for a clubwoman propaganda pamphlet.

Although the ECA press information office in Paris has a chief who gets about \$20,000 a year in salary and expense money, and has a large number of highly paid former reporters on his staff, the ECA here sent a man from Washington to show a group of editors about Europe.

Several others from the Washington Office have gone to Europe this summer on similar assignments.

Mullen now has 48 persons on his Washington staff drawing salaries totaling \$280,000 a year. Among these are the Morgan heiress, an ex-bullfighter, the daughter of a famous symphony conductor, and a score of graduates from the defunct war agencies of World War II.

He recently separated a noted Negro World War II Air Force pilot who achieved some success as an author from his Washington staff and dispatched him to Formosa at \$15,000 a year to direct Marshall plan press information there.

The American press agents for ECA will draw \$673,000 in salaries this year.

Now, it is perfectly apparent that they can get along with much less money. They saved \$115,000,000 more out of last year's appropriation than they told us they would when they were before us on this side.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that newspaper article is a very good argument for the argument we have been making on the floor of this House time and time again that we, who are endeavoring to spread the truth about America throughout the world, should have one information service rather than having to scatter our shots in three or four different directions. We have three or four different information services from the United States, and unless we concentrate and coordinate this effort to tell the truth about our aims, you are going to have a situation like this happen right along and America will become the laughing stock of the world.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. On top of that extra balance that they had left, the expenditures for the fiscal year period down to a couple of days ago when I saw the Treasury statement, were running \$115,000,000 as against \$360,000,000 for the corresponding period a year ago. That indicates that a cutaway beyond the figure that I have named, and that has been made, would be justifiable. It indicates that there is considerable velvet in there.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Would the gentleman care to express his opinion as to the reduction in the amount of moneys to be accorded to the Franco government of Spain.

Mr. TABER. Well, that will come up for discussion separately when that amendment in disagreement is reached, and I would rather not spend my time on it now, because I do not have enough time to justify doing it in both places.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Will there be an explanation also of the cut in the point 4 funds?

Mr. TABER. Yes. The item was cut \$11,900,000, and that is in the conference report.

There are two or three other things that need explanation. In the first place, they could not possibly spend anywhere near the \$15,000,000 in addition to the \$8,000,000 that they have under the South America operation, and in the second place, the outfit operating in South America is bringing America into disrepute instead of creating good will in South America, and it was felt that a reduction of that kind would be helpful and would perhaps create a spirit of trying to do better instead of having a great lot of throw-away money without getting any results. The situation in South America has been very bad for a long time, and this other set-up is not even organized and in shape so that they can move in an intelligent way at all. I think that is about all I care to say on that.

The item for the children's fund was cut out. It was not authorized by law. Furthermore, that fund had \$24,000,000 remaining from last year. There seemed to be pretty general unanimity among the House conferees on that point.

There are a good many other items involved here. I believe I should spend a minute on the items with reference to chapter IX. That relates to rivers, harbors, and flood control. The rivers and harbors items were reduced \$22,000,000, or perhaps a little bit more, below the figure recommended by the other body. On flood control it is approximately \$54,000,000 below the Senate figure. In each case that is a little above the House figure, but it was a settlement because the engineers had reported that the President was going to impound all of that amount of \$74,000,000 anyway.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. Will the gentleman from New York explain under what conditions the new emergency flood control projects which were put in by amendment in the other body can get approval so that they may proceed with the work?

Mr. TABER. They must have a certification from the President of the United States that it is necessary for the war effort. That is the rule. I would not expect any project unless it were really necessary and would contribute in some way to the war effort, to be approved. That is our understanding.

Mr. GOLDEN. If a flood control project which protects railroad yards over which as much as 18 million tons of coal are shipped per year, and if it is shown that coal is used constantly in the defense program, do you think that sort of program might be approved?

Mr. TABER. Of course I would not be able to tell what the President would do, but that would be an element which I would consider very important to think about.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORAND). Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 254]

Bailey	Hall,	Pfeifer,
Barden	Edwin Arthur	Joseph L.
Barrett, Wyo.	Hall,	Pfeiffer,
Beall	Leonard W.	William L.
Biemiller	Halleck	Plumley
Blackney	Hand	Poulson
Boggs, La.	Hare	Powell
Bolling	Hébert	Quinn
Brehm	Hinshaw	Regan
Bulwinkle	Jacobs	Rivers
Burdick	Johnson	Sabath
Chatham	Kearney	Sadowski
Cole, N. Y.	Keefe	Scott,
Crawford	Klein	Hugh D., Jr.
Dawson	Kunkel	Smith, Kans.
Dingell	Latham	Smith, Ohio
Dondero	Lichtenwalter	Sutton
Eaton	McMillen, Ill.	Towe
Engel, Mich.	Martin, Iowa	Wadsworth
Fellows	Mason	Werdell
Furcolo	Miles	Williams
Gillette	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Tex.
Gilmer	Morrison	Winstead
Gore	Murray, Wis.	Withrow
Gregory	Norton	
Hagen	O'Neill	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARCANTONIO moves to recommit the conference report on H. R. 7786 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to incorporate in the conference report the following provision: At the end of chapter XI, titled "General Provisions," add the following:

"None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be paid to any person, firm, partnership, or corporation which refuses equality in employment to any person because of race, color, or creed."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the motion is not in order for two reasons: In the first place, the proposed instruc-

tions to the House managers incorporated in the motion propose action which is not within their province, they direct the managers on the part of the House to change the conference report, an action which can be taken only with the concurrence of the managers on the part of the Senate.

The second point is that the provision which the gentleman from New York seeks to add to the conference report does not appear in either the House bill or the Senate bill. It is therefore not in conference. It is not in difference between the two Houses. For either reason, the motion to recommit is not in order.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes, Mr. Speaker. As to the first point that has been raised, only the managers on the part of the House are directed by this motion to do certain things. This motion does not direct the managers on the part of the Senate. Therefore, if this motion were adopted, the House would not be going beyond its power or beyond its province. It would certainly be acting within its jurisdiction in instructing its own conferees.

The second question raised is whether or not this is a matter which can be discussed and taken up at a conference between the two Houses. The contention is made that this language was not contained in either one of the two bills. That is true, Mr. Speaker, but that is not the test to be applied. Assuming that these conferees had incorporated this language in the conference report, would the language then be subject to a point of order? Obviously not, because it would be germane. It would be language which both Houses had the power to incorporate. Therefore, the conference had the power to incorporate this language, and since the conferees had the power to incorporate this language, certainly the House has the power to instruct its own conferees to have this language incorporated.

What is more, Mr. Speaker, we are dealing here with a negative limitation. This is a limitation on funds which is something that the members of the conference can at any time put in a conference report. We have had conference reports here time and time again, particularly on appropriation bills, which contained limitations of various sorts, either a limitation of amount, or of scope, or of duties, and various other types of limitations, none of which had been either in the Senate or in the House bill. The precedents are ample on this point.

If the conferees could do it, why cannot the House ask the conferees to do it?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, would the Speaker permit a brief observation?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to make the observation that the conferees do not have the power to include in a bill something

which is not in conference. This subject was not in conference.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. Without passing on the first point raised by the gentleman from Missouri, the Chair will rule on the second point made by the gentleman from Missouri. The point of order is that this matter was not incorporated in the bill when it passed the House, nor was it in the bill as it passed the other body. The motion to recommit calls upon the Committee of conference to do something which the House itself does not have the power to do, namely to amend its own bill after its passage. This matter, not being in either the House version or the Senate version of the bill, the Chair holds that the point of order is well taken and sustains the point of order.

The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, most of the items reported in disagreement are merely formal matters on which there is general agreement. They are technicalities reported back in compliance with the rule, and as their individual consideration would consume a great deal of time, without any corresponding advantage, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be considered en bloc:

Chapter II: Amendments 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 26, 28, 39, 46, 47, 48, 49, and 51;

Chapter III: Amendments 94 and 107;

Chapter V: Amendments 142, 148, and 151;

Chapter VI: Amendments 157, 166, 201, 223, and 224;

Chapter VII: Amendments 254, 278, 279, 285, 295, 300, 302, and 306;

Chapter VIII: Amendments 342 and 353;

Chapter IX: Amendment 398;

Chapter X: Amendments 417, 418, 451, and 456;

Chapter X-B: Amendments 474, 478, 481, 482, 483, 485, 486, and 488.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Reserving the right to object, this is only for the purpose of keeping the RECORD straight; is any one of these amendments the amendment providing for a loan to Franco?

Mr. CANNON. No. That is submitted in a separate amendment.

Mr. YATES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do any of these amendments include the amount appropriated under the point 4 program?

Mr. CANNON. No; these amendments are likewise submitted separately.

Mr. KEOGH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the amendments enumerated in this list are amendments on which the conferees on the part of the House and on the part of the other body are in unanimous agreement?

Mr. CANNON. The managers on the part of the House and the managers on

the part of the Senate are all in complete and unanimous agreement on the amendments included in the request.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do any of the amendments read affect the Economic Cooperation Administration funds that have been added to this bill that were not considered in the House?

Mr. CANNON. No; they do not.

Mr. RICH. Have you agreed to the fact that you are going to give this \$100,000,000 to Spain?

Mr. CANNON. That will come up in a separate amendment.

Mr. RICH. And the \$1,678,000,000 for arming these foreign countries? When you talk about peace and you are preparing for war—

Mr. CANNON. No such provision is included in the amendments enumerated.

Mr. RICH. That comes up later?

Mr. CANNON. Either in the conference report or later.

Mr. RICH. Is the House going to agree to that?

Mr. CANNON. That will be for the House to determine.

Mr. RICH. We hope not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 4, line 1, insert:

"For clerical assistance to the Vice President, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in multiples of \$5 per month, \$50,870."

Page 4, line 11, insert:

"SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

"For professional and clerical assistance to the Select Committee on Small Business, \$88,645, authorized by Senate Resolution 272, agreed to May 26, 1950, at rates of compensation to be fixed hereafter in accordance with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, with respect to standing committees."

Page 4, line 18, insert:

"CONFERENCE COMMITTEES"

Page 4, line 19, insert:

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$30,280."

Page 4, line 22, insert:

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Minority at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$30,280."

Page 5, line 5, insert:

"OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

"For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, including three in lieu of two assistant chief telephone operators at \$2,400 each and 33 in lieu of 26 telephone operators at \$1,800 each, \$1,028,205."

Page 5, line 15, insert:

"Legislative reorganization: For salaries and expenses, legislative reorganization, including the objects specified in Public Law 663, Seventy-ninth Congress, \$100,000."

Page 6, line 1, insert:

"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, including the objects specified in Public Law 20, Eightieth Congress, \$160,135."

Page 6, line 11, insert:

"Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: To enable the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to engage by contract the services of private firms or corporations for making a survey of cer-

tificated interstate, overseas, and foreign air-carrier operations, with a view to drafting legislation requiring the separation of mail compensation from any Federal subsidy payments, \$200,000."

Page 8, line 13, insert:

"Senate restaurants: For repairs, improvements, equipment, and supplies for Senate kitchens and restaurants, Capitol Building and Senate Office Building, including personal and other services, to be expended under the supervision of the Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, \$42,500."

Page 9, line 11, insert:

"The Sergeant at Arms is authorized and directed to secure suitable office space in post office or other Federal buildings in the State of each Senator for the use of such Senator and in the city to be designated by him: *Provided*, That in the event suitable space is not available in such buildings and a Senator leases or rents office space elsewhere, the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to approve for payment, from the contingent fund of the Senate, vouchers covering bona fide statements of rentals due in an amount not exceeding \$900 per annum for each Senator."

Page 9, after line 21, insert:

"Commencing with the fiscal year 1949 the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to protect the funds of his office by purchasing insurance in an amount necessary to protect said funds against loss. Premiums on such insurance shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration."

Page 10, line 4, insert:

"Salaries or wages paid out of the foregoing items under 'Contingent expenses of the Senate' shall be computed at basic rates as authorized by law, plus increased and additional compensation as provided by the 'Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945,' as amended, and the 'Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950.'"

Page 19, line 8, insert:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

"For an amount to enable the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures to carry out the duties imposed upon it by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726), to remain available during the existence of the committee, \$20,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate."

Page 22, line 12, insert:

"Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel and for personal and other services, including four female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms at \$1,500 each and one at \$1,560, for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building; to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, \$643,900."

Page 94, line 14, after "annum" insert "and such employees may be appointed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949."

Page 80, line 5, after "\$3,400,000" insert

"*Provided*, That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Board without charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, and accessories surplus to the needs of such Departments."

Page 150, line 2, after "including" insert "grants of adrenocorticotrophic hormone (ACTH), cortisone, and other chemical substances, and for."

Page 152, line 16, after "\$1,375,000" insert "*Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe not to exceed 25,000 square feet of land presently included in the site of the National Institutes of Health to the Bethesda Fire Department, a body corporate of the State of Maryland, for the purpose of erecting and maintaining a fire station to provide protection for the facilities of the National Institutes of Health and for the adjacent community: *Provided further*, That such terms and conditions may include an agreement by the Surgeon General to pay to such department on behalf of the United States 33 1/2 percent of the cost of the construction of the station but not to exceed \$20,000, to be charged to the maximum limits of costs set out in this paragraph."

Page 156, line 19, after "fund" insert "of which not more than \$404 shall be available for payment in advance when authorized by the Federal Security Administrator for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public."

Page 168, strike out all after line 3 over to and including line 17, page 157, and insert:

"To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products under the provisions of title II of the act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1621-1629), but including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such act of August 14, 1946, \$6,000,000: *Provided*, That not less than \$650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets."

Page 175, line 24, strike out "\$2,863,708" and insert "Sections 3 and 5, \$2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11 of said act as added by the act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427h, 427j), including administration by the Office of Experiment Stations in the United States Department of Agriculture, \$5,000,000, no part of which latter amount shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of \$15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed \$29,000."

Page 196, line 11, after "\$1,300,000" insert "of which \$30,000 shall be made available for the establishment of a forest utilization service unit in the Southwest."

Page 214, line 6, after "\$56,350,000" insert "of which not to exceed \$3,500,000 of the amount available for the purposes of title I and section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, may be distributed to States and Territories without regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy, in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto, for loans in rec-

lamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented public land."

Page 215, line 5, after "acts" insert "*Provided further*, That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that act are extended to include such loans to the Secretary: *Provided further*, That repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-debt transaction."

Page 238, line 19, after "lands" insert "and materials."

Page 248, line 14, after "Dam" insert "*Provided further*, That in order to promote agreement among the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado and to avoid any possible alteration of existing vested water rights, no part of this or of any prior appropriation shall be used for construction or for further commitment for construction of the Glendo unit or any feature thereof, until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and approved by Congress."

Page 248, line 12, after "Dam" insert "*Provided further*, That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction, nor for further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Mont., or any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress."

After "(e)" insert "including payments on account of dependents of employees in field offices in project areas engaged in construction and related activities."

Page 263, line 11, insert: "The Veterans' Administration is authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior, for the use of the Bureau of Mines, without compensation therefor, full jurisdiction, possession, and control of a parcel of forty-three acres, more or less, within the boundaries of the Fort Snelling Government Reservation in Hennepin County, Minnesota."

Page 265, line 6, after "appropriation" insert "*Provided further*, That not to exceed \$150,000 of the funds available for the Independence National Historical Park, Pa., shall be available after January 1, 1951, for the management, protection, maintenance, and rehabilitation of Independence Hall, grounds, and structures in that park."

Page 266, line 11, after "695c)," insert "and not to exceed \$30,000 for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service."

Page 267, line 22, strike out lines 19 to 23, inclusive, and insert: "For carrying into effect section 4 of the Act of March 16, 1934, as amended (16 U. S. C. 718-718h), amounts equal to the sums received during the current year and each fiscal year thereafter from the proceeds from the sale of stamps, to be warranted monthly and to remain available until expended."

Page 288, line 23, after "amended" insert: "*Provided further*, That necessary expenses of inspections of projects financed through loans to educational institutions authorized by Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be compensated by such institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative, and for the purpose of providing such inspections, the Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency may accept reimbursement

or payment for such services from such institutions or the Administrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such charges have been made."

Page 294, line 23, after "monthly" insert: "*Provided further*, That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, 81st Cong.) shall not be effective."

Page 371, strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 102. No part of any appropriation contained in this chapter shall be used directly or indirectly, except for temporary employment in case of emergency, for the payment of any civilian for services rendered by him on the Canal Zone while occupying a skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory position unless such person is a citizen of the United States of America or of the Republic of Panama: *Provided, however*, (1) That notwithstanding the provision in the act approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409) limiting employment in the above-mentioned positions to citizens of the United States from and after the date of approval of said act, citizens of Panama may be employed in such positions; (2) that at no time shall the number of Panamanian citizens employed in the above-mentioned positions exceed the number of citizens of the United States so employed, if United States citizens are available in continental United States or on the Canal Zone; (3) that nothing in this chapter shall prohibit the continued employment of any person who shall have rendered 15 or more years of faithful and honorable service on the Canal Zone; (4) that in the selection of personnel for skilled, technical, administrative, clerical, supervisory, or executive positions, the controlling factors in filling these positions shall be efficiency, experience, training, and education; (5) that all citizens of Panama and the United States rendering skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory service on the Canal Zone under the terms of this chapter (a) shall normally be employed not more than 40 hours per week, (b) may receive as compensation equal rates of pay based upon rates paid for similar employment in continental United States plus 25 percent; (6) this entire section shall apply only to persons employed in skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory positions on the Canal Zone directly or indirectly by any branch of the United States Government or by any corporation or company whose stock is owned wholly or in part by the United States Government: *Provided further*, That the President may suspend from time to time in whole or in part compliance with this section if he should deem such course to be in the public interest."

Page 393, line 20, after "\$300,176,000" insert "*Provided*, That the sum of \$2,000,000 of the appropriation 'Engineer Service, Army', fiscal year 1947, shall remain available until June 30, 1951, for the payment of obligations incurred under contracts executed thereunder prior to July 1, 1947."

Page 394, line 1, insert:

"MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

"For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Army, as authorized by the Act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$95,318,585, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$661,400 of the funds appropriated under this head in the Military Functions Appropriations Act, 1949,

are hereby made available for construction authorized by the Act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 414)."

Page 414, after line 11, insert:

"PUBLIC WORKS

"For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy, as authorized by the Act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459), and the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.); major repairs and improvements to the Davisville pier, Naval Base, Newport, R. I.; furniture for public quarters; personnel in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personnel services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; and engineering and architectural services as authorized by section 3 of the act of April 25, 1939 (34 U. S. C. 556); \$62,928,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated by the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1027), for construction of two new storehouses at Adak, Alaska, may be used for the conversion of existing facilities, if the Secretary of the Navy determines such action would result in a savings to the Government."

Page 419, strike out lines 13 and 18, inclusive, and insert:

"For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the act of March 30, 1949 (Public Law 30, 81st Cong), the act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 415, 81st Cong.), the act of May 11, 1949 (Public Law 60, 81st Cong.), and the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, to remain available until expended, \$164,784,000, of which \$25,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, or authorized to be transferred to this head by the National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950."

In the last line of Senate amendment No. 471, after "specified" insert "of which not more than \$25,000 shall be available to the Administrator for any further action he may consider advisable to carry out the provisions of section 115 (f) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended."

Page 449, line 9, insert:

"ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

"For expenses necessary to provide assistance to the Republic of Korea, as authorized by law, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); transportation of privately owned automobiles; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes; and loss by exchange; \$90,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses."

In the last line of Senate amendment No. 477, after "years" insert "*Provided, however*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for the duplication of any program being carried on by any other agency of the United States Government or any international agency to which the United States is a major contributor, nor for the construction of any project except for demonstration or instructional purposes, nor for any purpose except administrative expenses, and preliminary surveys and technical cooperation programs upon which reports shall be made to the Congress of the United States quarterly."

In the last line of Senate amendment No. 477, after "years" insert "*Provided further*, That the making of any survey or the advancement of any technical cooperation program or the preparation of plans for projects does not constitute any obligation whatsoever on the part of the Government of the United States to make any loan or grant for the execution or construction of any project or for the completion of any program devised under title IV of Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950."

In the last line of Senate amendment No. 477, after "years" insert "*Provided further*, That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of State to give written notice to each recipient of funds or beneficiary under said title that such assistance shall not be construed as an obligation on the part of the United States to make funds available for the construction or execution of any project and to report such action to Congress."

Page 453, preceding line 16, insert:

"TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE"

Page 453, line 16, insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CIVIL FUNCTIONS
"GOVERNMENT AND RELIEF IN OCCUPIED AREAS

"For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government or occupation of certain foreign areas (except Germany), including personnel services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere and, subject to such authorizations and limitations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned, tuition, personal allowances (not to exceed \$10 per day), travel expenses (not to exceed those authorized for like United States military or civilian personnel), and fees incident to instruction in the United States or elsewhere of such persons as may be required to carry out the provisions of this appropriation; travel expenses and transportation; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); translation rights, photographic work, educational exhibits, and dissemination of information, including preview and review expenses incident thereto; expenses incident to the operation of schools in Japan for American children who are dependents of Government personnel; printing and binding; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; repair and maintenance of buildings, utilities, facilities, and appurtenances; contingencies for the United States commanders, commissioners, or other administrators of foreign areas, to be expended in their respective discretions (not exceeding amounts authorized or approved by the head of the department or agency concerned); such minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such areas as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest, prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished; and such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; \$288,000,000, of which not to exceed \$18,200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That the general provisions of the appropriation act for the fiscal year 1951 for the military functions of the Department of the Army shall apply to expenditures made by that Department from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made outside continental United States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sections 355, 1136, 3648, and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, civil service or classification laws, or provisions of law prohibiting payment of any person not a citizen of the United States:

Provided further, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 151-161): *Provided further*, That expenditures may be made hereunder for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in such occupied areas in such manner as to be consistent with the general objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated hereunder and unexpended at the time of the termination of occupation by the United States, of any area for which such funds are made available, may be expended by the President for the procurement of such commodities and technical services, and commodities procured from funds herein or heretofore appropriated for government and relief in occupied areas and not delivered to such an area prior to the time of the termination of occupation, may be utilized by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the maintenance of the political and economic stability of such areas: *Provided further*, That before any such assistance is made available, an agreement shall be entered into between the United States and the recognized government or authority with respect to such area containing such undertakings by such government or authority as the President may determine to be necessary in order to assure the efficient use of such assistance in furtherance of such purposes: *Provided further*, That such agreement shall, when applicable, include requirements and undertakings corresponding to the requirements and undertakings specified in sections 5, 6, and 7 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, approved December 17, 1947): *Provided further*, That funds appropriated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable, and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned to pay ocean transportation charges from United States ports, including territorial ports, to ports in Japan and the Ryukyus for the movement of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned to individuals residing in such countries: *Provided further*, That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the head of the department or agency concerned shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to Japan or the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals: *Provided further*, That the President may transfer to any other department or agency any function or functions provided for under this appropriation, and there shall be transferred to any such department or agency such unobligated balances of this appropriation and, without reimbursement and without regard to the appropriation from which procured, such property as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to relate primarily to any function or functions so transferred; and any funds so transferred may be expended either under the authority contained herein or under the authority governing the activities of the department or agency concerned."

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Page 457, line 21, insert:

"GOVERNMENT IN OCCUPIED AREAS OF GERMANY

"For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government, occupation, and

control of occupied areas of Germany, under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, including personal services in the District of Columbia; one deputy to the United States High Commissioner for Germany at a salary of \$17,500; tuition, personal allowances (not to exceed \$10 per day), travel expenses (not to exceed those authorized for United States civilian personnel), health and accident insurance, and fees incident to instruction in the United States or elsewhere, of such persons as may be required to carry out the provisions of this appropriation; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) and payment of tort claims in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; expenses for translation and reproduction rights; acquisition, maintenance, operation, and distribution of educational, informational, reorientation, and rehabilitation materials and equipment for Germany, including grants; medical and health assistance for the civilian population of Germany; expenses incident to the operation of schools for American children who are dependents of Government personnel; expenses incident to maintaining discipline and order in occupied areas (including trial and punishment by courts established by or under authority of the President); printing and binding, including printing and binding outside continental United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase, rental, operation, and maintenance of printing and binding machines, equipment, and devices abroad; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; transportation to occupied Germany of property donated for the purposes of this appropriation; unforeseen contingencies (not to exceed \$100,000) for the United States High Commissioner for Germany, to be accounted for pursuant to the provisions of section 291 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 107); and representation allowances (not to exceed \$20,000) similar to those authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131); \$27,000,000: *Provided*, That provisions of law, including current appropriation acts, applicable to the Department of State shall be available for application to expenditures made from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That when section 601 of the Economy Act of 1932, as amended (31 U. S. C. 686), is employed to carry out the purposes of this appropriation the requisitioned agency may utilize the authority contained in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made outside the continental United States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sections 355 and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Department of State is authorized to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, including unforeseen contingencies, without dollar reimbursement from this or any other appropriation (1) currencies deposited in Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany in accordance with section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and which may be made available by the Economic Cooperation Administration, (2) currencies otherwise deposited in Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany and which become available for use of the Government of the United States, its repre-

sentatives or agencies in Germany, in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be determined by the Secretary of State after consultation with the Administrator for Economic Cooperation, and (3) other currencies derived from activities carried on under this appropriation: *Provided further*, That civilian employees of the United States serving in Germany who received appointments in October 1949 to the Foreign Service of the United States for service in Germany shall, for the purposes of section 625 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, be considered to have been in class on September 30, 1949: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this appropriation appointments may be made to the Foreign Service Reserve without regard to the 4-year limitation contained in section 522 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946: *Provided further*, That in the event the President assigns to the Department of State responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government, occupation, or control of foreign areas in addition to Germany, the authorities contained in this appropriation may be utilized by the Department of State in connection with such government, occupation, or control of such foreign areas: *Provided further*, That when the Department of the Army, under the authority of the act of March 3, 1911, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1253), furnishes subsistence supplies to personnel of civilian agencies of the United States Government serving in Germany, payment therefor by such personnel shall be made at the same rate as is paid by civilian personnel of the Department of the Army serving in Germany."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered: (Ch. II) 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 26, 28, 39, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51; (ch. III) 94, 107; (ch. V) 142, 148, 151; (ch. VI) 157, 166, 201, 223, 224; (ch. VII) 254, 278, 279, 285, 295, 300, 302, 306; (ch. VIII) 342, 353; (ch. IX) 398; (ch. X) 417, 418, 451, 456; (ch. X-B) 474, 478, 481, 482, 483, 485, 486, 488; and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. There is no question of reserving the right to object. The gentleman from Missouri has made a motion that is in order.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 35: On page 7, line 11, insert:

"Inquiries and investigations: For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate or conducted pursuant to section 134 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, including compensation for stenographic assistance of committees at such rates and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, but not exceeding the rate of 25 cents per hundred words for the original transcript of reported matter; and including \$50,000 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution No. 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, and Public Law 20, Eightieth

Congress, \$832,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses (as defined in the Travel Expense Act of 1949) at rates in excess of \$9 per day except that higher rates may be established by the Committee on Rules and Administration in the case of travel beyond the limits of the continental United States: *And provided further*, That hereafter the provisions of section 134 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, shall be applicable to the Select Committee on Small Business."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McGRATH moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 25, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In line 13 of the Senate amendment, strike out "\$832,000" and insert the following: "\$722,000, and the affairs of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, provided for in Senate Resolution No. 298, Eighty-first Congress, shall be liquidated not later than August 31, 1950."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 68: Page 54, line 13, after "\$34,000,000" insert "of which sum \$200,000 shall be used for the purpose of preserving friendships with the peoples of western European countries by means of radio broadcasts, said programs to be created and produced under the supervision and control of the Department of State by experienced private international broadcasting organizations; and."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "of which sum \$100,000 may be available for the purpose of preserving friendships with the peoples of western European countries by means of radio broadcasts, said programs to be created and produced under the supervision and control of the Department of State by experienced private international broadcasting organizations; and."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 72: Page 56, line 16, after "expended" insert "and in addition, the Institute is authorized, prior to June 30, 1953, to enter into contracts for the purposes of such act, as amended, in an amount not to exceed \$7,000,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$1,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 92: Page 79, line 9, after "expenses" insert "of which \$35,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration" for such expenses, including the maintenance and operation of aircraft."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and concur therein within an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$17,500."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 175: Page 179, line 15, strike out all after "\$7,950,000" down to and including "entry" in line 23.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 175, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following: "including \$30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 189: Page 189, line 22, after "\$850,000", insert "of which \$1,500,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said joint resolution only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$1,250,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 192: Page 190, line 22, after "\$900,000", insert "of which \$1,000,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said act only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 192, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$750,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 198: Page 195, line 5, insert:

"Cooperative range improvements: For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national-forest lands, pursuant to section 12 of the act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law No. 478), \$750,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$700,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 200: Page 196, line 6, after "\$2,995,000", insert "of which \$55,000 shall be available for such investigations and experiments at Bartlett Experimental Forest only."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 200, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$41,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 209: Page 200, line 14, after "situated", insert "Provided further, That of the funds available herein, not in excess of \$7,880,000 may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, for necessary gully control, floodwater detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 209, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$8,315,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 215: Page 206, line 2, strike out all after "States" down to and including "county" in line 24.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 215, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allotted with the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I have a minute or so to interrogate the gentleman?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I ask the gentleman in this connection if he feels the language is absolutely voluntary as regards the various counties and States?

Mr. WHITTEN. There is no question but what it is purely permissive.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I notice that the State PMA committee must agree to any such transfer on the part of the county.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. It has to be agreeable to the county and to the State before it is done; in other words, it is permissive. It enables them to do it if they want to.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Has the gentleman conferred with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the members of the legislative Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. WHITTEN. I have several times, and they are in complete accord with what we are trying to do.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. They do not think that we are infringing on their legislative rights?

Mr. WHITTEN. None whatever.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Would the language in this amendment in any way prohibit the PMA committees from employing personnel which some might consider to be technicians in the construction or work such as pools, terraces, and so forth, where there are no soil conservation districts?

Mr. WHITTEN. It would not restrict it in any way whatsoever. This is to try to prevent duplication, but in those areas in which soil conservation technicians are not available, it would in no way restrict their activities.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman feel that this additional assistance from the Production and Marketing Administration of soil conservation personnel assigned to soil conservation districts will be kept in those districts where the work has not been substantially completed?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly, there is no intention to upset that in the least.

Mr. ALBERT. But you did cut the soil conservation item approximately \$500,000?

Mr. WHITTEN. No.

Mr. ALBERT. In this make-up?

Mr. WHITTEN. No. The figure for the soil conservation district is in excess of \$1,000,000 higher than it was last year. The Senate did cut it \$500,000, and this is additional money over what they had hoped to get at this date. So, since they got a million dollars more than they now have, I do not see that there is any reduction. There might be a reduction in what they hoped to have.

Mr. ALBERT. And the gentleman feels that all these districts which have not completed their jobs will be kept open under this bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly, that is the intention of this committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman explain the difference in the language in this amendment which the gentleman has just offered and the language in the present law?

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, the difference was this: The Senate insisted that this should have approval of the State PMA committee. Personally, I think it is sound to have some consideration by the State and have a State policy rather than have individual handling of it in each county. I think that is the only change.

Mr. JENSEN. In other words, this language is giving the authority back to the farmers, so to speak?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is the way I see it, and it is an effort to correlate the efforts of these two agencies which I think have done a splendid job. We counselled with numerous Members of the legislative committee. This program did not get started until last November, but nevertheless, 250 counties have voluntarily come into it, and it looks like it holds real promise to get maximum dividends from this soil program.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 232: Page 220, line 6, insert the following: "together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses which several amounts not exceeding a total of \$207,000 shall be trans-

ferred to and made a part of this appropriation."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement. The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 234: Page 221, line 19, insert the following: "Provided, That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the programs of the various agencies of the Department authorized by Congress can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office of Information, as the central agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not exceeding \$300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 238: Page 229, line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 411. Of the funds appropriated in this chapter for travel expenses, \$791,888 shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury on or before August 1, 1950; but such amount shall be credited toward any other reduction in amounts available for such travel expenses resulting from decreases in appropriations made by this act below the budget estimates."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 238, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: "In lieu of the words 'on or before August 1, 1950' in said amendment, insert the following: 'within 30 days after enactment of this act.'"

The motion was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 275: Page 247, line 4, after "fund" insert "and in addition thereto the Commissioner of Reclamation is hereby authorized to incur obligations and enter into contracts for additional work, materials, and equipment in an amount not exceeding \$3,000,000 for power transmission lines and substations in the fiscal year 1951."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 277: page 247, line 22, after "Dam" insert "Provided further, That \$3,000,000 of the funds provided in this paragraph plus \$3,000,000 contract authority

shall be available for construction of transmission lines and substations in South Dakota, to include a transmission loop from Fort Randall through the load centers of Armour, Huron, Aberdeen, Andover, Watertown, Brookings, Sioux Falls, and Gavins Point to Fort Randall, and lines from Fort Randall to Winner and from Rapid City to Midland."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 284: Page 252, line 8, after "Reclamation;" insert "payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts; and, without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JACKSON of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 284, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 288: Page 253, line 7, strike out all after "law" down to and including "Investigations." in lines 8 and 9, and insert "Provided further, That, except as otherwise provided by the act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), or by any other law, no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the said act of April 19, 1945, for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except expenses under the head 'General administrative expenses' and under the head 'General investigations.'"

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JACKSON of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 288, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment, insert "Provided, That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except \$7,200,000 under the head 'General administrative expenses' and \$1,193,205 (\$197,925 for reconnaissance, \$769,080 for basin surveys, and \$226,200 for general engineer-

ing and research) under the head 'General Investigations.'"

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 289: Page 256, line 11, insert:

"TRANSFER OF EPHRATA AIR FORCE BASE

"For the purpose of assisting in the construction, operation, and maintenance, and settlement programs on the Columbia Basin project in the State of Washington, the armed services, General Services Administration, or other Federal agency having ownership or custody thereof or interest therein, is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, all of their right, title, and interest to certain buildings, facilities, and equipment at the Ephrata Air Force Base, Ephrata, Wash., including the following buildings in accordance with block and building numbers: Block 800, building No. 68; block 1900, buildings Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17; block 2000, 4 buildings No. 75. 2 buildings No. 56; block 3000, buildings Nos. 56, 131, 58; block 2900, buildings Nos. 59, 53, 55, 57, 66, 89, 90, 85, 84, 124, 141, 2 buildings No. 60, 2 buildings No. 64, 2 buildings No. 65; block 3300, 11 buildings No. 28; block 3400, 7 buildings No. 28; block 3500, buildings Nos. 43, 46; block 3600, buildings Nos. 34, 35, 36, 38, 2 buildings No. 37; block 3700, buildings Nos. 35, 38, 4 buildings No. 31, 2 buildings No. 32, 2 buildings No. 34, 2 buildings No. 37; block 3800, buildings Nos. 35, 38, 39, 42, 2 buildings No. 37; block 4300, buildings Nos. 19, 20, 21, 22; block 4400, buildings Nos. 113, 114, 2 buildings No. 112; block 4600, buildings No. 134; block 4700, buildings Nos. 94, 95, 96, 99, 109, 100, 35, 108, 104, 110, 8 buildings No. 97; block 4800, buildings Nos. 53, 40, 102, 101, 103, 105, 107, 111, 2 buildings No. 32, 5 buildings No. 106, 3 buildings No. 98, together with one sewage-disposal plant No. 116, 1 water tank No. 115, 1 well, 1 flag pole No. 118, 2 garbage racks No. 155, 2 garbage racks No. 158, 1 wash rack No. 63, 2 grease racks No. 62, and sewer system, water lines, electric-power lines, railroad spur and siding, road improvements, and all other facilities and equipment incident to the foregoing property, and including land and rights-of-way formerly under Reclamation withdrawal to other federally owned land on which said buildings, are situate, which have heretofore or which may hereafter be declared surplus to the needs of the Armed Forces."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JACKSON of Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 289, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In the last line of the matter proposed by said amendment, before the period, insert "Provided, That amounts equal to the value of all property transferred hereunder and used shall be charged, in the same manner as appropriations are charged, as part of the construction or appropriate other costs of the Columbia Basin project, such values to be determined by appraisal approved by the Administrator of General Services of the market value of such property current at the time of transfer hereunder less expenditures on such property by the Bureau of Reclamation prior to such transfer."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 319. On page 291, strike out all of line 11, on page 291, down to and including line 17, on page 292, and insert:

"Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended by the Act of June 16, 1950 (Public Law 555), including personal services and rents in the District of Columbia; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; purchase (not to exceed three), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); expenses incident to the primary and secondary education of American children who are dependents of Government personnel paid from this appropriation and stationed overseas; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; and payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; \$9,000,000: *Provided*, That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further*, That the Commission may enter into agreements with international, governmental, and private agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this act."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 319, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended by the act of June 16, 1950 (Public Law 555), including personal services and rents in the District of Columbia; travel expenses, including travel expenses outside continental United States without regard to the standardized Government travel regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; purchase (not to exceed three), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); expenses incident to the primary and secondary education of American children who are dependents of Government personnel paid from this appropriation and stationed overseas; services as

authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; and payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; \$8,000,000: *Provided*, That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further*, That the Commission may enter into agreements with United States governmental agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this act."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 337: On page 304, strike out "the" and insert "not to exceed \$4,000,000 of the."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 337, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$4,350,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 338: page 304, line 21, after "1951" insert: "The sum of \$2,000,000 carried in the said unexpended balances shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approved of this act."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 338, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$1,324,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 345: Page 314, line 13, strike out "\$9,889,600" and insert "\$10,002,600."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 345, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$9,889,600 (and any part of the amount of \$100,000 for valuations of pipelines, and \$3,831,920 for the work of the Bureau of Motor Carriers, contained in this paragraph, may be transferred as the Commission may determine for carrying out other functions of the Commission)."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 354: Page 320, line 18, after the word "Philippines," insert "or, in the absence of such finding by such court, the Commission after hearing finds upon evidence that such person was guilty of such collaboration or act of disloyalty."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 354, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "or, in any case involving charges of such collaboration or disloyalty which have not been adjudicated by any such court, where the Commission, after hearing and evidence, certifies that it is satisfied that the person so charged is guilty of such collaboration or disloyalty."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 325, line 17, strike out all after "\$63,000,000" down to and including "estimates" in line 15, and insert: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used (1) to start any new ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year or (2) to start any new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless, in either case, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construction and the Director shall submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, or used herein, the term "budget" includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$64,875,000 of the funds and contract authority made available for new ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, shall continue to be available until December 31, 1950."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 361, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Provided, That not to exceed \$64,875,000 of the funds and contract authority made available for new ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, shall continue to be available until December 31, 1950: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used (1) to start any new ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year; or (2) to start any new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construction and the Director shall submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, as used herein, the term 'budget' includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. This \$64,875,000, after World War II, or before we got into this Korean war we had hundreds and hundreds of ships that were tied up in ports.

Mr. THOMAS. Twenty-two hundred; and we still have them.

Mr. RICH. Twenty-two hundred ships. Is this money to be used for the repair of those ships, or are you going to start to build new ships?

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to my friend from Pennsylvania that this is not fresh money; this is merely a reappropriation of money that has heretofore been appropriated, and this item has nothing in the world to do with the repair of the 2,200 ships that are laid up.

Mr. RICH. Is the Congress now going to go out and build a lot more ships and tie them up after we finish the Korean war?

Mr. THOMAS. There is no money in here for that purpose. We are building six or seven ships which are really prototypes, types that have not yet been built.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 363: Page 328, line 11, strike out all after "contracts" down to and including "1950" in line 25.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 363, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for obligation, nor any obligation made, for the payment of an operating-differential subsidy for any

number of ships in excess of the number of 263, unless a certificate has been received from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, that an operating-differential subsidy is required for a larger number of such ships in connection with national defense."

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion to recede and concur.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PHILLIPS of California moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division of the motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede.

The motion to recede was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 363 with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for obligation, nor any obligation made, for the payment of an operating-differential subsidy for any number of ships in excess of the number of 263, unless a certificate has been received from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, that an operating-differential subsidy is required for a larger number of such ships in connection with national defense."

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it now, there are two motions before the House, the motion of the gentleman from Texas to adopt the amendment of the Senate which has just been read, and my amendment to concur in the original Senate wording?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Will the gentleman yield me some time?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, the point at issue is the only point, I think, in our particular chapter of the bill in which my distinguished chairman and myself have any difference of opinion. I still live in hopes, Mr. Speaker, that some day I am going to persuade him of the correctness of the side which I take. This is in defense of the American merchant marine. There is no money involved. There is a technical point involved which says that a line, in order to set itself up and to offer itself as a carrier to the people of the United States, must some months ahead of time establish its trade routes; it must offer its service to people all over the United States and must, therefore, know in advance that it is eligible to an operating subsidy. It must know that, once started, it may continue to operate for the benefit of its customers upon that line. It may take months to secure information and to present its case to the

Maritime Commission. I know one line that has perhaps \$50,000 involved already of its own money in order that it may set itself up so that it is in the eligible class for subsidies, if needed.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] sets an arbitrary figure for the number of boats which may receive subsidies. It is not the prerogative of the Appropriations Committee to set an arbitrary figure but to set a figure in money. We have set that figure in money in the appropriation and I have no controversy with that figure; it is adequate. In addition to that, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] wishes in his amendment to set a figure which limits the number of ships to those now under the wire for an operating subsidy or were entitled to it as of January 1 of this year.

Rather than to argue that point, I wish to point out that two lines involved, having 15 ships, which would be shut out by this amendment, are the very lines upon which the United States has been depending since the outbreak of the war in Korea to carry supplies to the men on the battle front over there.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the position presented by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. I am in complete disagreement with the approach being made to this subject by the very able gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

On the west coast we have at the present time two lines, as the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has mentioned, the Pacific Far East and the Pacific Transport Lines, which are the very backbone of the military supply to the Korean operations now. They are not subsidized at the present time. Their applications are in for a subsidy. Their vessels are not included in the 263 figure set by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. With the return to a normal condition, which we all hope will be somewhere in the immediate future, and with the cessation of the business now being conducted by these lines and possibly other lines, these particular lines would be barred from any subsidy and would be out of business.

I think it is an unfair approach to companies that are doing their best to return the American Flag to the seas. We are trying with the reorganization of the Maritime Commission to build an American merchant marine, to find new and faster vessels. This is that in reverse.

I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] will be adopted by the House.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. How long do these vessels have to operate before they can apply for a subsidy?

Mr. THOMAS. There is no set time.

Mr. RICH. Why not treat everybody alike if these vessels are now operating?

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that during wartime steamship companies make more money than they can count much less haul. They never need a subsidy. A subsidy is a hard-times matter. In the next three or four years if the war keeps up like it is today there will not be a dime of subsidy paid to any of them. They do not need it and they do not ask for it.

Mr. RICH. The fact of the matter is you are giving subsidies to everybody. Of course, I do not believe in subsidies at all, but I think you ought to treat everybody the same way.

Mr. THOMAS. There are more subsidies in here than you have ships for already.

Mr. RICH. With the 2,200 ships we still have tied up?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. We have them, too.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] in urging the position taken by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. In my opinion the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas effectively abrogates the policy set forth in the Merchant Marine Act under which the merchant marine of this Nation is, in part, assisted. The Merchant Marine Act is designed to keep American ships on the seas to carry on our domestic commerce and a part of our foreign commerce, to provide American operators, to provide that the ships shall be operated by American seamen and repaired and constructed by American yards, all of which are absolutely necessary when an emergency arises, for national defense. The Merchant Marine Act keeps the ships going in times of peace, and they are ready when we need them in national defense. That is the position we are in now. This amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas would wipe out, to some extent, the possibility of being as well prepared when we need them again. There is no money involved; it is not a matter of appropriations.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I am in complete accord with the objective of the gentleman from Texas to try to get some efficient and sensible operation in the Maritime Commission, but I am completely opposed to putting our merchant marine in a strait-jacket, and I believe that is what would be done unless the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is adopted. I have been given to understand that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is completely in accord with the amendment of the gentleman from California. I have not heard anybody from that committee make an observation, but with the gentleman's permission I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] if that expression is not correct.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is correct, so far as I know.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion of this bill on May 8 it was made abundantly clear by the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that they felt the number should be 285 ships, at least, and this would set it at 263.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I arise in support of the motion made by the gentleman from California, Mr. Phillips. His motion gives recognition to the fact that under the law as it now exists provision has been made for the payment of an optional subsidy to our Merchant Marine. The adoption of his amendment would not increase by one penny the amount that has been appropriated for this purpose, but, it would make certain that all ships that can qualify under the law would participate under the fund.

The motion made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] although offered with good intent, would in my opinion leave some uncertainty as to the number of ships that could participate. From the explanation he has given it would seem that he believes that no qualifying ship would be left out. However, why adopt a course that might have that effect?

I believe there is a question of good faith involved in the matter. We owe an obligation to all ship owners who have constructed ships for use in the Merchant Marine. They have done so with the understanding that in the event the operation should be a losing venture then they could, by due proof, obtain reimbursement of such loss. This is only fair in view of the fact that the route on which they operate has been approved or directed by the Merchant Marine Commission. No one knows whether the operation will prove profitable or otherwise. Without some such guarantee no ship line would be willing to operate these unknown routes. We must realize that the competition is great, with the advantage in most instances in favor of the foreign ship owner because of his cheaper cost of operation. We must do something of the kind we have in our law set out to do. It is the only way we can expect or hope to build up an American Merchant Marine.

Two world wars have demonstrated the need of an adequate Merchant Marine to support our fighting ships and our soldiers fighting on foreign fields. When war comes we find ourselves deficient in this respect. This has been our experience in World War I and II. It is even now our experience in the present Korean conflict. We have found it necessary, in getting men and supplies to Korea, to lease or utilize the ships of foreign companies to make up for our own deficiency in available ships.

I support the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], because it is the best guaranty to our shipowners that we intend to carry out the policy adopted by Congress in its effort to build up the American merchant marine.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would point out to you that in signing the report, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and I signed the report with the exception of this particular point which is still in controversy. I also point out, Mr. Speaker, that when the vote comes it will come first on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], and then upon the motion which I would like to substitute for the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have ever heard any more loose statements than have been made, no doubt in good faith, here this afternoon about this item. In the first place, the House thoroughly debated this question some 2 or 3 months ago and the House sustained the committee.

Now let us go back and see just what the facts are. I am imputing no ill motives to anybody. I think some of our friends are a little bit overzealous to give away about \$350,000 per year, per ship, to certain pressure groups.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is this the matter in which a gentleman by the name of Frazier Bailey is interested?

Mr. THOMAS. I understand Mr. Bailey is perhaps one of the highest-priced lobbyists that has been in Washington for the last 20 years, representing the steamship companies. When this item came up before your subcommittee the Maritime Commission justified the payment of differential subsidies to 235 ships, plus 19 others who wanted to get it, and of that 19, seven were building under construction-differential subsidies.

Now, what is this operating-differential subsidy that we hear so much about? You pay it to Club 13 which owns all these ships; just 13 steamship companies, that is all it is. Incidentally, when the act started out, it was Club 17 or Club 18, but it has shrunk now to Club 13, for whom Mr. Frazier Bailey, as somebody has pointed out, is the chief spokesman and mouthpiece.

You have an operating-differential subsidy on: (1) wages, (2) insurance, (3) food, (4) maintenance of the ship, and (5) repair of the ship. They wanted \$93,000,000. And, if my friend from California thinks there is no money involved in here, I wonder what he calls \$93,000,000 for the fiscal year 1951. But, that is all they want, \$93,000,000, for those 254 ships. Now, you can do a little quick arithmetic and that figures out that all you are paying Club 13 for each ship—not 13 ships but 254 ships—is \$367,000 per ship.

How often? Every year for the 10-year period. Do you see? They just get about \$3,500,000 over the 10 years for the one ship. And there are only 254. That is what the Maritime Commission justified to our committee.

About 2 months intervened before they appeared before the other body. On page 137 of the independent office appropriation hearings for 1951, before the other body, about a month or 6 weeks ago, this is what you find. This is their language—this is the Maritime Commission's language:

Number of actual vessels eligible for subsidy after January 1, 1950, and proposed additional ones eligible for subsidy for the year 1951 add up to 262.

Of course they increased the ante in the 2 months from the time that they left the House and went over to the other body. The limitation contained in this bill gives them one more than they asked for. Now that is really being hard on them, is it not? In addition there are seven ships building under a construction differential subsidy, and we were advised inferentially by the Maritime Commission that in all probability those seven ships will be put into military use and not to private use. Therefore, of course, they get no subsidy. Therefore, you have in this limitation eight ships more than they have asked for, and yet he says we are not being generous.

Listen to what our Comptroller General Lindsay Warren has to say about these ship subsidies. He has been working on it apparently for some time trying to find out the yardstick by which the Maritime Commission gives the Club 13 \$350,000-plus per vessel per year. This is what General Warren says:

Our detailed analysis of the calculations, is attached as appendix B hereto, on the audit of the United States Maritime Commission for the fiscal year 1948-49. That analysis revealed that the calculations by the Maritime Commission supporting the approved rates, contained so many errors and omissions as to render the result totally unreliable—

Now listen to this—

unreliable by the Maritime Commission.

As a result the former Chairman of the Maritime Commission ordered the recalculations of all operating differential subsidies since January 1, 1947.

Now pay particular attention to this point:

Up to date little real progress has been made, and none of the rates have been revised.

Can you imagine anything like that?

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the condition and all your committee is trying to do is to save the taxpayers a little money and put a little common horse sense into the head of the Commission. We are not trying to hurt the shipping industry. Why, you cannot hurt them in this bill—it is too one-sided. Do you think you are going to hurt them when you pay them \$350,000 every year per ship? If a good part of that amount is not all profit, I do not know anything about it.

Here is what the President of the United States says in his budget message to the Congress in January of this year:

I am seriously concerned about the increasing cost of these operating subsidies and by the potential cost of new subsidies now being advocated.

The President must have had in mind our good friend, the gentleman from California, and two or three of my other friends who are advocating not only keeping up this enormously wasteful and expensive burden on the pocketbooks of your taxpayers, but who advocate adding more to it.

Let us see further what the President has to say. He says, "To permit such expansion as may be required by a future emergency." Of course, the emergency he is talking about is building. Of course, we are building some. This has nothing in the world to do with building. This is operating.

Further the President said:

However, to limit the burden on the taxpayers, this subsidy program should be held to the minimum level that will satisfy national defense needs.

Do you know what this amendment does? It has not been exactly explained. It may be my fault, or it may be the fault of the gentleman from California. In addition to giving subsidies for eight more ships than the Maritime Commission has asked for, we put a clause in there which provided that in case the Secretary of National Defense wants more ships for national defense with a subsidy, he has authority to waive this provision. Let me read it to you. It gives them everything they want, and yet Mr. Bailey and the Club 13 are not satisfied. They are telephoning and wire-working everybody they can.

Just listen to this proviso:

That no part of the number of ships in excess of the number 263—

and that is eight more than the Maritime Commission asked for—

unless a certificate has been received from the Director of the Budget, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, that an operating differential subsidy is required for a larger number.

It could go to a thousand, if the Secretary of Defense said he needed them in connection with national defense.

Now, let us be frank about this whole matter. I think we are making a lot of fuss over nothing. We all know that during wartimes the shipping companies make so much money they cannot even haul it, much less count it.

You know that during World War II they did not get a subsidy. A subsidy is a hard-time proposition. You give them a subsidy because they cannot make money, because business is bad. Now they have more business than they can possibly handle. We are even giving them business when you have 2,200 ships of the same type laid up here. In fact, we sold them some of those ships they have for about 30 cents on the dollar, and we have over 2,000 of them laid up.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes to answer the argument he has made in support of this amendment?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, I will yield the gentleman 5 minutes, after I have finished.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to have about 3 minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, there is more involved in this item here today than one might think, just hearing it discussed during the few moments which it is before us. In my opinion this is a one-man crusade by the gentleman from Texas against the Maritime Commission. Those of us who have watched the operation of the Maritime Commission in the past cannot find too much fault with the gentleman from Texas in his crusade against the Commission, because the operation of the Commission has not been on a very sound basis; it has been subjected to severe criticism, and I think properly so. But in order to punish the Maritime Commission, American shipping is being made the whipping boy. Now, let us get back to this question coming up in the 1951 appropriation bill. When this limitation first came up in the consideration of the bill originally on the floor not a single Member could find out from the gentleman from Texas the language in the amendment he was going to offer. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART], after having heard it read by the Clerk said: "I think this perhaps meets our objection." But lo and behold, when it is adopted we find that it did not do a single thing but smoke-screen the whole proposition, and it batten down this business of ship subsidies just as tight as the gentleman from Texas had power to batten it down.

Since that time the Senate wisely struck that language out. Now today we had no way of knowing what language the gentleman was going to offer until we heard it read by the Clerk. Talk about not doing anything, let me tell you what it does, it applies to every shipping company in the United States. This is no Frazer-Bailey fight either; it is a fight of all maritime interests against national security; it strikes at every shipping company who had applied for subsidy contracts on routes which had been declared to be essential, but on which contracts had not been executed.

Under this language these shipping companies would be denied the right to have a subsidy contract although the route had been approved by the Maritime Commission. It does that on the west coast and along portions of the east coast. It strikes at a company in my district.

Talk about not affecting shipping, it strikes at the very basic maritime policy established by Congress; and one man, may it please you, one man in the House of Representatives, through the position he holds as chairman of this subcommittee, is striking at the very roots of it and would destroy it by the action here today and by the action he took in May.

I say this not in derogation of my friend from Texas; everyone recognizes him as an able man, a fine representative of his people, but I feel that he has some feeling about this maritime situation which we have not been able to fathom. It is demonstrated by the fact that he is determined to put the lid on this program which, incidentally, I want

to say has not cost the Treasury of the United States one dime in subsidy. This would abolish the rights of any shipping company to an operating differential subsidy by virtue of the maritime law which we passed. Does anyone dispute the correctness of this statement?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, I dispute that. There is \$85,000,000 in this bill to meet that. But what do you think the purpose of this is?

Mr. PRESTON. I am talking of an operating subsidy. I am not referring to a construction subsidy.

Mr. THOMAS. Construction subsidy is not before this House now. This is only an operating-differential subsidy and there is \$85,000,000 in here for that.

Mr. PRESTON. This language that we are arguing over today does not involve a penny; it is a limitation. It does not involve 1 dime, and the subsidy cannot be paid, Mr. Speaker, until the route has lost money. If it is making money it is not eligible for a subsidy payment, not at all. It has got to go in the hole before the subsidy is paid. He just wants to adopt this language which will destroy the merchant marine program in this country.

Do you know what he is doing? He is perpetuating the so-called Club 13. Nobody else can join the club if this language is approved. But he wants to take the subsidies away from these small companies like the South Atlantic Steamship Co. in the port of Savannah, Ga., which does not get subsidies, although they are operating on routes that the Commission said were essential, going to distant ports of the world where we want to establish trade relations and where it would be of assistance under the point 4 program of the President.

I hope you defeat the motion of the gentleman from Texas and adopt the motion of the gentleman from California.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. — I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the filing and printing of the conference report, Senator WHERRY may be permitted to sign the report on the general provisions and the general reduction sections including chapters 10 (a) and chapter 11 of the bill H. R. 7786, making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there are no ships from South Dakota operating in the merchant marine. I have no personal interest in this matter one way or the other, but I have sat through the hearings of the committee and I have sat through the conferences and I have heard the discussion on

the one hand by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], and on the other by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. Perhaps I can make a little objective observation here. There is not a dollar involved in either amendment as to how much we appropriate; the dollar sign appears earlier in the bill. That is not affected in any way by what we do at this point.

What we are doing here is considering only whether the limitations shall be the requirements which exist in the basic law and those remaining in the original House bill, or whether we shall adopt the limitation proposed by the gentleman from Texas which would add a limitation by number on the ships that might get this subsidy. As I say, I heard the whole argument. It seems to me that the whole question here is whether or not this \$85,000,000, which is available for payment of operating subsidies, shall be limited to 263 ships that already have their feet in the trough, so to speak, or whether it will be possible for other ships to qualify and participate in the operating subsidy. Perhaps I should change the metaphor and say "keels in the soup" instead of "feet in the trough."

The gentleman from California has pointed out that there are several shipping lines or some shipping lines which have prepared other ships to go into service. They have expended money on them anticipating that they could qualify if they went into service and failed to make operating expenses.

The limitation that the House approved when the bill passed the House limited payments to those ships that were in service and qualified as of January 1, 1950. The Senate amendment strikes that out and leaves the money here for such ships as might meet the qualifications under the basic law. That would be the effect of the motion to concur by the gentleman from California. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas would seek to put a limitation on the number of ships that could receive subsidy payments. He now says 263 or 262 is the number that are in operation. I have heard various figures. I have heard the figure as low as 239 and I have heard the figure as high as 288.

I do not know what the number is because the testimony has been conflicting. I do know that the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be to freeze this monopoly in the hands of certain ships or their owners. If it is a good thing to encourage the development of our merchant marine by providing an operating subsidy so that those who do not make their expenses can come before the Maritime Commission, offer a showing of their operating losses and qualify for some of this fund, it does not seem to me that we should limit it to a number of ships or to those owners having their feet in the trough already. It should be open to the ships that can qualify under the terms of the law.

That is why I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is not as good as a limitation as we had in the bill when it passed the House. It

would be fairer to put it upon the basis of those who qualified as of January 1, 1950, as we did by the bill as it passed the House. To limit it to a certain number of ships, which by the gentleman's own words is only one more than those already actually in operation, could be an unwise and unfortunate limitation. The parliamentary situation is this: The gentleman from Texas has offered an amendment which would take the place of the motion offered by the gentleman from California. If you want to go back to the position offered by the gentleman from California, of course, you must vote down the preferential amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCUDDER. I am interested in this measure. As I understand it the amount of money provided would be spread out a little thinner over a greater number of ships?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is right. Those of you who are familiar with the agricultural conservation program will remember that we provide so much money for the triple A or for the conservation program to use in prosecuting its program with the farmers of the country. I know more about that than I do about the ship subsidy. But when you say so much money is available to the Department of Agriculture, they then have to make their allotments by States and the farmers come in within the amount available for that State. You do not limit the farmers by number. The effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is to say that only a certain number of ships can qualify for operating subsidies. The motion offered by the gentleman from California does not change the dollars appropriated it; it simply says any ship can come in if it can qualify.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, that is the queerest argument I have ever heard my distinguished and able friend from South Dakota make. Of course, he participated very actively in the committee in this when we wrote a limitation at the very beginning of 235 ships. Now it is 265. His conclusion that it will perpetuate a monopoly is as erroneous as any statement that, that great, fine gentleman has ever made. Of course, under the limitation in here you could increase the number from 263 up to a thousand if the Secretary of Defense says it is necessary.

Now, about the money angle in here. All of this talk is about nothing but money. Mr. Frazer Bailey and his crowd would not be needling everybody around here if there were not other than dollars and cents involved.

We have tentatively agreed, and the Maritime Commission has indicated—and I am not trying to pin them down on anything—do not misunderstand me—that the probabilities are great when your next rescission bill comes in here that \$50,000,000 of this subsidy will be rescinded. My judgment is we ought to rescind the whole \$85,000,000, but the Maritime Commission has tentatively

agreed we can rescind \$50,000,000 of it on the basis they do not need it, because all of the ships, if the present war keeps up, will, as I said a while ago, make more money than they can haul, much less count.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was just going to recall to the gentleman's mind the fact that none of us were entirely happy about the original numbers limitation, and we abandoned it when the debate started on the independent offices appropriation bill in favor of the January 1, 1950, formula. The gentleman has read from the Comptroller's report. I do not know what that has to do with this particular question. No one went further than I in castigating the Maritime Commission on the basis of the Comptroller's report, and the RECORD of the debate when the original bill was on the floor will bear me out on that.

Mr. THOMAS. We only had 235 ships, and we have given them 19 more now, and yet my friend blows both hot and cold, and again I say I love him and admire him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman knows that the limitation of 235 was not entirely satisfactory to everybody because of conflicting evidence. And during the debate on the floor of the House we came out with a limitation not in terms of numbers but upon the basis of those that qualified as of January 1, 1950.

Mr. THOMAS. Which we found was around 235.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And I said on the floor a minute ago that I thought the limitation by the date January 1, 1950, was much more sensible than either the position of receding entirely or of making the limitation by numbers. Unfortunately, we have already receded, and I know of no way now to go back to the limitation or qualification that was in the bill as it left the House.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS) there were—ayes 91, noes 63.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS) there were—ayes 91, noes 76.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker appointed as tellers Mr. THOMAS and Mr. PHILLIPS of California.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 121, noes 97.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 373: Page 353, line 23, strike out "\$17,724,000" and insert "\$17,524,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 373, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$15,024,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 388. Page 366, line 1, after "project" insert "Provided further, That the section entitled 'National Military Establishment' in Public Law 343, Eighty-first Congress, first session, providing appropriations for the project at Mandan, N. Dak., is hereby amended to authorize reimbursement to local interests for such work as they may have done in providing interior drainage facilities at Mandan, subsequent to appropriation of funds for construction, as a part of the local flood-protection project, insofar as such drainage facilities shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the authorized project: *Provided further*, That such payment shall not exceed the sum of \$76,000: *Provided further*, That \$25,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available, at a total cost of not to exceed \$100,000, to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors for the purpose of continuing the review of the report on James River and tributaries, North and South Dakota, published as House Document Numbered 83, Seventy-third Congress, and determining the advisability of improvements for flood control and related purposes on James River and tributaries, including Pipestem Creek."

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KERR moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 388, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In line 13 of said amendment, and after the figure "\$76,000", change the colon to a period and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 399. Page 374, line 19, after "diem" insert "and contracts with not to exceed 23 temporary or part-time employees may be renewed for 1 year."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 399, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In line 2 of said amendment strike out the words "not to exceed 23."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 467. Page 443, line 10, insert:

"SEC. 630. Appropriations and contract authority contained in this chapter shall not be subject to the provisions of subsections (c) to (i), inclusive, of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1111 of this act, during the existence of an emergency affecting the national security."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 467, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the language proposed by the said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "During the current fiscal year, appropriations, funds, and contract authorizations, available for military functions under the Department of Defense, shall not be subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1111 of this act."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 471. Page 447, line 4, insert:

"ECONOMIC COOPERATION"

"For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended by the act of April 19, 1949 (Public Law 47), and as further amended by the act of June 5, 1950 (Public Law 535), including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation (not to exceed \$30,000); hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation and hire of aircraft; payment of damage claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); rents in the District of Columbia; transportation of privately owned automobiles; entertainment (not to exceed \$20,000); exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes; and loss by exchange; \$2,450,000,000, of which not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for expenditures of a confidential character (other than entertainment) under the direction of the Administrator or the Deputy Administrator, who shall make a certificate of the amount of each such expenditure which he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein specified: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be consolidated and merged with funds heretofore made

available for the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and such consolidated appropriation may be used during the fiscal year 1951 within the limitations herein specified."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 471, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in line 15 of said amendment insert: "\$2,250,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the line number is wrong. It should be line 18.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the motion will be modified accordingly.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. RICH. You are now considering an amendment that was offered to the appropriation bill by the other body appropriating money for this economic cooperation and for other foreign gifts. It seems to me that when the House has not considered this legislation but it comes from the Senate, that it ought to be taken up in the House and the Members be allowed to give consideration to the items that are contained therein. For instance, you have \$100,000,000 for Spain; \$90,000,000 for Korea; \$12,500,000 for welfare; \$26,900,000 for development; \$1,678,000,000 to arm foreign countries under the Atlantic Pact, yet the House of Representatives has not had an opportunity to debate and discuss them.

Mr. GARY. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Members will have ample opportunity to debate those matters; they are in separate amendments.

The amendment which you have before you at the present time relates purely to the ECA, the Economic Cooperation Administration. That organization last year had an appropriation of \$3,628,380,000. The budget estimate for this year was \$2,657,700,000, which is approximately \$1,000,000,000 less than was spent last year.

As the gentleman has properly stated, although the House committee had extensive hearings on all foreign-aid items, we did not complete our hearings in time to include these items in the House bill. The Senate approved for the ECA \$2,450,000,000, which was a further cut of approximately \$200,000,000. The conferees have recommended a further cut in that amount of \$200,000,000 to bring the amount down to \$2,250,000,000. I personally felt that was too much of a cut; and in view of the fact that the prices which the ECA is required to pay for commodities at the present time have greatly increased, I think the chances are that they are going to find it difficult to carry out their program as planned. However, that amount has been agreed to, and as chairman of the subcommittee I am now offering an amendment to make the amount \$2,250,000,000, as agreed to by the conferees.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman says that he is interested in increasing this because prices of commodities have increased. I want to ask you in all good faith, for the benefit of the American people who are paying the bill and the American people who have to buy the things in this country that they need, that if you think that you can increase this amount and expect the taxpayers of America to pay the bill and give these things away to these foreign countries all around the world, I say to you now, and I say to the Members of the House, that you will find out that all the help and aid you will get from these foreign countries will react to the detriment of the United States. Whenever you come to the time that you are wrecked financially and you have to go to the people of this country and say, "I want to go back to Congress because I want to protect you," the people of the country ought to say to this Congress, "You have ruined us; you have brought us to the point almost of despair; yet now you want us to pay more and more." I want to say that this New Deal administration ought to be taken into recognition by the people of this country, and they ought to be changed. If they do not change it, they are lost—lost forever.

Mr. GARY. May I say that I have the greatest respect for my friend from Pennsylvania, but I have just completed a primary campaign in my district. The election was held on August 1. In that campaign foreign aid was one of the major issues. I did not hesitate to champion the foreign-aid program as promulgated by this administration and approved by this Congress. I took an offensive rather than a defensive position on the issue and I was renominated by a handsome majority. So far as the people of my district are concerned they approve the foreign-aid program.

Mr. RICH. What are they going to say when you talk about arming these foreign countries? You talk about peace, peace, peace, yet all you do is prepare for war.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is acting in good faith, yet I think if we were to follow his direction it would mean a blow to the security of our country. If we were to follow the gentleman's reasoning, all of Europe would be controlled by the Communists today. We might just as well face the cold facts. None of us wants to appropriate the money but it is for the national interest of the United States.

It is very easy to talk about appropriating money and making gifts to other nations. What we are doing is for the national interest of our own country not to have all of Europe dominated by Communist regimes. We have seen Poland, we have seen Czechoslovakia, we have seen Rumania and Bulgaria, we have seen Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia not even given a satellite status. Unless we step in and do what we have

done western Europe, France, and Italy would undoubtedly be under the control of the Communists today.

With all due respect to my friend from Pennsylvania, and I respect him very much, as one American I do not think that would be for the national interest of the United States of America. The gentleman represents a point of view that is honest, the gentleman is absolutely sincere and I respect him for it; but in all justice to myself and other colleagues of mine who feel similarly, I think the RECORD should show that we do not believe it would be for the best interests of the United States of America to permit the remaining free countries of western Europe to become dominated by Communist regimes and thereby subject to Stalin and his gang in the Kremlin.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I do not question the way any Member votes. It is a tough proposition for me to get up here and say what I think when I know I am in the great minority. I believe it so sincerely that I think you will live to see the day you are going to rue it because we are wrecking America financially and when we wreck ourselves we are no good to either ourselves or anyone else.

Mr. McCORMACK. If I live to see the day when the Communists get control of the entire world but the United States of America, I shall rue that day, and I am going to do everything I can do to stop it if I can.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I regret to differ with my majority leader, but, in my opinion, the money as it is now being spent under the Mutual Assistance Act of over \$1,500,000,000 will not do the job as it is now being administered.

I think that we are heading for a major disaster in western Europe—an area of immense strategic importance to the United States.

The signs are many:

First, in eastern Europe the last year has seen Yugoslavia's military superiority decrease in relation to the Russian satellite countries. According to last Sunday's New York Times the Polish Army is stronger in number, equipment, training, and leadership than all of the western European continental armies put together. The Bulgarians are believed to have eight full combat divisions. It is assumed that the Soviet has made no less an effort with the Hungarian and Rumanian Armies.

Second, western Europe armed forces are in a deplorable condition in relation with the strength the Soviets could bring to bear in that area.

According to John Sherman Cooper, consultant to the State Department, there are about 12 British, French, Dutch, Belgian and American divisions, without a unified command, ready to defend western Europe. To meet this, the Russians have 175 divisions available—

with approximately 80 divisions averaging 10,000 men each, ready for any European offensive.

Third, it is, of course, general knowledge that the role of western Germany in defending western Europe is still undetermined.

Fourth, of even more importance is the lack of will to fight, especially in France, which has been growing steadily as the situation deteriorated.

According to the Associated Press of August 16 the lack of a will to fight such as resulted in the French collapse of the 1940's is in evidence again. What then must be done?

According to Walter Lippmann, the time has gone by when the continental nations can be satisfied with military aid, that is to say with money appropriated to procure arms.

The note of the French Government on August 7 stated the case clearly—no bigger French Army can be envisaged without a sufficient number of American divisions stationed in Europe.

Dr. Adenauer, the western German chancellor, states that we are going to have to send at least three more divisions within the next 3 months, and from then on there must be a steady build-up of army units.

If we are going to successfully meet our obligations under the Atlantic Pact—if we still feel it essential to our security that western Europe remain free—then we must mobilize our manpower to a far greater degree than we have as yet planned.

We must be able to put sufficient American divisions in the field in that area to demonstrate to the Europeans that we believe western Europe can be held.

The plain truth, and we all must know it, is that the forces that we now have and that we are planning to raise do not begin to meet the commitments that we have made.

On July 1 we had under arms 10 divisions—with 4 in Japan, the First and the constabulary in Germany, with perhaps 2 or 3 divisions in the United States. Nearly all of these troops, and the four National Guard Divisions are not enough to solve the problems in Korea alone. The French and the Germans have made it plain that they are not willing to fight, and so forth.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of this House, during my short tenure in this body as a Member of the Eighty-first Congress, I have, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], protested and voted against foreign aid as peace measures. Some of you will recall that during my many speeches in opposition to the foreign-aid program I always emphasized that former Secretary of State Marshall's plan for the European recovery program could not be justified as a peace measure and could be applied only as a defense and war measure for the preservation of our democracy.

I shall never have any apology for having protested during peacetime the lavish spending upon foreign soils with the fictitious hope of buying undependable friendship. No, it was never a peace movement; and during peace, there could be no justification for the taxpayers' money being so wasted. Especially, I could not justify the amounts of money involved, in face of my personal observation of the records which conclusively revealed wasteful administration to the extent that a great percentage intended for foreign aid was diverted from proper utilization.

However, Mr. RICH, we are now at war, and there is no need to kid ourselves about that. The European recovery program is a war measure that can properly be utilized in the time of war. The false dream of peace because of the European recovery program has completely vanished. We must not now deprive foreign aid of one single penny that we can afford in our efforts to prohibit the spread of war. This is now a defense measure; yes, this is now a war measure. We must not deprive ourselves of the benefits that can be derived from the involved funds in our efforts to protect the democracies from the onslaught of communism. I shall vote for foreign aid and every other defense appropriation during these troublesome times.

It is regrettable that this Congress has so lavishly wasted money during the last few years of peace upon unrealistic foreign policy to such an extent that we need now search for defense funds during war. Yes, it is regrettable that those wasted dollars have not been used for the general welfare of our own people. Especially is it regrettable that such funds were not used for our own defense. Our Air Force is pitiful; and, yet, those who have advocated lavish peacetime foreign aid have in the same breath protested the building of a great air force, necessary battleships, and providing ourselves with warring equipment, even though a child could easily foresee the probability of war at any minute during the last few years.

Oh, many who have in the past supported the European recovery program will now attempt to justify it in face of its failure by saying that the war would have come sooner, or that communism would have spread more had it not been for such policies. All of us can look around and see that our foreign-aid program has not in any wise provided peace or precluded war for 1 minute; and has certainly in no wise curtailed the spread of communism abroad or even internally within our own midst.

The peacetime Korean-aid program did not call for one dime of defense money; and of the millions appropriated by this Congress, less than \$1,000 ever reached Korea. This is just a typical example of the failures encountered by the foreign-aid program. Many other similar failures could be cited concerning the peacetime European recovery program. We have not bought a friend; and we are in the same trouble as had we saved our money for these troublesome times.

Mr. Speaker, we might as well confess that this country is now within its most critical period. Even though we are economically the strongest Nation in the world, we are without funds and strong friends. The British Navy is gone—the French people have given up—there are no allies that can assist materially. It is necessary that the United States of America fight the battles and pay the costs for the entire United Nations in the Korean conflict and any other outbreaks from Russia.

We have made mistakes, but to quibble over them will amount to nothing beneficial and will serve only to weaken our efforts. Maybe this time we will benefit from past experience; and after winning the war, we will for a change win the peace. I am hopeful that those who have protested wasteful foreign aid during peacetime will today assist in the passage of foreign aid as a defense and war measure.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I heartily concur in the recommendation of my good and able friend from Massachusetts that we must build up at least 25 combat divisions in Germany and do it quick if we are to stop Russians from communizing all of Europe and moving on to the English Channel. Time is running out on us. It is about time the policy makers of the State Department went into a huddle and determined what their policy in Germany is to be.

Recently, on July 21, in an interview with Ed Haaker NBC carried on July 22 in Voices and Events, Mr. John J. McCloy was asked the question:

Question. Should there be an attack on western Germany, will American troops defend the country without the help of German military contingents?

Answer. There are no German military contingents in Germany and we are not establishing them. On the other hand, I suppose there would be very many Germans who would be prepared and anxious to defend Germany in event of an attack, if given the opportunity. We are not talking now about rearmament of Germany or the creation of any sort of offset to the Communist-inspired Volkspolizei of the eastern zone. I am opposed to the re-creation of a German Army, but in the event of an attack such as took place in Korea I believe it would be very difficult indeed to deny the Germans the right and means to defend their own soil.

From this statement that the Germans would not be denied their right and means to defend their own soil, I wonder what Mr. McCloy thinks they would fight with—sticks and stones?

Now, along comes Mr. McCloy in a statement, by United Press, in the Washington Post of August 24, in which he says, and I quote:

West Germany's two top political leaders called today for a vast build-up of western armed strength in Europe and United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy promised that western Europe must and will be strengthened.

And continues:

Western Europe must and will be strengthened. Defense of Europe must be a joint ef-

fort and strength will be achieved. This will include Germany and require of the German people and their representatives straightforward and cooperative action.

As I stated before time is running out on us. We are either going to take a German on guard or a Russian on guard in France and Germany, and the State Department and the High Commissioner had better make up their minds—and quick—on a German policy.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to address the House on anything today except the question of the Spanish loan. But what was said by my dear friend and colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts, I think makes it necessary against to speak, especially as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee charged with the European recovery program, and the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. As I see it our country has a hard choice to make. Either fight the Russians now—and if you adopt this philosophy that all we have to do is to set down United States divisions in Europe and Asia and not do anything else, then that is a logical conclusion—to fight on our own terms and in our good time when we believe we can win.

The alternative, which I think is favored by the great majority of the American people very decidedly is that we should do everything we can to try to win the struggle against communism without a great war. In the interim to defend Europe with new divisions, and I think such divisions are necessary but also to do other necessary things.

That is the choice, Mr. Speaker, of fighting and fighting now, or of doing all the things which need to be done to take advantage of the only chance we have to avoid a war, and that is to put divisions where they are needed now—and I agree that they are needed in Europe—but also to arm and equip and train the Europeans; and finally to give them and other free peoples the will to fight by the economic recovery programs, because then we give them something in terms of goods, whereas the Communists give them nothing, only promises.

I am sure that practically every Member of the House of Representatives is just as worried as I am about the fact that the people in the Far East do not seem to have had enough which they considered worth while fighting or in adequate numbers on our side. It is our divisions in Korea now, with inadequate numbers of valorous South Korean—South Korean Republic—troops, who are carrying the heavy fighting. It is true that military preparations have not been well handled for the Asiatic peoples but the basic question is still the will to resist.

I say to you, my colleagues, though it may call for austerity on our part, our people are, I believe perfectly prepared. I am confident that as they are required

to fight this struggle against communism, they are willing to fight on three fronts—one, with United States divisions; two, with arming of our allies; and three, with economic aid—because I think our people are convinced that it is needed and they are prepared to go much further than the leadership in the administration on that. They are convinced that that is the way to fight and to succeed in the struggle that we all want to win against communism.

Mr. KENNEDY. Do you not think it would be a mistake for us to expect merely because we are giving the Europeans large sums of money for arms that we are putting in the Europeans any will to fight?

Mr. JAVITS. I just said to the gentleman that arms aid is only one phase of the whole effort—all phases must go together.

Mr. KENNEDY. If we expect to hold western Europe we are going to have to send troops as well as money for arms.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree. I say all the things have got to be done—United States divisions—our allies' divisions—and economic aid to free peoples. That is the hard choice we face. That is the hard battle against communism we must make.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEOGH). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago this House passed and sent to the Senate without a dissenting vote H. R. 9141 to encourage and assist the construction of modern, efficient wholesale markets for fresh fruits and vegetables and other perishable food commodities. The sole purpose of this bill is to help in bringing about a reduction in the price spread between the producer and the consumer of perishable food commodities. It will do this by making possible construction of modern wholesale markets which will eliminate much of the waste, unnecessary handling and delay, and other costly practices that add to the consumer's food bill and impair the quality and nutritional value of these foods.

Essential to the operation of this legislation are the surveys and studies being made by the Department of Agriculture to determine, upon the request of the cities involved, whether improvements in their present wholesale market facilities are necessary and, if they are, exactly what type of facility is best suited to the needs of that community. This work was authorized under the Marketing Act of 1946 and was reemphasized in the bill the House has just unanimously adopted, H. R. 9141.

There are now pending a great many requests from cities for these surveys and studies. These studies are absolutely necessary before any real progress can be made in improving these facilities. I think there are more than 30 cities that are presently urging the Department to make these studies in their communities.

Under the provisions of the omnibus appropriation bill now before us, the

funds for title II of the Marketing Act of 1946—the appropriation from which the funds to make these studies and surveys is derived—are appropriated in a lump sum of \$6,000,000. The allotment of that money among the various projects and purposes authorized by title II is left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

If it were not for the provisions of section 1114 of this bill—the section which directs a saving in the aggregate expenditures for each department—I would have no fear that the work of surveying, studying and planning to meet the market needs of cities would receive its full proportion of the available funds. In view of the fact that this provision is in the bill—and that the allotment of these funds are entirely within the discretion of the Secretary—I believe it should be recalled to his attention the importance with which Congress views this work.

During the past fiscal year only about \$140,000 out of the several millions available for title II operations were devoted to these important market facility studies and plans. It seems to me that this is a small enough amount to be devoting to this work. In view of the fact that the House has within the past few days unanimously expressed itself on the great importance it attaches to the improvement of our wholesale marketing facilities, I hope that it will be possible to make the necessary reductions in other projects, or at the very least not cut this important marketing work more than the over-all average which is applied to the whole program.

(Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this because I thought it was pretty well settled. But possibly it might be well to clear the atmosphere. The question before the House is, Are we going to appropriate the \$2,250,000,000 to continue the Marshall plan, or not, and that is going to be the "yes" or "no" vote which will come along shortly. This program was launched in 1948 in the Eightieth Republican Congress. In that year, as you remember, we appropriated about \$5,380,000,000. It has been cut down now to where it is less than half that amount in the third year. It was launched at a time when a great many of us thought Europe might go Communist from the inside. I remember during the debate on this floor telling one of my colleagues, "If you are not voting for this on the basis of security for the United States, you had better not vote for it at all." I said that 2 years ago and I think so even more now. I regret the failure of our foreign policy in the eastern half of the world, but our foreign policy in Europe, based largely on the Marshall plan and Greek-Turkish aid, which were both launched in the Republican Eightieth Congress, has resulted in holding the line against Communists over there up to now.

On this "Yes" and "No" proposition that faces us now, if we were now to say "No" to those whom we have encouraged to continue to resist by very generous contributions toward their economic rehabilitation, if we were now to say, "Boys, it is all over, let us forget it," Europe would probably go Communist in a hurry. I say that not because I have such great confidence in their will to fight. On the contrary, their will to fight and their economic ability to fight needs bolstering. They are over there under the guns; the first people who will be attacked if the Communists start west will be the people in western Europe. They will do their best, but they will also be looking over their shoulder wondering whether the most powerful Nation on earth is going to fight if they are invaded. The most powerful Nation I refer to is ourselves. Not most powerful militarily, because our policy is not aggression, but most powerful economically, politically, morally, and spiritually, towering over all the rest. To say to those people, when we have had devastating defeats and disasters in the eastern half of the world, that because of that and because of high prices and the general situation we are going to vote "No" on this, we are not going to continue this plan that was launched 2 years ago, in 1948, would be so disastrous that I had thought it was a matter that was not at this time the subject of serious debate. I do not think it should be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I remember well the gentleman's speech, where he stressed the importance of the Marshall plan from a security angle, and I joined with the gentleman on that occasion. I would like to ask my friend, who is one of the outstanding students of foreign affairs in this country, assuming we had not given aid, has the gentleman any views as to whether or not Italy and France could have successfully resisted the influence of the Communists within, backed by the power of the Soviet Union without?

Mr. VORYS. I believe they could not have resisted. I remember very vividly, although some others may not, the Italian election that was going to be held on April 18, 1948, and the race against time to get this legislation through in the Eightieth Congress. The deadline was April 1 on that measure and other measures included in it. This House finished it on March 31, and the fact that we not only passed it and supplies went forward, but that we finished it on time was, in my humble opinion, a great factor in the result that those countries did not go Communist from the inside, and since that time, at least for a period of 2 years, the Soviet Russian Communists have apparently despaired of overturning Europe from the inside. Now, comes the

threat of overt aggression. I proposed that we combine military aid with economic aid in March 1948, but the Administration would not support my proposal. However, what we did was not only valuable in peace, a great generous measure for rehabilitation and recovery, but also involved an element of higher selfishness that involved our own security in that it strengthened Europe to resist Communism, especially from within. That is clearer every day.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, we have here a motion to agree to \$2,250,000 for the ECA. Frankly, I think it is a larger figure than is needed. On the other hand, it represents the working out of a situation, and I shall support the motion made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The whole situation has changed in the last few months. We have in this bill an item of a little over \$1,600,000,000 for military aid to western Europe. We have in the supplemental appropriation bill, which is to follow this conference report, something like \$4,000,000,000 for that same military aid. A very large amount involved in that military aid will be provided for the purpose of permitting those countries to make things themselves which can be used for their defense. It will tend to build up their economic situation; it will provide them with dollars with which they can obtain goods so that there will be very considerably less need than there has been on some other occasions. The drafts out of the Treasury to this date are approximately \$115,000,000 as against \$360,000,000 a year ago. Or about one-third of what a year ago was required. It is absolutely necessary that we go ahead and pass this motion, in my opinion, and I hope that the House will do so.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. KEOGH]. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 472: Page 448, line 8, after "specified," insert "Provided further, That the Administrator is authorized and directed to issue notes from time to time during the fiscal year 1951 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to make such purchases, in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate \$100,000,000 for the purpose of assistance to Spain, to be extended upon credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 472, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of

the sum named in line 6 of said amendment insert "\$62,500,000."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, is it possible at this time to have this question divided so that the House will have presented before it squarely the question of receding or not receding?

The SPEAKER. The motion is divisible.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the motion be divided.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks for a division of the motion.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The question now before the House is whether or not the House recedes; am I correct?

The SPEAKER. That will be the first question presented.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Spanish loan provision. I am, personally, absolutely and unequivocally opposed to the Spanish loan provision of this bill. I do not think it has any place in the bill. If it does remain in the bill, in my judgment, the language should be changed. However, the conferees agreed that the language should not be changed but that the amount approved by the Senate should be reduced from \$100,000,000 to \$62,500,000. As chairman of the managers on the part of the House I offered the motion to carry out that agreement.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. COX. May I inquire of the gentleman managing this item of the bill, he being opposed to it, if it is his intention to yield to Members who favor the provision and would like to see it adopted?

Mr. GARY. I shall yield to anyone who asks me for time as long as time is available. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that I shall discharge my duties to my committee in full. I simply stated my personal views for the Record. If, however, the gentleman has any doubt as to my fairness I shall be glad to retire from the management of this item.

Mr. COX. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I do not question the gentleman's fairness; but I do feel that the committee having reported this item, that those favoring its adoption should have something to say in the debate.

Mr. GARY. Certainly, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, those favoring will have the same opportunity as those opposing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to any loan to Franco, whether it be \$100,000,000 or \$62,500,000. There is an old saying, "To him who is in fear everything rustles." We are indeed in

a jittery state if we approve this loan. Apparently the shadow of Russia makes us do queer things. This loan is one. We seem to hear rustling on all sides. This fear persuades us to rely upon Franco as an ally. What a broken reed to lean on.

The United Nations resolution, be it remembered, condemned Franco. We supported wholeheartedly that resolution and we did it with courage and with determination. We withdrew our Ambassador. Now our fears make us forget the UN resolution, in spirit at least, if not in word.

Mr. Speaker, you remember the telegram that Franco sent to the head of the puppet Government in the Philippines, Jose Laurel, when Emperor Hirohito made Laurel head of that country. Franco said in that telegram: "Most sincere sentiments from the Spanish people." That was while our boys were fighting and dying in the foxholes with the purpose of liberating the Philippines.

Nor must we forget the Nazi submarines and the U-boats which operated from the Spanish port of Vigo with the knowledge and consent of Franco. Think of the heavy loss we paid in lives and treasure.

We cannot subscribe to the non sequitur that an enemy of an enemy is a friend. If Tom hates Harry and Dick hates Harry, does it necessarily follow that Tom and Dick love each other? Must Uncle Sam love Franco because both hate Russia?

Moreover, I see very little point in wooing a bride that is already won. By that I mean that by no stretch of the imagination would Franco Spain throw its lot in with the Russian cause. No pact of ours need shape Spain's policy in that direction. It is already shaped. The word "welcome" would be on the Spanish mat to American aviators. There is no need to buy that "welcome" with a loan.

I believe the whole conception of the dependability of building beachheads for United Nations forces in Spain is the worst kind of deceit and defeatism.

This picture of Franco Spain as a strong and indispensable ally, is just wishful thinking and blatant propaganda. Franco Spain is weak and its people cowed and frightened by military dictatorship. Franco's army is designed to run a police state, not to fight a good cause.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope this provision involving a loan to Franco will be decidedly voted down.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, opposition to this motion is, in my judgment, reckless irresponsibility. Here by this vote we measure the depth of the concern of the membership of this Congress in the welfare of a nation. I should recognize the fact that we need Spain quite as badly as Spain needs us. She is in position to offer valuable and effective assistance to us and others in our endeavor to save what still remains of the once free world.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to this question I shall not deal with those phases of it which go to personalities nor to the tragic events of the past which my colleague from New York [Mr. CELLER] has just so completely dealt with, but shall confine myself to what I consider to be policy for the best interests of our country in a sense of complete responsibility today and for the future.

Let us first recognize what has occurred in this measure. Without the consent of the head of our foreign policy, the President, the administrative organ in charge of foreign policy, the State Department, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate or the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, but on the motion of a particular Member of the other body who is especially interested in this cause, there is introduced into this appropriation bill a great decision of national policy—to establish Spain as a recipient of foreign economic aid from us. If for no other reason, at a time when foreign policy is the most important element in the life of the United States, this particular provision should be stricken out. If anything is irresponsible on the issue of how to run our foreign policy, this is it.

Let us go a little further and see what happens if we adopt this particular provision. It strikes a blow of the most serious character at two pillars of American foreign policy, the Atlantic Pact and the European recovery program. The Congress, not the Executive, is telling the other nations of Europe that we fear their vulnerability to a Soviet aggression and occupation; that we fear we must defend behind the Pyrenees; so by this act we tend to discourage them in the face of this Communist menace, even though we have appropriated billions of dollars for them to rearm and to resist. Even though, also, that is the basic purpose of the Atlantic Pact, of which Spain is not a part.

Then as to the European recovery program—in respect of which we pride ourselves that it is based on the great policy of self-help and mutual cooperation—we say to the nations of Europe who are organized in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, "No; you cannot make up your mind as to who you take in or whom you will cooperate with, we in the United States will do it for you." They have the full right and power to do it under the way we have set them up under the European recovery program, but we say, "We will dictate to you." The very thing we have been trying to avoid all these years we do by this particular provision of a loan to Spain. We say, "We will dictate to you what you shall do with respect to Spain," one of the great vexing problems of the world.

We are losing thereby infinitely more than we could possibly gain in help from Spain in our struggle against communism. We are in danger of losing millions of Europeans to seek a dubious allegiance which Spain cannot do any-

thing else but give us anyway, because she is completely isolated, and she cannot do anything else but cooperate with the United States and the other western powers fighting against communism. We do it in this way and at this time by a loan without agreements or commitments of any kind and with no assurance of any kind of action to help by Spain.

Let no one be deceived by this loan provision of \$62,500,000. A few years ago the most important financiers of Spain said that Spain needed a billion and a half dollars to sustain her economy instead of the amount proposed in this bill. Spain, economically, is at a low ebb. She needs far more than \$62,500,000, and this is nothing more than the camel getting its nose under the tent.

In economic terms, on economic conditions and agreements, Spain right now is discriminating against business generally, and American business. Foreign investment is limited to a total of 25 percent in any Spanish industrial enterprise, and foreign management participation is not favored. Private enterprises, though American-owned as to Spain, are subjected to harassments on foreign exchange and to other peculiar and harassing discriminations. The policy Spain is pursuing in economic matters is definitely opposed to the very things which the United States is trying to preserve in the world today; a full statement as to practices of grave concern to us has been made to the House this year.

And, I say this advisedly, that the proponents of this amendment should think very carefully about the fact that today there is coming into existence a policy of aid to Spain by the back-door, off the cuff, which hereafter will always haunt our relations with Spain. The thing to do for the proponents is to fight it out on the level on which it should be fought out, as a great national policy, and then if we give aid to Spain we will do it the right way, in an advised way, and in such a way that it will really help us in this great struggle against communism. As it is being done here today it is doing ourselves and our allies in all of western Europe and free peoples everywhere, a grave disservice.

Mr. KEOGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Does the gentleman realize that his statements of opinion about the condition of the business there and American businessmen are not agreed to by the American businessmen who are engaged in business there, as was evidenced by a dispatch in the New York Times on August 21?

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to refer the gentleman to what I consider to be a highly authoritative answer on the gentleman's point and which bears me out fully. It is the speech made on the floor of this House January 9, 1950, by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEEL], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which is based upon a survey made by a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in Spain

in November and December 1949 in which he stated exactly and almost in the same words just what I have said here about American and other business in Spain and about the economic situation in Spain.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in 12 years, one of our colleagues has not been present on the floor of this House when an appropriation bill was up or a conference report such as we are considering this afternoon. I refer to none other than the Honorable FRANK KEEFE, of Wisconsin, whom I had the honor and the privilege to serve with on the same subcommittee for the past 4 years. For 12 years he has been a member of this august body. For the past 10 years he has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations and a member of the subcommittee that I have the honor to serve as chairman of at the present time. During the Eighty-first Congress he was the ranking minority member of this committee, and even though at times during the Eightieth Congress, when he was chairman of the committee, we did not see eye to eye on many of the issues that were presented to us, there was one subject that we saw eye to eye with at all times and worked together in complete coordination, and that was on the over-all health problems confronting all of the people of our Nation. I take these few minutes today to express my appreciation in behalf of the gentleman from Wisconsin for all of the work that he has accomplished in his 12 years as a Member of this Congress toward better health for all the people of our Nation. I only mention a few things that he has accomplished. In the control of tuberculosis, it was through his efforts that we have the so-called X-ray teams that have been operating throughout the States of this country for the past 5 years; the water pollution and sanitation control program.

The hospital construction act which he so ably helped to get through the House appropriating necessary moneys for the National Institute of Health, where \$50,000,000 is being spent at Bethesda. It is the expectation that the hospital construction will be finished in July of 1952. That, in my opinion, is a monument to FRANK KEEFE, because it will be without question of doubt the greatest research institution in the world.

I think everyone knows of his work for the establishment of the National Cancer Institute and the National Heart Institute and the work he has done in the field of mental illness and dental health and for the construction of research facilities, which he started as chairman of this committee during the Eightieth Congress, and the foresight that he showed at that time in securing appropriations for the future financing of scholarships in the medical sciences which were established in the medical colleges throughout the country during the past few years.

Everyone knows of his work in the field of social security for all the people of this country. That work will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that because of a recent heart attack, the gentleman from Wisconsin, FRANK KEEFE, cannot be here. It seems strange that a man who has done so much in the field of heart research in this country should be stricken by a heart attack only 2 months ago on his arrival at his home. It seems strange that he cannot be here this afternoon. He is not going to run for reelection again.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it not only an honor, but a privilege and a pleasure to have worked and cooperated with the Honorable FRANK KEEFE of Wisconsin. I believe he has done more than any other individual, not only in the Congress, but in our country, for the better health of all the people of our Nation.

I know it is the fervent wish of every single Member of the Congress on both sides of the aisle that FRANK KEEFE will have a speedy and happy recovery and that his services will again be available for all the people of the country.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the applause following the remarks of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], coming as it did from both sides of the aisle, demonstrates the esteem and respect which this body holds for our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, FRANK KEEFE.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security, has fully and completely covered the record of Mr. KEEFE's legislative activities and the contribution he has made to the health and welfare programs of this Nation.

Although I only served on this subcommittee with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] during this Congress, I learned to admire and respect his great store of knowledge, his untiring zeal, and his forceful advocacy of the programs to which he was so deeply devoted.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, I bespeak the hopes and voice the prayers of my colleagues that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] will be speedily and completely restored to health.

All of us wish for FRANK KEEFE a long, happy life as he leaves behind him his congressional life and activities. He served long and honorably.

We will miss him in the next and succeeding Congresses.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

(Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to take the floor to discuss this matter which we now have under consideration. I hold no brief for Franco as such. It was my privilege, however, in 1947, together with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] and Senator MUNDT, who was then a Member of the House, to spend 2 hours with

Franco in his summer palace. I came away from that meeting with the feeling that Franco was trying to do a good job for the Spanish people. When we talk about dictators, when we talk about the course of conduct he has pursued to bring peace, and some measure of stability to Spain, I think we ought to be consistent. We are not consistent when we condemn him for what he has done, because we are supporting other dictators in Europe and South America just as well as Franco or his Government.

What protest was made, I ask you, by Members of this House, when, a few weeks ago, the Communist dictator Tito received loans from our Government? Steel plants are being shipped to Yugoslavia now. Did ever a more ruthless dictator rule anywhere than Tito? It was his antiaircraft batteries that shot down American airplanes. We are supporting another dictator in Europe, another country that is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty group whom we have accepted with open arms. Have you ever heard of Salazar of Portugal? Was any protest made when we included Portugal for loans under ECA? No. Yet does any head of any government anywhere rule with greater dictatorial power than Salazar? Where were those Members then who now profess with great alarm the menace of dictatorships? Franco may be guilty of many charges made against him. I do not know about that, but I do know that Franco has prevented the Communists from taking over his country. Our own authorities will admit, as have the British, that Franco did cooperate with the Allies during the war. We say that it is our policy to stop communism, yet we are doing business with Russia and, in the city of Washington, the Soviet maintains an embassy, a listening post which gathers information to be used against us. Where is our consistency?

What consistency in our foreign policy when we recognize every rump revolution in South America and military dictators are set up as a result of those revolutions?

Mr. Speaker, every military man in our Government who has worked in the European theater of operations states unequivocally that in the event of war with Russia in Europe we will need the help of Spain. It stands ready to assist us if we give it the chance. Our national security is involved in this whole question and, for that reason, I favor financial assistance to Spain at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

(Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, what we have before us today to me is no surprise. It is true that the propaganda for this aid to Franco was conceived in Coca-Cola; but the fact nevertheless remains that the loan to Franco is the legitimate product of your for-

eign policy which compels us to embrace fascism. I cannot see how we in good conscience can justify embracing fascism, bearing in mind what fascism has done to the people of Spain. I cannot see how people who pretend to be the friends of labor can vote to aid a Fascist regime which has destroyed the labor movement completely in Spain; where hundreds of thousands of workers have been imprisoned, and thousands and thousands of workers have been shot. How can you justify voting \$62,000,000 for Franco and in the same bill refuse the \$12,000,000 which the Senate voted for international children's work? How can anyone justify support for Franco who aided and abetted Hitler and Mussolini in killing our boys? Of course, you seek to justify this, as you seek to justify everything else, by saying that all these crimes against democracy are committed to stop communism. This latest travesty on our democracy is the inexorable outcome of your foreign policy. If you oppose it nowadays, your patriotism is questioned. Whether it be a move to impose the exploitation of monopoly capital through the ECA on the people of Europe, or whether it be this action to help continue the Fascist rule of Franco on the Spanish people, oppose it and your loyalty is questioned by every faker and spurious patriot. By this foreign policy we must consider every revolt on the part of people against oppression as aggression on the part of the Soviet Union, or we are deemed to be subversive. Demand peace and the profit patriots and their political servants will seek to pillory you. Well, there was a time when we had a similar situation and a similar argumentation given in other parts of the world. Mussolini told the Italian people, "Follow me. This is a crusade against communism." As a direct result fascism was imposed upon the people of Italy, and he sought to impose it upon the people of Africa and Europe, and he helped impose the butcher Franco on the people of Spain.

Hitler said the same thing. He said, "Follow me. This is a crusade against Bolshevism. This is a crusade to stop communism. Destroy the civil liberties of the people of Germany. Destroy the constitutional rights of the workers and all other groups within Germany, and then march on against the rest of the world. We are fighting communism. We are doing this to stop communism."

There were some people in Germany who stood up and opposed that. They were called traitors, and the finger was pointed at them and they filled the concentration camps. But history has passed judgment on that policy, which is similar to the one which you have been promoting here today and other days for the past 5 years. History passed judgment and not too much time has gone by, just a matter of a few years. History has decided who were the real Germans; who were the real Italians. Those who said "yes" to this policy employed by Mussolini and Hitler? Those who said "yes" to the similar slogan, "destroy communism," and with that they allowed democracy and decency that exist-

ed in those countries to be destroyed? Were they the patriots, they who said "yes" to all this? Oh, no, the real patriots of Germany and Italy were those who resisted, those who did stand up and did incur the wrath and the opprobrium and the persecution and the vilification that so many so-called liberals, pseudo-liberals are afraid to incur here and now join the real enemies of democracy in support of Fascism incarnate, the product of Mussolini and Hitler, the bloody and bestial Franco.

Now, there is something else here. You voted to draft American boys to fight and die for this policy. You want them to answer to their names when the roll is called. The least you can do is to go on record when you vote for this policy for which you ask Americans to fight and die. The American people want the Members of this House to answer to a roll call on this loan to Franco. There is a maneuver on foot to dodge a record vote. We might as well face it. I say you have no right to ask American boys to fight and die, and then refuse to go on record so that the American people can know how you vote on an issue as fundamental and as important as this. Therefore I throw out the challenge. No matter how you vote, stand up for the yeas and nays when they are demanded. You ask Americans to fight and die; but do you have the courage to stand up and be counted?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I approach this question, I must confess, with some misgivings. I have long been of the opinion that we should be realistic about this Spanish matter. I, of course, do not find myself in accord with the reasoning of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. The gentleman from New York at one time, I regret to say, not too long ago, had a considerable following in this House; but, thanks to the patriotism of those Members who followed him, now that they have been enlightened, they no longer are found in his possession.

Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief for the dictator, Franco. Nor did I have any love for the dictators, Mussolini and Hitler, to whom the gentleman referred; but I might, also, add that I have never held any brief for the greatest dictator of them all, Joe Stalin, to whom the gentleman from New York did not refer in his arraignment of dictators. But permit me to say to my colleagues that I do not like this idea of a loan to Spain. I am generally in disfavor with the philosophy that our friends abroad must be purchased with American dollars. I think this whole approach of this loan is conceived in error. That we need friends abroad and that we should establish diplomatic relations with Spain is, to my mind, unquestioned. To my mind it is inconceivable that we should continue diplomatic relations with Russia, headed by the greatest dictator of all, and refuse to recognize Spain, on the ground that Generalissimo Franco is a dictator. Obviously, this is a back-door approach, and I am afraid is one

that is not well thought out. Before any loan to Spain should be considered, we at least should establish diplomatic relations.

In this all-out fight against communism at home and abroad we must be realistic. Who here today is there who can say that in the not too distant future we may not have urgent need for bombing bases in Spain, the closest proximity to Russia? I hope that day will not come, but if it does, who then will question the type of government that the people of Spain have? Let the administration reestablish diplomatic relations with Spain and forget the loan.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have long been convinced that this Nation should recognize Spain, and I am more than ever convinced from what I have heard today from those who have spoken on both sides of this issue that Spain should be recognized, and that this loan of \$62,500,000 should be made to the Government of Spain. This I know beyond the peradventure of a doubt, Franco has maintained the independence of Spain and the dignity of the Spanish people. No foreign invader, no foreign dictatorship has imposed its will upon Spain or the people of that country. I know also and we all know that Spain is a natural fortress in Europe: The Pyrenees are a natural barricade between Spain and France. The mountains, the Mediterranean and Gibraltar which is still under the control of Britain constitute that country a natural fortress.

Franco, I am informed has 18 divisions at this time which need only modern arms to be one of the finest fighting bodies in the world. In addition to that, I believe the people of that country will fight on our side. I am looking for a people and a nation who in the war that now impends will stand side by side with the boys from my country and your country and shoot down enemies who will be shooting down our boys.

Politics makes strange bedfellows. International politics has made natural bedfellows of Franco and the Spanish people for the people of our country. The Spanish people have always been known for their valor, for their courage and their willingness to fight and to die for their convictions and for their freedom. Theirs is a religion that is one of the anchors of civilization and human freedom. I do not hesitate here, now, or anywhere else to stand up and be counted on this issue.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that when we were in Paris last December I spent an hour with General DeLattre, commander of the ground forces of the Atlantic Pact countries, and he said he would like to have the Spanish infantry in the set-up for the protection of western Europe.

Mr. JENNINGS. All I have to do to make up my mind is to watch which way

certain people go, then I go in the other direction.

The issue is crystal clear. The battle lines are drawn. Atheistic communism seeks to conquer, dominate, and comminize the free, Christian peoples of the world.

To all those whose heart is as our heart, we say—Give us your hand, stand by our side, make common cause with us—and civilization, Christianity, and liberty will be saved.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

[Mr. O'TOOLE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I happen to be against the principle of dictatorship, whether it is in Russia, whether it is in Spain, or whether it is in Portugal. It is a principle with me that I am against and I intend to vote against this loan to Spain as a part of that principle.

FRANCO LOAN IS A COLOSSAL BLUNDER AND SHOULD BE DEFEATED

Mr. Speaker, when the history of this decade is written, it will be said that it came to a close with a colossal blunder, a monumental act of stupidity inspired by this Congress, namely, the proposal for a \$100,000,000 loan to Franco Spain.

Those who have persuaded themselves that Dictator Franco should be granted this loan are guilty of a fatal error in their thinking. They believe that every enemy of communism is a valuable ally of the democratic cause. They suppose, in palpable disregard of the known facts, that Dictator Franco can give aid and comfort to the democracies.

They have shrugged off the fact that the Franco regime is a Fascist regime that holds power by naked force and terroristic methods of suppression. Civil liberties are unknown in Fascist Spain. Free labor unions are not allowed to exist. Spaniards who, in their misery and agony, openly protest against the Franco regime, are jailed or shot in cold blood. Franco does violence to everything that we hold dear in the democratic way of life.

Paid propagandists of the present Spanish Government are working overtime in this country at lavish salaries, to persuade Americans that Franco is a kindly and benevolent ruler who makes common cause with us in the crusade against communism. They aim to help us forget that Franco came to power only with the help of Hitler and Mussolini—the Fascist dictators who were ground to dust by allied might in World War II.

It is a curious and ironic note that antisubversion legislation now before the Senate, if literally and honestly construed, would bar from our shores as subversive aliens the Spanish Falangists whom we propose to help by means of a \$62,500,000 loan.

The loan to Franco is reprehensible from any point of view.

This loan is bad in principle. At a time when we are proclaiming to the world the virtues of democracy, we cannot in good faith and consistency take to our bosom this orphan of facism left over from World War II. Democracy is not made stronger by seeking allies among those who hate it. The success of our struggle against world communism depends upon the strength and vigor of democracy.

This loan is bad business. In effect we would be directing the Export-Import Bank to make the loan without regard to sound business judgment and the criteria normally used for such loans. The Franco loan would be, as has been said, a "shotgun" order to the bank.

Our State Department has repeatedly declared that Spain can freely apply to, and consult with, the Export-Import Bank for credits for specific projects on the same basis as any other country. The department is on record as being prepared to acquiesce in the extension of credits to Spain covering specific and economically justifiable projects. Also, loans by private American bankers have been, and can be, made to Spain.

I believe that our Government has leaned over backward and has been more than generous in its position on economic assistance to a government which merits no support whatever from us. Aside from being a Fascist dictatorship, the Spanish Government has imposed restrictions on trade and foreign exchange and on foreign investments which prevent the very economic development we now propose in Spain to foster by this loan. Why should the American taxpayer support, through a bad loan, those economic objectives which Spain will not diligently undertake for itself?

This loan is bad business in another important sense. Today we are spending millions for Voice of America broadcasts. A greatly stepped-up information program has been requested by the President. By holding up Spain with one hand while we are offering democracy with the other, we will nullify for a great part of the world the value of our expensive broadcast program. The Voice of America will fall upon deaf ears while the Russians are blaring forth the fact of our aid to Fascist Spain.

A \$62,500,000 loan to Franco will mean that another \$100,000,000 program—the Voice of America—will be broadcast into a rat hole.

This loan is bad political policy. The eyes and ears of the world are concentrated upon the fateful decisions we make today. Fascist Spain does not sit well with the democracies of western Europe. Still struggling painfully to rebuild their war-shattered lives, the free peoples of Europe do not have such short and convenient memories as we do. The horror of nazism and fascism is burned too deeply into their minds and souls for them to hold out the hand of friendship to the remaining spawn of Hitler and Mussolini. If we hold out that hand to the Spanish Government, we will fritter away the good will of free Europe.

We will do irreparable damage to the cause of democracy.

I have heard a few Members say in this House that Spain is the real bulwark against communism in Europe. Why do they suppose we are spending billions in Marshall plan aid to strengthen the democracies of France and Britain and the other free nations of western Europe? Communism will be held back in Europe if these nations remain free and are made strong. Fascist Spain can do nothing to save Europe from communism. Politically and geographically isolated, it has no influence in the councils of Europe, no prestige, no power—nothing. It is but the evil symbol of the Fascist remnants left over from the Great War.

Toward the end of that war, when the United Nations organization was being created, it was agreed that Spain should never become a member of the United Nations so long as the Franco government held sway. The first session of the General Assembly early in 1946 endorsed this position and later in that year the General Assembly passed a resolution that the Franco government be barred from membership in specialized agencies of the UN and that all member nations recall their ambassadors from Madrid. In subsequent years, the matter of Spain was debated a number of times in the General Assembly, but the original resolution was never repealed.

Our State Department has declared itself as questioning the wisdom and efficacy of the actions recommended by the 1946 resolution of the General Assembly, particularly on the ground that it has only served to strengthen the position of the Franco regime. Whether that be so or not, let us keep in mind that the great majority of the United Nations have never accepted Franco Spain as an equal partner or a deserving member of the family of nations.

This loan is bad military policy. It is often said, though never verified, that we must court Franco because the military planners want to make Spain a stronghold behind mountains, a military bastion and base of operations in the event Europe is overrun by Soviet communism. Here again, we must ask the advocates of this view, why do they suppose we are preparing to spend billions for arms aid to the nations of western Europe, and planning actively for standardized weapons and joint resistance to aggression following the Atlantic Pact? Spain with her outmoded weapons, her poorly trained soldiers, and her demoralized population, will have no military help to offer. If the other nations of western Europe became convinced that in fact our military strategy is to use Spain as the focal point of European defense, then the Atlantic Pact will become a shambles, the billions to be spent for joint military security will be wasted in shattered European morale. For nothing would be plainer evidence that we considered western Europe expendable than a retreat behind Spanish mountains.

Let us, then, give sober thought to our actions here. By one fell stroke we can

wipe out the gains made in the past few years—gains made with hard work, and sacrifice and tremendous money costs—to keep the cause of democracy alive and strong in the free nations of Europe.

Let us come before the bar of world opinion with clean hands and a clear voice. Franco would weaken the fabric of the democratic, civilized world. Until Spain changes her robes of dictatorship for garments of freedom, we cannot, we must not feed the flames of Soviet propaganda by courting this Fascist regime.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, Joe Stalin is out to wreck the liberties of mankind. He is the menace that the free world faces today. In Russia you have no free labor unions, no free business enterprise, no free religion; you have an absolute dictatorship which controls every movement of her people. He seeks to fasten his tentacles upon the people of all the world. The United States today and the free nations of western Europe and the world are faced with a situation where they must utilize every facility at hand to combat communism and to maintain the liberties of their peoples. It is impossible for us to pass up alining ourselves with the free nations of the world. Spain must be alined with us. It is absolutely necessary if the United States and the rest of the free world are to survive the drive of communism and the effort to destroy our liberties, that we must stand together; that we must take advantage of our opportunity to protect ourselves to have every military facility that it is possible to line up alined up with us. I can see no way here for one who wishes to maintain the liberties of the world and the rights of the American people but to vote for this motion.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to this debate, because it is something I do not know too much about. There is one thing that impressed me all the way through. I know these Members of the House are serious. They know that we are dealing with grave problems that will affect our generation and generations to come. Yet, I have been struck with the idea that perhaps it was almost ludicrous for the House to sit here and undertake to write the foreign policy of the administration in a meeting of the House. We have a State Department; we have an executive department.

You may laugh. I do not stand here in defense of any individual, but I stand here in the interest of my people and of my country.

We have a system of Government of which we are very proud. To ignore the State Department and to ignore your President and sit here in a debate of 1 hour and undertake to establish a most important question of foreign policy, seems to me to be utterly ridiculous.

What are the terms of this loan? Under what conditions are we going to make this loan? Somebody gets up here and says, "We would like to have bases in Spain." How do you know you are

going to get any bases in Spain? How do you know you are going to get a farthing's worth for the sixty or ninety or one hundred million dollars? Gentlemen, let us stop, look, and listen before doing such a thing as this.

I have not been one who has been regarded as an administration Member of the House, but at least, in all the years that I have been in Congress, when we have been dealing with questions of foreign policy, I have always wanted to know before embarking on any such enterprise as this, what is the position of the President of the United States; what is the position of the Secretary of State; what is the position of your Secretary of War, and those people who are supposed to know? What does any individual Member of this House know about this situation, or what will be the effect or the result of this loan? We have been dealing with dictators for many years. All dictators look alike to me. I cannot see much difference between them, and I cannot understand how my friends here, who I know are thinking of only one thing, namely, the welfare of our country, can sit here in advance of advice from the administration and from the people who know the foreign situation and undertake to deal with this proposition in a House of 435 Members, many of whom I am sure, like myself, know very little about the situation.

Here you are not merely permitting this loan. You are not making any conditions of this loan. You are just saying here in the House of Representatives, "We demand and we instruct that you make the loan to Franco Spain."

Well, it is said, we are going to take a note for it. What do you want to take a note for anyhow, from a guy like that? If you are going to give him any money, why do you not give it to him and forget about it. If you do give him any money, do not expect to get any quid pro quo, because his word is not worth anything, nor is the word of any other dictator worth anything.

Again let me ask the Members of the House when you vote on this question, voting as I know you will, with the deepest sincerity and motivated by the highest ideals of public service, to stop, look, and listen, and at least ask for some advice of your President whom you elected to handle the questions of foreign affairs.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I never thought the occasion would arise when I would find myself in so complete disagreement with my dear friend, the gentleman from Virginia, who has just yielded the floor, as I do find at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this Spanish question has been dangling in the air for a number of years now, and I make the assertion that there are probably no more than 30 Members of this House of Representatives who are lacking in appreciation of the importance of our establishing some kind of a friendly working relationship with Spain.

The gentleman from Virginia takes the position that the making of the foreign policy of this country is no concern of the Congress. I would remind him that the Congress, or at least one branch of the Congress is, under the Constitution, made the final arbiter on the question of treaties and therefore it does have a responsibility in making decisions on questions of our relationship with other peoples of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have found thousands of instances where I was in disagreement with the State Department but not one where my disagreement was so complete as relates to its attitude toward Spain. Is Spain to ever be taken into the family of nations resisting Russia? How much longer does the State Department need to make final decision?

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], in the brief address he made this afternoon, developed the case quite satisfactorily, because he demonstrated in what respect we would need the cooperation and assistance of Spain in the event of an all-out struggle.

Mr. Speaker, at the moment we find ourselves in combat, in war, with a force that we know intends, if possible, to enslave the entire world. Just how long it will be our good fortune that this contest be localized in Korea, we do not know, but we have no assurance that it will not spread out all over the globe. Mr. Speaker, if that event should come to pass, is there one here who would question the need of Spain?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, I made it quite clear that I was in favor of recognition of Spain, but I did not say I was in favor of the loan. I want to get that straight.

Mr. COX. The gentleman at least did develop the case as far as the need of the cooperation of Spain is concerned. I say to the gentleman that we should manifest some reasonable understanding of the tremendous problem with which we are confronted. We should evidence something of an intelligent and interested concern in the welfare of the Republic. We should adopt this amendment and follow it with quick recognition of Spain.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recede.

Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. It is not a fact that the vote now recurs on the motion to recede; and if that is carried, then there will be a vote on the motion that the House concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry. Is it not a fact that on the motion to recede, if that motion is defeated that ends the matter of the Spanish loan?

The SPEAKER. That would be equivalent to disagreeing and insisting.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recede.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 165, noes 90.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 164, noes 80.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 473: Page 448, line 15, after "specified" insert: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$15,255,000 of such consolidated appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses during the fiscal year 1951."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 473, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$14,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 475: Page 448, line 22, after "specified" insert: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$600,000,000 shall be available for transfers under section 111 (d) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 475, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$500,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 476: Page 448, line 25, after "specified" insert: "Provided further, That after November 1, 1950, no funds herein appropriated shall be made available

to any nation of which a dependent area falls to comply with any treaty to which the United States and such dependent area are parties."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 476, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "Provided further, That after November 1, 1950, no funds herein appropriated shall be made available to any nation of which a dependent area falls in the opinion of the President to comply with any treaty to which the United States and such dependent area are parties."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 477: Page 449, line 3 after "specified" insert "Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which, in the opinion of the President, has failed, refused, or neglected to support the United Nations in the Korean war by supplying armed personnel, materials of war, or services."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 477, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which, in the opinion of the President, has failed, refused, or neglected to support the United Nations in resisting aggression."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 480: Page 450, line 4, insert:

"INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

"For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the act for international development (title IV of Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950), including personal services in the District of Columbia; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase (not to exceed 12), and hire of passenger motor vehicles for use outside the continental limits of the United States; printing and binding; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health-service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; acquisition of temporary quarters outside the continental limits of the United States to house employees of the United States Government by rental (without regard to section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), lease, or construction, and necessary repairs and alterations to such temporary quarters; exchange of funds without regard to section 8651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543); entertainment (not to exceed \$2,000); health and accident insurance for foreign trainees and technicians while absent from their own countries participating in activities author-

ized under this appropriation, and actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of such persons who may die away from their homes while participating in such activities; services of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for purposes of providing such services the Public Health Service may appoint not to exceed 20 officers in the Regular Corps to grades above that of senior assistant, but not above that of director, as otherwise authorized in accordance with section 711 of the act of July 1, 1944, as amended (42 U. S. C. 211a), and the Coast and Geodetic Survey may appoint for such purposes not to exceed 20 commissioned officers in addition to those otherwise authorized; \$26,900,000; and, in addition, there may be transferred to this appropriation for the purposes hereof not to exceed \$2,600,000 from the appropriation to the Department of State for international information and educational activities, fiscal year 1951: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for contracts or agreements entered into during the fiscal year 1951 pursuant to section 405 (e) of the act for international development which entail commitments for the expenditure of funds for not to exceed 3 years."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that this House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 480 and concur therein.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my good friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] and my fellow conferees on this chapter for their action with regard to this amendment. On yesterday during the conference with the Senate I moved that the House recede on this item and concur in the amount voted by the other body. The gentleman from Virginia, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES] and I voted in favor of receding and giving to the point 4 program the full amount voted by the Senate. The motion now before the House would correct an unfortunate mistake made on the part of the conferees who voted the other way on yesterday. I thoroughly agree with the present plan of correction of that mistake.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this is a similar program to one down in South America which has brought so much discredit to the United States and which has created such ill will on the part of South Americans against us. We have had people come back from there indicating repeatedly that that is the situation and that is the result.

Why we should appropriate three times what they can intelligently use is beyond any intelligent person's mind.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is always a precarious thing to try to look into the future. But I am convinced that if we accept the drastic cut in the point 4 appropriations, recommended in the conference report on Foreign Aid, we will find, a few years hence, that we have been penny-wise and pound foolish.

It seems to me that World War II showed us all too clearly that military victory alone—and the words “unconditional surrender”—do not necessarily mean the end of struggle. Five years of waging the cold war should have taught us that.

No sooner had we won a global war against a totalitarianism of the right when we were plunged into another global war—of a quite different kind—this time against a totalitarianism of the left.

Because we had not attacked the roots of world conflict, the military surrender of the Germans and the Japanese has meant very little in the way of bringing peace to America and the world.

We are now afforded an opportunity to learn our lesson. For unless we attack the roots of the present world conflict—the misery and poverty and disease that grip millions of human beings—military victory—in Korea or elsewhere—will mean precious little. We will still be faced with the task of meeting basic human needs.

Point 4 is our one program aimed at satisfying the basic needs of underdeveloped areas. It is our one program that attacks the roots of world conflict. It is not a large program by any standards—even with the \$26,000,000 provided in the Senate bill. It may not be large enough to do the job—but it is the foundation of an attack upon human misery.

In 1947 we tried to ignore the job to be done in Europe—and we tried to economize on foreign-relief funds to war-devastated areas—only to find in 1948 that the misery was still there. The job remained to be done, and we extended to western Europe some \$4,000,000,000.

I venture to say that had our penny-wise attempt to save \$150,000,000 in foreign relief funds prevailed in 1947, it might have seemed very pound-foolish in 1948, if it had cost an extra billion dollars to accomplish the Marshall plan aid of European recovery.

Now we are asked to save some \$11,000,000 on our one program of economic aid to underdeveloped areas. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that democracy will sooner or later be called upon to help these areas raise themselves from their poverty and misery. If democracy does not, then a dictatorship of the left will.

Mr. Speaker, Paul Hoffman, the ECA Administrator, has estimated that the final cost to the American people of World War II—without trying to place any dollar value on the loss of human life—will be \$1,300,000,000,000. And yet, 5 years after World War II, we are no closer to peace than we were in 1939.

A trillion-dollar investment in peace has apparently been wasted.

And now, Mr. Speaker, we are being asked to invest another \$10,000,000,000 to rearm America, and an additional

\$4,000,000,000 to rearm other free nations.

We are about to embark upon another multi-billion-dollar investment in peace.

Against such a colossal investment, the saving of \$11,000,000 on point 4—our one program that proposes to attack the roots of world conflict—seems foolishly small.

I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that should our multi-billion-dollar investment in rearmament bring us victorious through a military war—only to bring us face to face with another world-wide struggle of mankind for a better life—those \$11,000,000 will look even smaller and more foolish.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I think the record should show in connection with the South American activities which we have been engaged in that the South American countries do not agree with the gentleman from New York because they have in a period since the thing has been in effect quadrupled the amount of money they are putting into it. Today they are putting in something like \$17,000,000 against our \$5,000,000. So, those South American countries certainly feel it is doing them some good.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

HAIL COLUMBIA; CALIFORNIA, HERE I COME

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, must Oregon and Washington say good-bye to the Columbia River? The public press recently has carried a number of news items to the effect that there is a proposal under consideration by the Bureau of Reclamation to divert water from the Columbia River to California to relieve that State of its water shortage. Some discussion has taken place recently in the House with respect to this proposal and a number of Representatives from the State of California have issued press releases thereon.

I have had the matter up with Commissioner Michael W. Straus of the Bureau of Reclamation and I am advised by him that there is no pending proposal on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation to divert water from the Columbia River to California. He further advises that under authority granted to the Department studies are being made of the full utilization of the water resources of the Pacific Northwest and that in that study consideration is given to any available use to which surplus waters might be put. The Commissioner advises me that no water in any event will be diverted from the Columbia River above existing or available potential dam sites for the development of hydroelectric power and in any event only water that is surplus would be considered. It is my information that any proposal to divert water from the Columbia River to California is so fantastic and would entail such enormous expense as to be pure moonshine.

The Columbia River is the second largest river in the United States and the

largest in potential hydro power. Millions of acres of rich fertile land are available for reclamation in the watershed of the Columbia and its tributaries which can be reclaimed and put to agricultural use by utilization of the water of the Columbia River drainage basin not necessary for navigation, power, industrial, and domestic use.

I would suggest that if California residents have their eyes on this great natural resource which God has given to the Pacific Northwest, rather than to divert the water from its natural location to the arid lands of California, that they themselves migrate to this garden spot of America, the Pacific Northwest and become permanent residents of the area and utilize the waters of this great river in its natural habitat. They will be much happier, we will be much happier and the American taxpayer will be saved millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks some news releases from some of the members of the California delegation with reference to this problem in which it will be noted that they state that the State of California does not want the Columbia River water. However some other members of the delegation seem to have their eyes on the Columbia.

CALIFORNIA WANTS NO COLUMBIA RIVER WATER
(Statement of Representative NORRIS
POULSON)

Newspaper and radio reports of the past 3 days have described in vague detail a gigantic project to bring Columbia River water into southern California. The project is proposed by the Department of Interior, and assertedly has the interest of President Truman.

I wish to make clear the following facts:

1. Neither the idea nor the plan was initiated by any one connected with the State of California. No engineer or other responsible official in California, either employed by the State or the various California water agencies, has made such a proposal or has initiated by anyone connected with the State government nor any of its branches has proposed such a project.

2. Prosperous as California is, it could never afford to finance a project of such magnitude as the Columbia River diversion proposed by the Interior Department.

3. California would never call upon the taxpayers of the Nation to pay for such a project, as Arizona has done in the case of the proposed central Arizona project, which Secretary Chapman says would cost the Nation's taxpayers more than \$2,000,000,000 in interest alone.

4. California does not need and does not want water from the Columbia River or any other river of the Northwest. Our State engineer has said that California's water supplies are sufficient, and that the State does not have to go beyond its boundaries for more water. The Colorado River water awarded to southern California in Federal Government contracts, and other available supplies, are sufficient to meet the foreseeable needs of that area.

5. The Columbia River diversion plan is brought forward at this time by the Interior Department in a desperate attempt to aid the fantastic central Arizona project, which would take an enormous share of California's Colorado River water. It is a nefarious scheme to rob California of Colorado River water by diverting attention to the Columbia River diversion proposal. The scheme also intended to give Representatives and Senators from Northwestern States the false impression that California has a plan to

acquire Columbia River water. I wish to assure the entire Congress that California has no such plan, and does not support such a plan.

6. Southern California has always paid its own way. The people of southern California have obligated themselves for more than half a billion dollars for water projects, and they are paying these debts with unvarying regularity.

7. The Columbia River scheme is even more infeasible, grotesque, and absurd than the central Arizona project. It would cost an estimated 5 to 10 billion dollars. As a member of the Public Lands Committee, and as a leader in California's fight to protect its vital water supplies, I disavow the Columbia River proposal and proclaim California's opposition to it.

CALIFORNIA REPUDIATES COLUMBIA RIVER DIVERSION PLAN; FIGHTS FOR LEGAL RIGHTS TO COLORADO RIVER

(Statement of Representative CHET HOLIFIELD)

Reports continue to be circulated, both in Congress and in the northwestern United States that California is back of a plot to take away water from the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

Let me state at once, emphatically and without equivocation, that California has no part whatever in such a plot, and that California has not proposed or endorsed any such plan.

This is not the first time the Columbia River diversion scheme has been repudiated by responsible California officials, and no doubt it will not be the last time. Yet, I note in newspaper stories and in correspondence that the fear persists in certain sections of the Northwest that California has designs on northwestern waters.

Let me assure my colleagues and the people of the Northwest that California has no such designs, and that reports to the contrary are propaganda disseminated by those who would injure California.

The proposal to divert water from the Columbia and Snake Rivers to the Southwest is the brain child of the Bureau of Reclamation and the opponents of California's fight to protect its legal share of the Colorado River.

The proposal was designed for the purpose of aiding Arizona in taking an enormous share of California's Colorado River water. The strategy behind the Columbia River diversion scheme is to give Congress and the nation the impression that California does not need its Colorado River water because water will be available to California from the Northwest.

This is a serious matter. It should be exposed and clarified in all details.

In my inquiry of the issue, I find that the Bureau of Reclamation is now conducting various studies on bringing Northwest water into southern California. I have a letter, dated August 18, 1950, from Reclamation Commissioner Michael W. Straus setting forth this fact.

In his letter, Mr. Straus states that the studies were "undertaken pursuant to congressional and California requests, directions and authorizations."

"Further," writes Mr. Straus, "in this instance, a specific congressional resolution requesting this investigation is at hand."

He identifies this legislation as House Resolution 244, Eightieth Congress, first session.

This resolution was not passed by Congress. It was introduced in the House Public Lands Committee, at the request of the Reclamation Bureau, on June 2, 1947, by the late Representative Richard J. Welch, Republican chairman of the committee. The resolution was strenuously objected to by

both Republican and Democrat Members from California. Mr. Welch ignored the objections of his California colleagues and of his State, and forced the resolution out of committee with a favorable report.

That was as far as the resolution got. California Members objected to it on the floor, and it died.

Thus, I find no specific resolution "at hand" which authorizes the Reclamation Bureau to conduct the studies of the Columbia River diversion plan. Certainly H. Res. 244, which never passed Congress, provides no authorization. California representatives opposed this resolution in committee, and continued to oppose it until they killed it.

Mr. Straus mentions that the Columbia studies were undertaken pursuant to "California requests."

So far as I can learn, the only so-called California request came from the late Representative Welch in the Eightieth Congress. He was opposed by his California colleagues, by the California State government, and by innumerable officials, engineers, and attorneys of California water agencies, such as the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and the Colorado River Board of California, a State body appointed by the Governor.

Let me make it plain once again, that neither the State of California, nor any responsible water, reclamation, or power officials of California, nor the California Members of Congress, have in any manner supported or endorsed the Columbia River diversion proposal.

California has a water plan now being formulated, but it does not contemplate utilization of any water from the Northwest. This assurance comes to me in a statement from T. R. Simpson, principal hydraulic engineer of the California State Division of Water Resources.

Here is Mr. Simpson's statement: "The Federal Government is presently conducting a preliminary investigation to determine the feasibility of bringing water from the Columbia River to supplement California's supplies. The (California) State-wide water investigation is only partially completed at this time. * * * However, on the basis of the inventory of (California) water resources and estimates of ultimate requirements so far made, it is indicated that adequate water supplies can be developed and regulated from California's water resources, including California's right in and to the waters of the Colorado River * * * to meet probable water requirements of the State, without resort to importation from the Columbia River."

From James H. Howard, general counsel of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, I have received a statement soundly denouncing the Columbia River diversion scheme. The Metropolitan Water District includes Los Angeles and San Diego and 26 other cities and areas in southern California, with a population of nearly 4,000,000 persons.

"In advancing the Snake and Columbia River diversion surveys, the Reclamation Bureau is considering a plan that would take water away from Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. It is important that the people of those States realize the true sources of the scheme to divert water outside their State boundaries.

"It is a program that originated with, and is sponsored by, the Reclamation Bureau. The people of California are not parties to this proposal. California has no aspiration to any water belonging to Washington, Oregon, or Idaho, or any other State."

The list of protests from California representatives and officials against the Columbia scheme is long and impressive. It cer-

tainly should give assurance to the Representatives of the people of the Northwest that California has no part in, and does not endorse, such a proposal.

The facts of the matter are this: The people of southern California, at their own expense, have built dams, aqueducts, and canals costing more than half a billion dollars to bring their legal share of Colorado River water to their cities and farms. Southern California was awarded this Colorado River water in contracts with the Federal Government, approved by the Congress.

Now the State of Arizona and the Reclamation Bureau want to take an enormous part of California's share of Colorado River water for a fantastic, unfeasible project in Arizona. The proposed Arizona project would cost more than \$1,000,000,000 to build, and would mean a loss in interest to the Nations' taxpayers of an additional \$2,000,000,000.

There is no Colorado River water available for this Arizona project. So the Reclamation Bureau, with no doubt, the support of Arizona, has proposed the Columbia River diversion. This, they say, would give California her vitally needed water, and then Arizona could have California's share of the Colorado River.

That's the scheme. California is having none of it. California believes that its legal share of Colorado River, if protected, will be adequate for California's foreseeable needs and California will fight to preserve those legal rights against any attack. California is not looking to the Columbia and Snake Rivers for additional water.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT WILL-O'-THE-WISP PLAN WOULD TAKE COLUMBIA RIVER WATER FROM NORTHWESTERN STATES

(Statement of Representative CLAIR ENGLE)

It is reported to me that the Department of Interior is proposing a gigantic project to bring the Columbia River water into California for the avowed purpose of solving California's water problem. Assertedly, President Truman has interested himself in this project.

The purpose of this proposed project is not, as stated, to solve California's water problem. The purpose is to solve Arizona's water problem by turning over to Arizona California's water in the Colorado River.

California will not be fooled by this obvious strategy into giving up her established rights and huge investments on the Colorado River for any such will-of-the-wisp. Moreover, the people on the Columbia and Snake Rivers should clearly understand what is going on * * * their water is to be exported at huge expense in order that an exchange can occur by which Arizona will get the water in the Colorado River.

It is a clever scheme designed in the Interior Department to eliminate California's opposition to the fantastic Arizona project, which has been proposed by the Interior Department, and would use water to which California has long-established legal rights. California is to be promised pie in the sky from the Columbia River and asked to drop her opposition to the Central Arizona project, to give up long-established legal rights to the waters of the Colorado, and to abandon diversion works on the Colorado costing hundreds of millions of dollars.

Of course, if Arizona is able to perpetrate a theft of the Colorado River waters from California, it may be necessary for California, at some future time, to look elsewhere. For the present, however, California will stand on her established rights and investments, and will develop the remaining water potential, which is substantial, within her own borders and in the Colorado River.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I am very much pleased with the action of the Foreign Aid Subcommittee in moving to recede and concur with the Senate in providing the appropriation of \$26,900,000 to implement the President's point 4 program, rather than insisting upon the much lower figure which had been agreed upon by the conferees yesterday. Point 4 is a necessary and vital part of our foreign policy if we are to crush communism before it obtains a foothold among the underprivileged peoples of the world.

The supplemental appropriations bill, which this House will consider later tonight, contains a much increased and desired appropriation for the Voice of America, to spread the truth about democracy and our Nation, to counteract subversive Communist propaganda. Point 4 ties in with our Voice. It gives substance to the story of our warmth and peaceful good intentions, of our desire to live in peace and friendship with the nations of the world.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we are now considering a bill which carries many billions of dollars. Much of this is for the necessary measures of military defense which we must undertake today in this troubled world. We are being forced by the aggressive actions of world communism to devote more and more of our resources and our energies to self-preservation. But the struggle in which we are engaged cannot be fought solely with guns and planes. The Communists have long realized as we are now beginning to do that this is an economic, social, and ideological struggle as much as a military one. It is easy for everyone to see the need to appropriate billions for defense. The need for making an adequate effort in other fields should be equally obvious.

The point 4 program is one program where we can at small cost—in fact with expenditures which are insignificant when compared with our military appropriations—do a great deal to strengthen the free world. Here is a program which is not a give-away program. It is a program to show others how they can support themselves. It is a concrete and positive answer to the false propaganda of the Communists who say that only under their system can the millions of backward people achieve a decent life. If we want to be purely selfish and materialistic about it we can say that it is one of the cheapest ways of fighting our Communist antagonists. If we want to put it on a higher plane we can say that it is a way in which we can cooperate

with other free peoples in making this a better world.

This program will benefit most the very areas of the world which are now up against the guns of Communist aggression. These are areas whose people may be peculiarly vulnerable to Communist promises, for their living standards are low and their aspirations are high. They certainly could not understand any failure on our part to cooperate fully and adequately in a program to give them the benefit of knowledge and skill which could help them improve their economic conditions. The 49 countries which pledged assistance in the United Nations aspect of this program could not understand it if we fail to undertake our reasonable share of this constructive United Nations activity. We are holding high the United Nations banner in Korea. We should also hold it high in connection with its program of technical assistance in which such a great part of the free world is vitally concerned.

I do not see how we can expect the point 4 program to make any real headway or achieve any results if we limit the appropriation to \$15,000,000. The program originally developed in the executive branch amounted to over \$100,000,000. This was very carefully screened over a period of months by all of the agencies in the Government which are competent in the various fields of technical activity. The Department of Agriculture, the Public Health Service, the Department of Interior, and many others participated in this work. They based their analysis on their own experience over many years in conducting technical-assistance programs under previous congressional authorizations. As a result of all this work the program was screened down to \$45,000,000 and this amount was requested by the President. We then cut \$10,000,000 from this, authorizing only \$35,000,000. The recommendation of the conferees limiting the appropriation for new programs to \$15,000,000 would, with the addition of the \$7,600,000 recommended for continuing existing programs, give a total of only \$22,600,000. This is only 50 percent of the amount requested and only 65 percent of the amount which we authorized. I cannot see why we should cut this program so much more drastically than most of the other items in the bill especially when it has already been pared down so far.

We pride ourselves on being able to look ahead. We criticize those who have failed to foresee and prevent aggressive moves of our enemies. Here is a chance for us to help prevent such aggression in the future. Let us act now to help prevent conditions that will lead to war.

RESTORATION OF \$26,900,000 APPROVED FOR
POINT 4

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, the point 4 program is, I believe, potentially one of the most important international programs of our time. It can help our economy. It can help our international relations. And it can help our national security.

The long-run security of the United States must be built up over time. We

must start to build early so that we are not caught unprepared. We must build adequately, for half measures may be worse than none.

National security is more than a military problem. It requires political stability, sound and productive economies, and friendly democratic governments and peoples in many areas outside the United States. Nearly a billion people live in underdeveloped areas outside the Soviet orbit, many of them in critical areas bordering upon that orbit. The political stability of these people is tied closely to their living conditions. They have the capacity and the natural resources to produce far more than now, and thus to raise their living conditions over the years. But they need help, and it is to our advantage, as well as to theirs, to help them.

There are various ways of helping them produce more, but some ways are cheaper and more enduring than others. Technical assistance is one of the least costly, relying largely on self-help on the part of the recipient country and leaving behind a widening circle of modern techniques, awareness of new methods, and friendship toward the sharing country. Its economic effects may not become apparent for years, but the fact that something concrete is being done can produce political effects very quickly.

The forces of peace and democracy throughout the world have already been greatly strengthened by the action of the administration and the Congress in proposing and authorizing a substantial point 4 program. To torpedo this program by refusing it adequate funds would hurt this Government and would hurt many governments which have been our strong supporters. It would give the Communist propaganda machine effective material. It would confirm the doubts of the many people of the world who are still doubtful that the United States has forsaken isolationism and really means to follow a consistent program of support for the forces of democracy and peace.

Point 4 is a symbol of the maturity of United States foreign policy. It indicates the transition from emergency programs hastily developed to put out fires, to prevention of the conditions that result in fires. It shows that this country recognizes the interrelation of economic and political developments, and the interrelation of developments abroad and at home. Instead of emergency thinking, and isolationist thinking, it represents a broad and deep approach, far more effective and far more economical than continual improvisation.

Because this is a program in which both the United States and the United Nations can make a great contribution to peace, I urge that the House give it full support. To my mind, \$26,000,000 is a small price to pay for a major international program. I urge that we confirm our earlier support for this program by appropriating the full \$26,900,000 approved by the Senate.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, western Europe and the civilized world is faced with a dictator who seeks to destroy the

liberty of the people of the entire world.

We are pouring billions of our money into western Europe to help her build a military machine that will help us and them to keep our countries and our people free from the dictatorship of Russia. In the event Russia moves against western Europe it will be the policy of this Government to help with all of the manpower necessary from the United States to protect western Europe and defeat our enemies.

High military officials agree as to the great advantage that Spain offers as a natural base for our operations in the event of a war with Russia. Every Member of this House who knows anything about the geography of Europe knows that Spain with its broad expanse of territory surrounded on the north and east by mountains is a natural fortress and base which offers an opportunity to the United States and western Europe as a base of operations in the event of a war with Russia, that should be embraced at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Speaker, under our present foreign policy we are allied with all of the nations of western Europe with the exception of Spain which is greatly needed by us and all of the Atlantic Pact nations. I am informed that Spain has an army consisting of 17 divisions well trained and only lacking modern equipment to make it the strongest fighting force today in western Europe.

Spain has indicated its desire to join with the United States and other nations in its opposition to communism.

This bill today provides for a loan of \$62,500,000 which I am informed largely will be used for military equipment.

I am supporting this loan because I believe the territory of Spain is essential to the defense of western Europe and thereby our Nation. I am supporting it because we will need all of the military strength Spain can give us and our allies in the event of a war with Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting it because I believe that it will save thousands upon thousands of the lives of American boys, if unfortunately we have to meet Russia in a clash of arms in western Europe.

Mr. Speaker, we will need all the strength that can be mustered in western Europe. Because of the increasing danger of a drive to the west on the part of Russia and the billions of dollars we have poured into western Europe to help build a military defense against Russia, I want to take the opportunity today to say I think it is imperative that western Germany be taken into full fellowship and cooperation with the Atlantic Pact nations.

With the hate of the people of western Germany against communism, its location between France and Russia, a powerful army in western Germany could soon be organized into a great fighting force in cooperation with other nations to repel an attack by Russia.

In 1937, you will recall Russia sent troops to Spain to help the Communists take over that government. The Spanish Government defeated that attempt and soundly licked the Russian and

Spanish Communists. Stalin has never forgotten it and has made his influence felt through our Government and others in the Potsdam conference.

We will need Spain again to help do the job if we carry out our present policy of helping to defend European nations in the event Russia moves against them. We should welcome the help of any European nation that is willing to fight on our side against Russia.

Mr. Speaker, referring again to western Germany: As a member of the Herter committee, who, with other Members of Congress, made a study of Germany in 1947; on our return home we strongly urged through a resolution to the Congress that we should abandon the Morgenthau plan and stop the dismantling and giving away to Russia, England, and France, industrial plants in Germany that we would doubtless be called upon in the future to help rebuild at great expense to our Government.

RECOGNIZE SPAIN

Spain should be accorded full diplomatic recognition by the United States Government and be taken into partnership with the European nations under the policy of the Atlantic Pact.

Its broad expanse of territory with its natural protection of the Pyrenees Mountains against an invasion of Russia, its hate throughout the years past against communism, and with its sizeable arm in the event of war, would add to the Atlantic Pact nations formidable strength and great value.

In the event of war by its broad expanse of territory it would furnish the greatest opportunity on the continent for bases from which United States troops and air power could operate with telling effect.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a letter to the Speaker from President Truman on the point 4 appropriation and the importance of it, which it is unnecessary to read at this time in view of the present legislative situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

AUGUST 25, 1950.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,

The House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The importance of the point 4 appropriation in the struggle against Communist imperialism cannot be overemphasized.

Although the amount involved is relatively small in terms of dollars, the point 4 program has come to be a symbol of hope for millions of people all over the world. In countries where the choice between Communist totalitarianism and the free way of life is in the balance, this program can tip the scales toward the way of freedom.

The advance agents of the Communist conspiracy loudly promise the peoples of these countries a better way of life. We know that communism cannot deliver on these promises. We know that the way of freedom actually can and will provide a better life for people everywhere. But only through such action as the point 4 program can we demonstrate that fact, in concrete and practical terms.

If the reduction made by the conference committee in the amount appropriated by the Senate for point 4 is allowed to stand, it will largely destroy the program's effectiveness. More than that, it will be regarded throughout the world as evidence that this country cannot be depended upon to help the millions of people in the underdeveloped areas of the world in bettering their lot. This attempt to save some \$10,000,000 will do more for the Communists in their attack on the free world than hundreds of millions of dollars of their own propaganda.

At a time when we are calling upon our young men to go into battle in the cause of freedom, I can conceive of no more tragic blunder than to throw away this opportunity of doing so much to strengthen the cause of freedom at such little cost.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, there was confusion in reference to this amendment yesterday. I am very pleased it is being reconsidered today and I am happy to join in what is going to be done.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, we have just finished a vote on a limitation in the number of ships under the Merchant Marine Operating Subsidy Act. This is not a postmortem in any sense of the word. The wording that we adopted in the bill is still subject to interpretation and in order that there may be no misunderstanding as to what that interpretation should be, I should like the RECORD to show that in fixing the limitation of 263 vessels, the committee did not intend, directly or by implication, to pass upon the inclusion of any particular vessels within the total. All vessels covered by pending applications or commitments are entitled to equal consideration on this point.

Further, the power to subsidize vessels in excess of 263 with the approval of the Secretary of Defense is a clear recognition and reaffirmation by the committee as to the importance of an adequate merchant marine for national defense purposes. It would be my understanding that in making his certification the Secretary of Defense would consider the total number of vessels now subsidized, the extent to which that number is de-

ficient in supplying necessary shipping reserves for military purposes, and the resulting need for increasing the number of subsidized vessels in order to insure adequate military reserves. The reference to the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of Defense may serve a useful purpose by focusing attention on the importance of the merchant marine to our national defense, although it seems to me to be quite unnecessary as a subsidized fleet of 263 vessels obviously is woefully inadequate for defense purposes, and I am sure that the Secretary of Defense will so certify promptly. However, the reference may serve some useful purpose to emphasize the direct relation between national defense and the subsidized merchant marine.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. As far as the remainder of the week is concerned, we will meet tomorrow for the further consideration of the final deficiency appropriation bill, unless disposed of today.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand we are going to take that bill up immediately and continue on with it tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. Monday is District Day and there are six bills on the calendar.

H. R. 4281 relates to the limitation on taxicabs.

S. 3659 relates to dealers identification tags.

H. R. 1188 relates to regulating the practice of engineering.

S. 2028 relates to the Board of Education, teacher exchange.

H. R. 9524 is the supplemental teachers leave Act of 1949.

H. R. 9362 relates to the exchange of park land.

Following that we will take up House Resolution 474, the Teague resolution to investigate the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; S. 868, dealing with scientific, technological, and engineering information; S. 3357, gambling devices in interstate commerce, and S. 784, First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.

On Tuesday H. R. 9490, the so-called security bill, will come up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The security bill comes up the next day.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the Wood bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They are all the same.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the bills scheduled for Monday are disposed of, then the security bill will be in order of business on Tuesday.

If there is any change in the program, an announcement to that effect will be made to the House. Of course, conference reports may be brought up at any time. There are several important conference reports, such as the Defense Production Act and the tax revision bill. Whether or not they will all be ready for next week, I am unable to state,

but I hope so, because we are anxious to dispose of everything we possible can next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman cannot tell me definitely, but I have been asked to inquire if he thinks there is any possibility of a roll call on any of these bills on Monday. That is a matter of opinion, of course.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Those bills, I think, are not very controversial. They are all in the same category as the goat bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. None of them will be considered then if they are in the same category as the goat bill. We did not take up that bill.

Mr. GRANGER. They are in the same category as the bill for the regulation of goats.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I will accept the gentleman's opinion on the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to say that the bills that have been reported from the District of Columbia are not as simple as has been indicated. The bill providing for the regulation and practice of engineering is a very important bill that has been urged on this Congress by practically every engineering organization in every State of the Union.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not agree then that they are all goat bills?

Mr. HARRIS. We should not let that statement pass lightly as indicated. If the gentleman will yield further, there is another bill out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce known as the gambling-machine bill, or the slot-machine bill. That could very well become controversial to the extent that there might be a demand for a roll call.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is on the program. Whether or not it will be reached by Monday, I cannot state.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

SUBSTITUTION OF CONFEREES

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] be excused from further service as conferees on the bill H. R. 7941, the Federal Aid Road Act, and that conferees be appointed in their place.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. TRIMBLE and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

GRAPHIC ARTS CORP. OF OHIO—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 697)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4832, an act for the relief of Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio. The purpose of H. R. 4832 is to pay the sum of \$84,359.19 to Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio, Toledo, Ohio, in full settlement of all claims of the said Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio against the United States.

The effect of H. R. 4832 is to afford financial relief to the Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio for losses alleged to have been incurred in the performance of contract W33-038 ac-2023 with the Army Air Corps during the period January 1 to June 1, 1946.

The claim is predicated on the contention that the contractor was not supplied with the full quantity of work contemplated by the contract during the contract period, and that the contractor was assured by representatives of the Army Air Corps that it would be protected against losses in its operation under the contract. However, it appears that contractor did accept extensions of time and other amendments to the original contract under various change orders and supplements pertinent thereto by executing said documents. It is reported that payments totaling \$2,029,185.29 were made to the contractor.

Thus, insofar as furnishing work under the contract was concerned, it appears that there was substantial compliance by the Government within the contract period as extended.

The general rule is that a formal written contract entered into on the basis of negotiations between the parties merges all such previous negotiations and is presumed in law to express the final understanding of the parties. Contract W33-038 ac-2023, as amended, was entered into on a fixed-price basis. It contained no provision for payment of additional compensation merely because the contractor might suffer a loss in performance. Hence, while the contractor's claim is based primarily upon the promise that certain representations were made by Government officers at the time the contract was negotiated, to the effect that the Government would protect the contractor from any loss in performance, the terms of the contract relating to the work to be performed and to the prices to be paid therefor were clear and unambiguous and such extraneous representations, even if established, legally could not be resorted to for the purpose of imposing an additional obligation on the Government. If the contractor felt that the formal contract and change orders and extensions, and so forth, did not afford it sufficient protection against losses in performance, it should not have signed the contract and accepted the extensions. Having done so, it seems clear that there is no liability for any further payment to the contractor, based upon the contract provisions.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same.

SAM HOBBS,
PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT McCARRAN,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
JAMES EASTLAND,
By McCARRAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment to the House to the bill (S. 1838) to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to fees of United States marshals, submit the following explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon in conference and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House passed the Senate bill after amending it by striking out the first section, which proposed to make the fee chargeable by marshals for the sale of property uniform in all judicial districts, and to make applicable to all sales the fees presently authorized for the sale of property under process in admiralty. The Senate recedes.

SAM HOBBS,
PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

AUTHORIZING CORRECTION OF CHAPTERS AND SECTION NUMBERS ON H. R. 7786

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 272), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House in the enrollment of H. R. 7786, the general appropriation bill, 1951, is authorized and directed to correct chapter and section numbers.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORTS ON S. 3959 AND H. R. 9038

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill S. 3959, and also on H. R. 9038, have until midnight tonight to file conference reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON, from the committee of conference, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3959) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and for other purposes":

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 3001)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3959) entitled "An Act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the parenthetical expression appearing in clause (1) of the final sentence of subsection (a) of section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress) is amended to read as follows:

"(including the purchase from or through the Public Printer, for warehouse issue, of standard forms, blankbook work, standard specifications, and other printed material in common use by Federal agencies not available through the Superintendent of Documents)."

"SEC. 2. (a) Clause (2) of the final sentence of subsection (a) of section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as hereinbefore amended, is amended to read as follows: '(2) for paying the purchase price, transportation to first storage point of supplies and services, and the cost of personal services employed directly in the repair, rehabilitation, and conversion of personal property.'

"(b) The third sentence of subsection (b) of section 109 of such Act is amended to read as follows: 'On and after such date, such prices shall be fixed at levels so as to recover so far as practicable the applicable purchase price, the transportation cost to first storage point, inventory losses, the cost of personal services employed directly in the repair, rehabilitation, and conversion of personal property, and the cost of amortization and repair of equipment utilized for lease or rent to executive agencies.'

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective on the date, not earlier than July 1, 1950, on which the Administrator of General Services shall determine that appropriated funds adequate to effectuate the purposes of such amendments have been made available.

"SEC. 3. (a) The final sentence of subsection (b) of section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows: 'Where an advance of funds is not made, the General Services Administration shall be reimbursed promptly out of funds of the requisitioning agency in accordance with accounting procedures approved by the Comptroller General: *Provided*, That in any case where payment shall not have been made by the requisitioning agency within forty-five days after the date of billing by the Administrator or the date on which an actual liability for supplies or services is incurred by the Administrator, whichever is the later, reimbursement may be obtained by the Administrator by the issuance of transfer and counterwarrants, or other lawful transfer documents, supported by itemized invoices.'

"(b) Section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Whenever any producer or vendor shall tender any article or commodity for sale to the General Services Administration or to any procurement authority acting under the direction and control of the Administrator pursuant to this Act, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion, with the consent of such producer or vendor, to cause to be conducted, in such manner as the Administrator shall specify, such tests as he shall prescribe to determine whether such article or commodity conforms to prescribed specifications and standards. When the Administrator determines that the making of such tests will serve predominantly the interest of such producer or vendor, he shall charge such producer or vendor a fee which shall be fixed by the Administrator in such amount as will recover the cost of conducting such tests, including all components of such cost, determined in accord-

ance with accepted accounting principles. When the Administrator determines that the making of such tests will not serve predominantly the interest of such producer or vendor, he shall charge such producer or vendor such fee as he shall determine to be reasonable for the furnishing of such testing service. All such fees collected by the Administrator may be deposited in the General Supply Fund to be used for any purpose authorized by subsection 109 (a) of this Act."

"Sec. 4. Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 are amended to read as follows:

"(1) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion to donate for educational purposes or public health purposes, including research, in the States, Territories, and possessions without cost (except for costs of care and handling) such equipment, materials, books, or other supplies under the control of any executive agency as shall have been determined to be surplus property and which shall have been determined under paragraph (2) or paragraph (3) of this subsection to be usable and necessary for educational purposes or public health purposes, including research.

"(2) Determination whether such surplus property (except surplus property donated in conformity with paragraph (3) of this subsection) is usable and necessary for educational purposes or public health purposes, including research, shall be made by the Federal Security Administrator, who shall allocate such property on the basis of needs and utilization for transfer by the Administrator of General Services to tax-supported medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, school systems, schools, colleges, and universities, and to other nonprofit medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, schools, colleges, and universities which have been held exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, or to State departments of education or health for distribution to such tax-supported and nonprofit medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, school systems, schools, colleges, and universities; except that in any State where another agency is designated by State law for such purpose such transfer shall be made to said agency for such distribution within the State."

"Sec. 5. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by—

"(a) redesignating section 210 thereof as section 212, and wherever such section number appears in such act as originally enacted, it is amended to conform to the redesignation prescribed by this subsection;

"(b) inserting in the table of contents appearing in the first section of such Act, immediately after the line in which 'Sec. 209,' appears, the following:

"Sec. 210. Operation of buildings and related activities.

"Sec. 211. Motor vehicles identification."

"(c) inserting, immediately after section 209 thereof, the following new sections:

"OPERATION OF BUILDINGS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 210. (a) Whenever and to the extent that the Administrator has been or hereafter may be authorized by any provision of law other than this subsection to maintain, operate, and protect any building, property, or grounds situated in or outside the District of Columbia, including the construction, repair, preservation, demolition, furnishing, and equipment thereof, he is authorized in the discharge of the duties so conferred upon him—

"(1) to purchase, repair, and clean uniforms for civilian employees of the General Services Administration who are required by law or regulation to wear uniform clothing;

"(2) to furnish arms and ammunition for the protection force maintained by the General Services Administration;

"(3) to pay ground rent for buildings owned by the United States or occupied by Federal agencies, and to pay such rent in advance when required by law or when the Administrator shall determine such action to be in the public interest;

"(4) to employ and pay personnel employed in connection with the functions of operation, maintenance, and protection of property at such per diem rates as may be approved by the Administrator, not exceeding rates currently paid by private industry for similar services in the place where such services are performed;

"(5) without regard to the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended, to pay rental, and to make repairs, alterations, and improvements under the terms of any lease entered into by, or transferred to, the General Services Administration for the housing of any Federal agency which on June 30, 1950, was specifically exempted by law from the requirements of said section;

"(6) to obtain payments, through advances or otherwise, for services, space, quarters, maintenance, repair, or other facilities furnished, on a reimbursable basis, to any other Federal agency, or any mixed-ownership corporation (as defined in the Government Corporation Control Act), or the District of Columbia, and to credit such payments to the applicable appropriation of the General Services Administration;

"(7) to make changes in, maintain, and repair the pneumatic tube system connecting buildings owned by the United States or occupied by Federal agencies in New York City installed under franchise of the city of New York, approved June 29, 1909, and June 11, 1928, and to make payments of any obligations arising thereunder in accordance with the provisions of the Acts approved August 5, 1909 (36 Stat. 120), and May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 533);

"(8) to repair, alter, and improve rented premises, without regard to the 25 per centum limitation of section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended, upon a determination by the Administrator that by reason of circumstances set forth in such determination the execution of such work, without reference to such limitation, is advantageous to the Government in terms of economy, efficiency, or national security: *Provided*, That such determination shall show that the total cost (rentals, repairs, alterations, and improvements) to the Government for the expected life of the least shall be less than the cost of alternative space which needs no such repairs, alterations, or improvements. A copy of every such determination so made shall be furnished to the General Accounting Office;

"(9) to pay sums in lieu of taxes on real property declared surplus by Government corporations, pursuant to the Surplus Property Act of 1944, where legal title to such property remains in any such Government corporation;

"(10) to furnish utilities and other services where such utilities and other services are not provided from other sources to persons, firms, or corporations occupying or utilizing plants or portions of plants which constitute (A) a part of the National Industrial Reserve pursuant to the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948, or (B) surplus real property, and to credit the amounts received therefrom to the applicable appropriation of the General Services Administration;

"(11) at the direction of the Secretary of Defense, to use proceeds received from insurance against damage to properties of the National Industrial Reserve for repair or restoration of the damaged properties; and

"(12) to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, real estate and interests therein.

"(b) At the request of any Federal agency or any mixed-ownership corporation (as defined in the Government Corporation Control Act) or the District of Columbia, the Administrator is hereby authorized to operate, maintain, and protect any building owned by the United States (or, in the case of any wholly owned or mixed-ownership Government corporation, by such corporation) and occupied by the agency or instrumentality making such request.

"(c) At the request of any Federal agency or any mixed-ownership corporation (as defined in the Government Corporation Control Act), or the District of Columbia, the Administrator is hereby authorized (1) to acquire land for buildings and projects authorized by the Congress; (2) to make or cause to be made, under contract or otherwise, surveys and test borings and to prepare plans and specifications for such buildings and projects prior to the approval by the Attorney General of the title to the sites thereof; and (3) to contract for, and to supervise, the construction and development and the equipping of such buildings or projects. Any sum available to any such Federal agency or instrumentality for any such building or project may be transferred by such agency to the General Services Administration in advance for such purposes as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary, including the payment of salaries and expenses of personnel engaged in the preparation of plans and specifications or in field supervision, and for general office expenses to be incurred in the rendition of any such service.

"(d) Whenever the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine such action to be in the interest of economy or efficiency, he shall transfer to the Administrator all functions then vested in any other Federal agency with respect to the operation, maintenance, and custody of any office building owned by the United States or any wholly owned Government corporation, or any office building or part thereof occupied by any Federal agency under any lease, except that no transfer shall be made under this subsection—

"(1) of any post-office building unless the Director shall first determine that such building is not used predominantly for post-office purposes, and functions which are transferred hereunder to the Administrator with respect to any post-office building may be delegated by him only to another officer or employee of the General Services Administration or to the Postmaster General;

"(2) of any building located in any foreign country;

"(3) of any building located on the grounds of any fort, camp, post, arsenal, navy yard, naval training station, airfield, proving ground, military supply depot, or school, or of any similar facility of the Department of Defense, unless and to such extent as a permit for its use by another agency or agencies shall have been issued by the Secretary of Defense or his duly authorized representative;

"(4) of any building which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget finds to be a part of a group of buildings which are (A) located in the same vicinity, (B) utilized wholly or predominantly for the special purposes of the agency having custody thereof, and (C) not generally suitable for the use of other agencies; or

"(5) of the Treasury Building, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing Building, the buildings occupied by the National Bureau of Standards, and the buildings under the jurisdiction of the regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator is authorized, in

accordance with policies and directives prescribed by the President under section 205 (a) and after consultation with the heads of the executive agencies affected, to assign and reassign space of all executive agencies in Government-owned and leased buildings in and outside the District of Columbia upon a determination by the Administrator that such assignment or reassignment is advantageous to the Government in terms of economy, efficiency, or national security.

"MOTOR VEHICLE IDENTIFICATION

"SEC. 211. Under regulations prescribed by the Administrator, every motor vehicle acquired and used for official purposes within the United States, its Territories, or possessions, by any Federal agency or the District of Columbia shall be conspicuously identified by showing thereon either (a) the full name of the department, establishment, corporation, or agency by which it is used and the service in which it is used, or (b) a title descriptive of the service in which it is used if such title readily identifies the department, establishment, corporation, or agency concerned, and the legend "For official use only"; *Provided*, That the regulations issued pursuant to this section may provide for exemptions from the requirement of this section when conspicuous identification would interfere with the purpose for which a vehicle is acquired and used."

"Sec. 6. The Federal Property and Administration Services Act of 1949 is amended by—

"(a) redesigning 'title V' of such Act as 'title VI' thereof, and 'title V', wherever it appears therein, is amended to read 'title VI';

"(b) redesignating sections 501-505, inclusive, of such Act, respectively, as sections 601-605, inclusive, thereof, and wherever any such section number appears in such Act as originally enacted, it is amended to conform in numbering to the redesignation prescribed by this subsection;

"(c) inserting at the proper place in the table of contents to such Act the following:

"TITLE V—FEDERAL RECORDS

"Sec. 501. Short title.

"Sec. 502. Custody and control of property.

"Sec. 503. National Historical Publications Commission.

"Sec. 504. Federal Records Council.

"Sec. 505. Records management; the Administrator.

"Sec. 506. Records management; agency heads.

"Sec. 507. Archival administration.

"Sec. 508. Reports.

"Sec. 509. Legal status of reproductions.

"Sec. 510. Limitation on liability.

"Sec. 511. Definitions."

"(d) inserting, immediately following title IV thereof, the following new title:

"TITLE V—FEDERAL RECORDS

"SHORT TITLE

"Sec. 501. This title may be cited as the "Federal Records Act of 1950".

"CUSTODY AND CONTROL OF PROPERTY

"Sec. 502. The Administrator shall have immediate custody and control of the National Archives Building and its contents, and shall have authority to design, construct, purchase, lease, maintain, operate, protect, and improve buildings used by him for the storage of records of Federal agencies in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

"NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

"Sec. 503. (a) There is hereby created a National Historical Publications Commission consisting of the Archivist (or an alternate designated by him), who shall be Chairman; the Librarian of Congress (or an alternate designated by him); one Member of the United States Senate to be appointed for a term of four years, by the President of the Senate; one Member of the House of

Agricultural Appropriations, 1951, Compared With Appropriations and Borrowing Authorizations, 1950, and Budget Estimates, 1951

[Note.--Figures include all supplemental appropriations to date and are adjusted for comparability with the appropriation structure in the 1951 General Appropriation Act.]

Bureau or Item	Actual Appropriations and Borrowing Authorizations 1950	Budget Estimates, 1951	Appropriations 1951 a/	Increase (+) or Decrease (-), Appropria- tions, 1951, Compared With Appro. and : Borrowing : Auth. 1950 : Budget Estimates, 1951
APPROPRIATED FUNDS:				
Production and Marketing Administration:				
Conservation and use of agricultural land:				
resources	\$257,043,439:	\$285,000,000:	\$282,500,000:	-\$2,500,000
Acresage allotments and marketing quotas	30,150,774:	34,000,000:	32,300,000:	-1,700,000
Sugar Act	60,000,000:	67,500,000:	63,750,000:	-3,750,000
Removal of surplus agricultural com- modities (30% of customs receipts)	125,606,982:	110,000,000:	110,000,000:	-15,606,982
National School Lunch Act	83,500,000:	83,500,000:	83,500,000:	-
Marketing services	10,719,200:	11,487,000:	10,989,000:	-498,000
Total, Production and Marketing Admin- istration (excluding Commodity Credit Corporation)	567,020,395:	591,487,000:	583,039,000:	-8,448,000
Soil Conservation Service	54,625,800:	56,695,600:	56,208,675:	-486,925
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	5,123,000:	7,450,000:	7,204,000:	-246,000
Farmers' Home Administration	27,249,000:	32,000,000:	29,150,000:	-2,850,000
Rural Electrification Administration (administrative expenses)	7,128,000:	9,525,000:	8,550,000:	-975,000
Agricultural Research Administration	76,109,523:	81,567,008:	73,825,358:	-7,741,650
Research and Marketing Act of 1946 (Title II)	6,000,000:	6,102,000:	6,000,000:	-102,000
Control of forest pests (including white pine blister rust control)	7,981,000:	8,213,500:	5,700,000:	-2,513,500
Forest Service	71,371,990:	80,082,300:	71,976,000:	-8,106,300
Flood control	9,500,000:	11,700,000:	10,315,000:	-1,385,000
Extension Service (principally payments to States)	32,723,360:	33,519,448:	32,708,208:	-811,240

Bureau or Item	Actual Appropriations and Borrowing Authorizations 1950	Budget Estimates, 1951	Appropriations 1951 a/	Increase (+) or Decrease (-), Appropriations, 1951, Compared With Appro. and Budget Borrowing : Estimates, Auth. 1950 : 1951
APPROPRIATED FUNDS: Continued				
Bureau of Agricultural Economics	\$5,538,600:	\$6,293,400:	\$5,504,000:	-\$34,600:
All other	10,548,876:	11,599,900:	10,862,893:	+314,017:
Deduct amounts included above transferred from "Salaries and expenses, farm housing", "Supply and distribution of farm labor", and "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Administration" for pay adjustment costs	-677,955:	- -:	- -:	+677,955:
Total, appropriations	880,241,589:	936,235,156:	901,043,134:	+20,801,545:
BORROWING AUTHORIZATIONS:				
Farmers' Home Administration loans	129,350,000:	163,000,000:	154,000,000:	+24,650,000:
Rural Electrification Administration Loans:				
Rural electrification	b/ 350,000,000:	400,000,000:c/	350,000,000:	- -:
Rural telephone	25,000,000:	50,000,000:	32,500,000:	+7,500,000:
Total, Borrowing authorizations	504,350,000:	613,000,000:	536,500,000:	+32,150,000:
Total, Appropriations and Borrowing Authorizations	1,384,591,589:	1,549,235,156:	1,437,543,134:	+52,951,545:
DEDUCT:				
Borrowing authorizations	504,350,000:	613,000,000:	536,500,000:	+32,150,000:
Permanent appropriations	141,427,682:	125,509,210:	125,509,210:	-15,918,472:
Total, Direct annual appropriations (excluding permanents) in General Appropriation Act	738,813,907:	810,725,946:d/	775,533,924:	+36,720,017:
				-35,192,022

istration provisions will not be operative for a considerable time, if ever. What is needed is authority to take preventive action against the specific danger of sabotage without prolonged legal proceedings. The authority requested by the President, and which I hope will be restored in S. 4037, will provide the tools for this necessary job.

Section 23 of the McCarran bill is derived from H. R. 10 (the Hobbs bill) and deals with the problem arising out of the fact that many aliens under final orders of deportation cannot actually be deported because no other country will receive them. Section 23, in accordance with the President's recommendation, provides the Attorney General with new powers of supervision over such aliens which in my judgment will be sufficient to cope with the problem. As you know, the President in his recent message to the Congress strongly opposed any provision for the indefinite detention of such aliens. I should also like to add that in my opinion the provision for criminal penalties recommended by the President, and set forth in section 7 of S. 4061 will be more enforceable than the corresponding paragraph (c) of section 23 of S. 4037 (the McCarran bill) and I urge that it be substituted for the latter provision.

With these changes, sections 18 through 21 and section 23 of S. 4037 (the McCarran bill) will embody all of the recommendations of the Interdepartmental Intelligence Committee consisting of representatives of the military intelligence services and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. If enacted into law, they will provide the additional weapons which we need to deal with fifth-column tactics, while leaving intact our constitutional liberties.

Sections 1 through 17 of S. 4037 embody the provisions of S. 2311, better known as the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill. Since I am sure that you are familiar with the constitutional problems posed by these provisions, I shall only state that in my judgment they will be completely ineffective to accomplish their purpose. They will be ineffective because the registration provisions, upon which most of the other provisions are hinged, will not apply to any Communist organization until after prolonged administrative and judicial proceedings. When, finally, an organization is required to register, it will in all probability dissolve itself, then reappear with a new name and new officers. Even if this registration process could be made effective, most of the penalties which would be imposed upon registered organizations and their members would be superfluous in that they are already applied under existing law. Communists and fellow travelers are already excluded and removed from Federal employment under the President's loyalty program, the State Department denies passports to Communists, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue withholds tax exemptions and deductions from subversive organizations and their contributors—and all this without going through the cumbersome procedures of the Mundt-Ferguson provisions. Thus the new result of these procedures will be meager in contrast with the staggering and perhaps futile enforcement burden which would be placed upon the Department of Justice.

Also, I wish to point out that section 22 of the McCarran bill, embodying the objectives of S. 1832, would change the laws governing the exclusion and deportation of aliens in respects that will probably create serious problems in the conduct of our foreign relations. I trust that these proposed changes will receive the most careful consideration.

Finally, it must be assumed that these provisions will have the effect of hastening the present tendency of the Communist Party to go underground. In this connection, I wish to call your attention to a paragraph

contained in the Department's report to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate on an earlier form of this legislation:

"Outlawing of the Communist Party appears to this department to be unwise, even if doubts as to the constitutionality of such a step were removed. Outlawing would materially increase the Department's problem of law enforcement. Whereas the Communist Party, to some extent, now operates on the surface, if this bill becomes law it will be forced underground where surveillance of its activities will become increasingly difficult. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of this Department, in his testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee in March 1947, admonished that he would hate to see a group that does not deserve to be in the category of martyrs have the self-pity that they would at once invoke if they were made martyrs by some restrictive legislation that might later be declared unconstitutional."

The present world situation requires the prompt enactment of practical and constitutional legislation which will give to the Department of Justice adequate weapons to deal with the precise dangers which we face, while preserving our traditions of personal liberty. We in the Department favor the general purpose of this type of legislation, but we do not feel that there is time enough remaining for novel experiments in law enforcement over a period of years, with doubtful, meager, and inadequate results.

Yours sincerely,

J. HOWARD McGRATH,
Attorney General.

PROMOTION OF VETERANS IN FIELD SERVICE OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I do not see the majority leader in the Chamber at the moment, but I wish to have brought up at the earliest possible opportunity the veto message on House bill 87. That bill has already been passed by the House of Representatives over the veto, by a vote of 213 to 71. I hope the matter may soon be taken up by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It cannot be brought up at this time, under the agreement in regard to procedure.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report see pages 13574-13577, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 24, 1950, House proceedings.)

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the report be adopted.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee wish to be recognized now to speak on the conference report?

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me inquire whether the Senator from New Hampshire has any objection to adoption of the conference report.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to make a few comments on it, first.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course; but let the report be adopted now.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I wish to speak on it before it is adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless the Senator from Tennessee wishes to speak at this time, the Chair will recognize the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is the conference report on the first over-all appropriation bill which the Congress has acted on. It naturally involved a tremendous task on the part of the conference committee. It is entirely conceivable that in such a huge over-all bill, touching so many subjects and relating to items, and containing so many figures, mistakes may be made. However, by and large, I think the conference committee has done an excellent job.

There are two items I wish to comment on, however. One is the so-called 10-percent-cut amendment, which was adopted by the Senate by a very substantial margin. That was the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and some 35 other Senators. That amendment was agreed to in the Senate by such an overwhelming vote that certainly the Senate conferees should have given very special attention to the particular approach by which that cut was proposed to be made.

It was not a blank-check cut or a meat-ax cut, but the Bridges-Byrd amendment spelled out specifically how the cut was to be made and the specific exemptions which were to be granted for certain agencies and departments mainly of a defense and security nature. The exemptions exempted agencies which are of vital importance at this particular time.

However, the conference committee saw fit to ignore that approach, and, instead, agreed to an amendment which was proposed by one of the House Members, which is a meat-ax approach, a blank-check, and everything which many Members of the Senate have been speaking against. It is a complete delegation of authority; it grants to the President and to the Bureau of the Budget complete blank-check authority.

I wish to point out that that is exactly contrary to the approach of the Byrd-Bridges amendment, which was supported overwhelmingly in the Senate. I regret very much that the Senate conferees saw fit to yield on a very important matter of principle in that connection. As the ranking Republican member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and as a member of the conference committee, I could not concur in the action taken by the conference committee on that item, and I did not agree to that part of the report.

Let me call attention to another part of the conference report, as agreed to by the conferees. I refer to the elimination of the appropriation for the Children's Fund. I stood on the floor of the Senate and spoke and voted to cut the appropriation for the Children's Fund 10 percent in line with my general desire to make such cuts. The Senate, in its wisdom, by a record vote, defeated the attempt to cut the Chil-

dren's Fund appropriation 10 percent; the Senate was not willing to cut that appropriation even 10 percent. Yet the conferees have eliminated the item entirely. If the Senate was not willing to cut the item 10 percent, how can the Senate conceivably agree to cut the item 100 percent—in other words, to eliminate it?

These are some of the inequities of the conference report.

However, by and large, I think the conferees have done a good job. I think the work they undertook on this overall appropriation bill was most difficult, and I think generally speaking they should be commended. Nevertheless, there are certain inequalities and inequities in the situation of which I think the Senate should be aware when it acts on the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator describe briefly what the conferees did with regard to the Bridges-Byrd amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. They eliminated the so-called 10-percent cut proposed by Bridges-Byrd amendment, which was adopted by the Senate by an overwhelming vote, and substituted an instruction to the executive branch of the Government—namely, the President and the Bureau of the Budget—to cut \$550,000,000 from the fund. Under that instruction, they could cut it anywhere; for instance, they could cut the appropriation for the armed services if they wished to do so, and if they deemed that such a cut would not be harmful to the national defense, or they could cut the appropriations for the FBI or for the Bureau of Internal Revenue or for any other agency or function of government. In this respect the action by the conferees proposes a wide delegation of authority, a blank check. That is what I object to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. From reading the newspapers, I do not understand that the President or the Bureau of the Budget would have to make the cut; my understanding is that it would be somewhat discretionary on their part.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe the cut is mandatory, but if the cut is not mandatory, then the amendment is worse than I have stated. I assume from its wording that it is mandatory that the cut be made.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. From reading the press, I understood that the conferees had specifically cut the ECA appropriation \$200,000,000; or was that left to the discretion of the President?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; the conferees cut the ECA appropriation \$200,000,000. The Senator from New Jersey will recall that in the Senate he made a successful fight to exempt the ECA appropriation from the 10-percent cut; but in the conference the ECA appropriation was cut \$200,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. \$200,000,000 more than the appropriation was as the Senate left it?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In other words, the conferees have cut that appropriation an additional \$200,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to call attention to that fact for the record, because later it may be necessary for the ECA to make a further request for appropriations.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. With respect to the Children's Fund, is it not true that it is the only international cooperation fund for which the local contribution has been far more than our contribution?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When we put up \$25,000,000, for instance, \$100,000,000 has been contributed from other sources, and that fund has taken care of approximately 3,000,000 helpless children.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe the Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In the event the conference report is agreed to, can the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire tell us what will be the net result in dollars by way of a reduction in the recommendations of the Budget Bureau?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not have the exact figure in mind, but it is over \$2,000,000,000. The specific cuts, I may say to the Senator from North Dakota, total \$1,640,000,000-plus, and in addition thereto a reduction of \$550,000,000 is authorized. So the appropriations would be some \$2,000,000,000 below the budget estimates.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. LODGE. What did the conference committee do regarding the amount for technical and economic assistance to economically underdeveloped areas?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is my understanding that the conference agreed upon a sum of \$15,000,000, and, from what I have read in the press, I understand that the House disagreed to that provision of the conference report and so it now restored the original figure of \$26,500,000.

Mr. LODGE. So it has not been cut, then. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. The conference committee cut it to \$15,000,000, and then, as I understand, under the further procedure, when the report was considered by the House, instead of accepting the amount of \$15,000,000 as recommended by the conferees, the House voted to

overturn that item in the conference report and to restore the full figure.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to know about that, if the Senator will yield further.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. ROBERTSON rose.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Virginia, if he can give the answer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is seeking the floor in his own right.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There are two matters connected with the report which I desire to discuss.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is an item that is utterly indispensable to making our foreign commitments effective.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the conference report, but I desire to mention two items in it in which I have had particular interest. One has to do with the appropriation for civil functions. The committee recommended a figure to the Senate which was 10 percent below the Budget estimate. That is point No. 1. Point No. 2 is that the Senate adopted the Bridges-Byrd amendment and cut it another 10 percent. When it went to the conference it was cut \$76,000,000 more. Then, in addition to that, a provision was inserted that no project under that title of the bill should be proceeded with unless the President certified it was a contribution to the national-defense program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. That provision relates only to new projects, not to projects which are under way at the present time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It relates to the new projects, then.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then, I wrote to the Chief of the Army and asked him to give me an answer as to what would have been the result of the 50 percent cut proposed by the Douglas amendment, had it been adopted. I voted against it, because I felt there were involved hydroelectric projects which could be brought into operation within the next year, which were highly essential to the war effort, and to stop which now would be poor economy from every standpoint. He wrote me that in his opinion if we had made a 50 percent horizontal cut across the board of all those projects we would have to pay liquidated damages to contractors, and we would have left unfinished construction so exposed to the elements that in his opinion there would have been no saving whatever by that cut.

But, the way we have operated, we do have a saving. We saved 10 percent on the Bridges-Byrd amendment. We saved \$76,000,000, which was further cut,

and we saved on all new projects in the bill, including some of those items about which I frankly had some doubt, which doubt I expressed in the committee. However, I do not have the controlling vote. They cannot be started unless the President certifies that they are essential to the defense effort.

So, Mr. President, I feel that those of us who believed in economy but who did not believe in the approach to it on this particular item advanced by the Douglas amendment, have been fully justified in the stand which we took.

The other item to which I desire to refer is the loan to Spain, which has created quite a bit of discussion. We provided that the Export-Import Bank was to make a loan to Spain of \$100,000,000, and everyone knows that the bank has control over loans of that kind, to see how the funds are expended. The conference committee cut that to \$62,500,000, and left the Senate provisions in the bill rather intact, except to this extent: The ECA is required to exercise the same type of administration and supervision over the use of this fund that is used in any ECA country.

Why did I vote for a loan to Spain? I believe in democracy. I believe in the system of private enterprise. I do not believe anyone more firmly believes in that than I. My colonial ancestors left the Church of England to join with Thomas Jefferson in America in the fight for religious freedom. They joined a Baptist church, and we have been Baptists ever since. We believe in religious freedom of every kind, and in complete separation of church and state. But what was the situation which confronted us? We spent untold billions of dollars and the flower of our youth on foreign battlefields to win a war against aggression. Did we win the peace? We did not. Then, when our constituents said, "Bring the boys home. Bring the boys home" we brought them home. We demobilized the greatest army we had ever had, and the greatest Navy the world has ever seen. Then one of our allies, Russia, would not allow us to have a peace in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, of which she was a member. We set out to buy the peace. We put \$22,000,000,000 into a program and into an effort to buy the peace. Still we did not get the peace.

So what were we then forced to do? We were compelled to add some \$20,000,000,000 to an already burdensome defense program and to add \$4,000,000,000 to the Atlantic Pact nations. We urged Mr. Hoffman to channel ECA funds as far as possible into military preparedness instead of business as usual in western Europe. We did not stop there.

What else did we do? We made our plans to win the peace. We made an Export-Import Bank loan of \$20,000,000 last year to Tito, and we made another Export-Import loan of \$20,000,000 to him this year. Then I called the president of the Export-Import Bank and said, "Did you get any collateral for the loan to Tito?" "Why," he said, "of course not." I said, "You made it on the faith

and credit of Yugoslavia?" He said, "Of course." I said, "Do you think you will get that loan repaid if Russia moves against Tito and overruns and controls Yugoslavia?" "Well," he said, "I do not know." I said, "You ought to know, because you ought to know that one of the first things the Communists did in Russia was to repudiate every obligation of the Czarist government." They never paid a nickel of it that was due. They never paid anything that was due us from Russia in World War I. And, of course, they are not going to pay a nickel of this. Why then was the loan made to Tito? If it had any validity, it was because Tito had said to the Politburo, "If you start to cross my border, I am going to fight—and we have something to fight with."

Is Tito an exponent of representative democracy? He is as much a Communist dictator as anyone who can be named. I visited in Spain last fall. There is a great deal more personal freedom in Spain than there is in Yugoslavia. I could circulate anywhere in Spain. As a matter of fact, I said to the Prime Minister of Spain, "The treatment which you have given my Baptist and Methodist friends over here is a stumbling block to closer unity between Spain and the United States." He said, "You have my permission to visit anywhere in Spain. You may investigate every alleged act of intolerance, and," he said, "when you come back, I will take your word and the word of your Baptist missionaries for what is done over here."

I replied, "Mr. Prime Minister, I do not have an opportunity to make that investigation, but I certainly appreciate your willingness to let me make it." Do Senators think that Tito would let me make an investigation of what was done to Archbishop Stepanic and to the other of the Catholics in Yugoslavia? Of course he would not. Do Senators think there is any comparison between the situation in Spain and what has been done in the way of religious intolerance in Yugoslavia? Of course not.

But we accepted the credit risk of Yugoslavia, because we thought Tito would fight the Russians if they tried to cross his border.

Anyone can draw any distinction he pleases between a dictator in Yugoslavia and a dictator in Spain. I cannot draw such a distinction. I found in Europe that the Communists in Italy and in France—and they total approximately 4,000,000—were so bitter against Franco because he destroyed communism in Spain that they prevailed upon those nations to sponsor a resolution in the United Nations that we would not recognize Spain or have anything to do with that nation, that we would treat her as an outcast. We went along with that program.

Last winter the Secretary of State told me that he was planning to pull away from that agreement. I now understand that he does not plan to pull away from it.

I was recently at the White House, and the President had some remarks to make about those who voted for a loan to

Spain. I said, "With all due deference, Mr. President, we have 92 employees in the Embassy in Madrid, and there is no one to speak over there on the level of a cabinet officer. We have a full staff in Yugoslavia. We recognized Yugoslavia and made a loan to her."

Let those who please draw a distinction. I am for taking steps to meet the Communist aggression. I intend to support the McCarran bill with such appropriate amendments as I think will be adequate, and I hope we shall consider that bill as soon as the other "must" bills are completed. We must combat communism on our home front.

I rejoice in our support of Greece, because Greece fought the Communists and won, and I think, if necessary, she will fight them again. I was very much encouraged when I was in Oslo and found the indomitable, irrefragable spirit of the Norwegians against communism. They will stand up and fight to the last man. When I went to Madrid and asked about Communists, I was told, "If there are any of them here we do not know where they are. They are underground, if they are here."

If Spain will not fight against communism, no one will fight against communism. When we are pouring out billions of dollars to stem the tide of future communistic aggression, let those who will draw the distinction between furnishing funds to the Communists in Yugoslavia to help them make their fight and denying funds to the anti-Communists in Spain, who have more men under arms today and a larger potential of men than Tito ever hoped to have. There are between 300,000 and 400,000 men, well trained and equipped soldiers, in Spain, and a million men could be brought to the colors and trained within 6 months, if they had the support of planes, tanks, and the heavy artillery they need. Certainly the Pyrenees are a barrier that will not be easily crossed.

I heard over the radio that regardless of what we do, the President claims the right to impound any money we appropriate. I do not challenge that right. If, after Congress appropriates funds, he sees fit to decide that he is not going to spend a nickel of the amount, that will be his responsibility. Spain may never get any of this money and we may never receive any help from Spain. Some day we may be on the battle front in western Europe fighting the onrushing tide of communism and wanting allies who have been receiving not \$62,500,000, but hundreds of millions of dollars of ECA money, and they may say "Gentlemen, we prefer to be neutral. We are so sorry, but we can not put our cities in this situation. Please count us out."

If anyone thinks we have bought lasting friends with ECA money, he should go to Europe and take a quick look at the situation. I have been in favor of voting ECA funds because I felt that if we did not give the western European nations rehabilitation funds, the propaganda put out by the Communists would sway so many poverty-stricken people that they would yield to it. It is not

poverty, as someone recently pointed out, that makes Communists. We can go to some of the mountain areas in Virginia where the people do not know what \$250 cash means, but they would fight, until their gun barrels got hot, for freedom and against communism. We are dealing in Europe with many people who have never known real freedom. We have tried to sell them a conception of democracy and the enterprise system which they do not know anything about. I have been saying that if we tried to sell them the principles of the Christian religion, on which our democracy is founded, they would know something about it. We do not have to tell them the meaning of God or of the estical principles of the Bible which the Communists seek to destroy.

But the point I make, Mr. President, is that we spent approximately \$2,000,000,000 in a program of trying to buy friends and trying to buy peace, and it did not work. Therefore I exercised the privilege, with other Members of the Senate, to use my best judgment as to how to appropriate future funds in a struggle in which our destiny and our future are vitally concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am in complete agreement with the statement which has been made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in regard to the fact that the Senate conferees apparently made little effort to secure the retention of the amendment adopted by the Senate by an overwhelming vote to reduce nondefense spending by 10 percent. This amendment was very carefully prepared. It was prepared after consultation with the Budget Bureau, with the Comptroller General, and other officials of the Government. It was so prepared that it required a 10-percent reduction in non-defense spending by each department. Instead of that, the Senate conferees have agreed to an amendment suggested by the House which permits the President to cut nondefense expenditures by \$550,000,000, approximately the same reduction which would have resulted from the Bridges-Byrd amendment. Under the provision now contained in the conference report the President can in the case of any department of the Government use a meat ax and cut those things he does not like, or, perhaps, hold the power given him as a threat over the heads of Senators in connection with appropriations in their own States, such as those for rivers, harbors, and other public improvements. He can suspend the construction of public works and say that it is the result of the reduction contemplated by the conference report.

Mr. President, I am very sorry that the Senate has abdicated in this matter. I think Congress should say where its appropriations are to be cut. The amendment which was proposed and adopted by the Senate was effective and workable, and was so declared by the Budget Bureau. It would have accomplished the desired result and we should still have retained control of the purse

strings, which is the duty of the Congress.

Mr. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in defense of an omnibus appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD IN DEFENSE OF THE ONE-APPROPRIATION BILL

The Congress today, has completed legislative action on what may be regarded as the complete regular appropriation side of the Federal budget. This was accomplished in the first consolidated appropriation bill of modern history.

The last of the 11 appropriation bills required for the expenditure budget for fiscal year 1950 was not passed until October 29, 1949. The consolidated bill for fiscal year 1951 embracing virtually all of the appropriations for the current year, except those incident to the unanticipated Korean outbreak, is ready for the President's signature two full months ahead of the budget completion date last year. At this date last year less than half of the 1950 appropriations had been enacted.

As an advocate of the consolidated appropriation bill procedure, I cannot refrain at this time from remarking on the record that Congress has made in the first year of its operation. Actually the single appropriation bill this year accomplishes what was done last year in 11 separate and virtually unrelated supply bills. With the exception of the interest on the debt and some other permanent and indefinite appropriation items the single appropriation bill this year embraced the appropriation objects covered by Presidential requests in January totaling \$34,800,000,000 including contract and loan authorizations and reappropriations. As the bill goes back to the President, the total has been reduced by \$2,000,000,000, the largest reduction yet made in an appropriation bill.

In contrast Presidential requests covered by the 11 separate bills last year totaled \$38,800,000,000 and congressional action, spread over 10 months resulted in increasing the aggregate by nearly \$100,000,000.

Last year the actual debate on the 11 bills in the House and the Senate totaled 290 hours in the aggregate. This year actual debate on the single appropriation bill in the two Houses totaled 236 hours; a reduction of 54 hours.

Last year 292 Members of the House and Senate participated in the debates on the 11 bills. This year 308 Members of the 2 Houses participated in the debate on the single appropriation bill; an increase of 16.

From the RECORD there is no way of computing the Members on the floor at all times when a bill is under consideration, but the RECORD does show that the average number of announced absentees on days during which the 11 appropriation bills of last year were under debate in the Senate was 14. Absentees announced on days when the single appropriation bill was debated this year averaged the same number—14.

In summary, the record shows that enactment of the single appropriation bill this year required less time, promoted fuller participation and resulted in savings rather than increases.

These statements are based on examination of the RECORD itself and they are submitted in the nature of a factual reply to criticism which may be summarized by the remarks of the majority leader of the Senate, who, at the conclusion of the debate on the single appropriation bill, August 4, 1950, (column 2 of p. 12017 of the RECORD), said:

"When the Congress convenes next year I think it will seriously consider the repeal of the rule which provides that an appropriation may be considered in one package. I am convinced that, as the result of the experience we have had this year, the work we are now going through has saved no money, so far as decreases in appropriations are concerned. I am convinced that we have consumed more time than was necessary in handling this appropriation bill collectively than would have been consumed had we considered the bill in separate categories. I have talked with many Senators and have found none who disagreed with this particular thought."

As a sponsor of the resolution for the single appropriation bill procedure which was approved by unanimous votes in both the Senate Rules Committee and the Senate itself, I would not expect the majority leader to have included me among those to whom he talked in an effort to find agreement with his view that we should seriously consider changing the procedure. Of course I know that the single appropriation bill required changes—changes in committee procedure, changes in committee staff work, changes, in some cases, in committee and subcommittee organization, changes in preparation of the bill and report, and changes in the management and presentation on the floors of Congress. And I know that changes in long established customs are the most difficult changes to make. But I believe in this case, the record shows that the changes have been good and progressive in all of the aspects involved.

I believe especially they have been in the interest of more intelligent consideration of the budget by the Congress, individually and collectively. I dare say more Members of Congress know more about what is in the budget this year than at any other time since World War I, when the budget first began to assume colossal proportions.

Contrary to the views which were found by the Senate majority leader, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, who more than anyone else in Congress has the responsibility for appropriation legislation, on June 20, after he had steered the single appropriation bill through the House Committee and the House itself, said "the single appropriation bill offers the most practical and efficient method of handling the annual budget and the national fiscal program. Judged by our experience there is no legitimate reason which can be advanced against it. Conversely, there is every reason for the consideration of all appropriations in one bill. The consolidated bill is in conformity with the best business thought of the Nation. It is supported by the weight of public opinion. It has been approved by metropolitan newspapers in every section of the country."

These are quotations this year, after he had worked with the single appropriation bill, by the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. He summed up his remarks on experience with the single appropriation bill, in contrast with his long experience with the old methods to which the majority leader of the Senate, would return, by saying:

"It is inconceivable that the Congress should consider taking a backward step reverting to multiple supply bills. They are the quill and pen and the three-legged stool in an adding-machine age. They are the ox-cart and the kayak in a jet-plane era. The decision on the applicability of the one bill to modern budgetary conditions determines whether under our form of Government the representatives of the people can control national spending or whether they will continue on down the rapidly accelerating declivities of the road to unbalanced budgets and mounting national debt."

These quotations from the Hon. CLARENCE CANNON are taken from the beginning and

the end of his June 20 estimates of the value of the single appropriation bill. In between he refuted every criticism that has been made of the new procedure.

As to the charge that the single appropriation bill opens the way for more partisan manipulation of the budget, Mr. CANNON said: "Neither party can possibly gain or lose any political advantage except by making it in any case an instrument for carrying out more completely and more effectively its platform pledges for economy and better administration."

Chairman CANNON's answers to other criticisms may be paraphrased as follows:

1. The single appropriation bill provides a means of proper and orderly retrenchment through better allocation of funds.

2. The single appropriation bill permits earlier reporting of the appropriation recommendations in the aggregate. (The House had the full appropriation bill before it on March 21.)

3. The single appropriation bill lends itself to better organization of subcommittee, and committee staff organization, with the result of a more thorough consideration and processing of estimates and appropriations. The effect was demonstrated by the relatively few changes made in the committee recommendations found by the House to be necessary.

4. The single appropriation bill, lending itself to a more complete and comprehensive understanding of the fiscal situation, protects the bill against ill-conceived and poorly drafted amendments.

5. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee found that the single appropriation bill tended to keep members on the floor during its consideration.

6. He emphatically refuted the contention that the single appropriation bill would be conducive to increased log-rolling. Actually, he said experience with the single appropriation bill this session demonstrates that it effectively disposes of the old system of log-rolling so prevalent in the consideration of individual departmental bills.

7. The House chairman said the single bill visualizes at a glance the outline of national income and expenditures and centers the attention of the country on the national fiscal program. "It was the pitiless limelight of national attention concentrated on the final votes" he said, "that offset the pleas and importunities of the pressure groups and special interests."

8. He said that the single appropriation bill procedure eliminated the practice of a dozen or more subcommittees, working in their segregated corners of the budget, spending in the dark.

9. He said the single appropriation bill, in itself, tends toward the elimination of conflicts, duplications and overlapping expenditures.

10. He said the single appropriation bill discourages the practice of attaching irrelevant riders either in committee or by floor amendment.

11. The House chairman disclaimed the contention that the Senate must mark time until final action on the single appropriation bill is taken by the House. On the contrary, he said, under the new system the Senate may begin work much sooner than before—within a week or two after the session opens—because the House subcommittee transmits to the Senate committee the printed hearings as they progress.

12. As to the item veto objection, Chairman CANNON first referred to the constitutional question involved and then said the item veto could be used on the single appropriation bill as well as on the separate bills and that the veto power would be stronger on the single bill than on any of the separate bills because operation of virtually all of the Government instead of a relatively small segment would be involved.

13. Chairman CANNON said the most untenable of all the objections to the single appropriation bill was that it was unwieldy. To this he replied the experience of every major nation in the world and every State in the Union belies such criticism.

These are the views, based on experience with both the old system and the new, of the man who has the prime responsibility for appropriation legislation in Congress.

Anything I would say, of course, would be anticlimactic. But in my humble judgment the Congress has done a better, a more thorough and a more intelligent job on appropriations this year than at any time since I have been privileged to be a Member of the Senate. That goes for the membership of the committees as well as the full membership of both Houses. I think the procedure has been more orderly, the debate more complete and enlightening, and the action has by far been based on better consideration as a whole.

I believe the public has a better comprehension of the task involved, that it has a better appreciation of the problems which have to be solved, and that it, too, has benefited from the more intelligent debate.

This in itself is progress. I believe that we would have come close to producing a balanced budget, despite the President's January requests for \$5,000,000,000 of deficit financing, if it had not been for the outbreak in Korea.

I believe under normal conditions, with the single appropriation procedure we can do a better job, a more intelligent job, and balance the budget with less time consumed and a fuller participation in debate. It is certain that it would have been impossible to write \$2,000,000,000 of reduction in 11 regular appropriation bills scattered hit and miss over the 8 months since January.

Even if it had taken half of an entire session to pass the appropriation bill, the time and the effort and the study would be fully justified, for the Budget of the United States is the biggest fiscal operation on earth. And without sound financial conditions in this Government there can be no hope for the preservation of our freedoms, or security against invasion.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I concur in the remarks made by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BRIDGES] and also in the remarks just made by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], with reference to section 508 of the conference report. I do so as a Member of the Senate and as one who sat as a conferee attempting to iron out the differences confronting the Senate and the House.

The so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment was worked out over many weeks. It provided a sound formula. If we are to make cuts in appropriations from now on, I doubt if we could find a formula which would be more practical than the one that was submitted. The Bridges-Byrd amendment, calling for a 10-percent cut was adopted by the Senate by an overwhelming majority. Under it the responsibility would be placed squarely on the Congress. We would not have delegated the authority. I remember the complaint that was made a year ago by columnists throughout the country. They said, "This is a meat-ax cut. You are simply squirming out of your responsibility and putting it on the shoulders of the President." Yet here we are supplanting the so-called Bridges-Byrd formula with the old meat-ax formula. That is exactly

what is being done. The power is delegated to the President to make the cuts where he pleases. Granting that he would make them and get the most efficient economy possible, yet it is very difficult to do the job. It is very difficult, indeed, because the bill contains one chapter here, another chapter there, and various subsections in the chapters. They were all gone over very carefully, and the Congress accepted the full responsibility and told the Bureau of the Budget and the executive agencies where to make the cuts percentagewise. That constituted a sound formula. It was adopted, as I said before, by an overwhelming vote of the Senate. Now it has been taken out in conference. That is to say, there was no agreement on it because of the pressure to pass the appropriation bill. It was said "We must pass the appropriation bill out. If you hold it out any longer, this and that will be jeopardized."

If the conference report is adopted, I trust that the membership of the Senate will remember that the formula we are adopting is the old meat-ax formula. The cuts will be made by the President through his executive agencies, and they will be made where and when he wants to make them. He takes the full responsibility off the shoulders of Congress under a delegated authority. It is contrary to the basic theory of the Byrd-Bridges amendment, which I think would have been most successful in application.

Mr. President, no doubt the conference report will be adopted. There are other things about which I might comment, because I worked very diligently with the committee. I voted with the Senator from New Hampshire to strike out section 508, because I felt that if cuts are to be made, they should be made under the formula, not in the manner in which they would be made under the conference report, with instructions to the President to cut approximately \$550,000,000 from appropriations which now total, or will total, when we add the supplemental deficiencies to the omnibus appropriation bill, in the neighborhood of \$60,000,000,000.

Mr. President, I hope when the Committee on Appropriations does its work in another year, the program which was industriously worked out by the members of the committee will not be disregarded. If it were not for the fact that apparently there is much anxiety about having the appropriation bill passed, I think this would be one time when Members of the Senate would be justified in attempting to resist the conference report in order to strike out the provision delegating the authority to the President, and reinsert the Byrd-Bridges amendment. It seems to me that if we want to do the job and do it right, and provide a formula which can be used from now on, we should not disregard the formula, which we would surely do if we were to accept the conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I regret to hear my friends denounce the conference report and charge that the reduction is to be made with a meat ax.

The committee took almost 10,000 pages of printed testimony. It heard practically everyone who wanted to be heard; no one was denied a hearing. The committee did not turn down the Bridges-Byrd amendment. There was all kinds of evidence about the Byrd-Bridges amendment. We took evidence on practically every item in the bill, which consists of nearly 500 pages—478 pages as I recall—and embraces many subjects. Meat ax? Oh, no. It is based on testimony. Since January 28, 1950, the committee has been diligently at work. It did not work for some weeks and then do nothing the next week, but it worked diligently every day and every week. Meat ax? Oh, no. That is ridiculous, Mr. President. I am astonished that my friends should complain about the Byrd-Bridges amendment not being retained and that the committee used a meat ax. What in the world would they want us to do? Let us look at the report. By how much did the committee reduce the appropriations originally contained in the bill? I have some figures before me.

The House bill as passed—I am making a recapitulation of the figures—appropriated \$27,346,713,664. The Senate bill as passed appropriated \$32,577,362,231. The conference action, as is usually true in conference actions, was a compromise. Incidentally, in this instance there was a real and free conference, not only in the opinion of myself, but in the opinion of many other members of the conference committee. The conference action provides appropriations of \$32,253,455,425, which is under the amount in the Senate bill by \$323,906,806. It is under the Budget estimate by \$1,646,753,223. Does that look as though the committee had used a meat ax?

Let me tell the Senate something else. The Appropriations Committee worked from the 26th of January to the 28th of August, or approximately 7 months, in preparing the bill.

It is said we should have cut the appropriations 10 percent, and left them there. There is not a Senator in this body who would have done that; not one would have voted for such a thing. Would any Senator have voted to cut by 10 percent the amount required to pay the interest on our bonds? Would any Senator have voted to cut 10 percent from the amount going to our soldiers and sailors of the First World War, the Second World War, or any other war, who went forth to fight for the Nation? It is said the conferees excepted those items. They did except some, it is true. But what about a proposal that would take in everything, and make no exception?

This is the first unified bill we ever had. The chairman of the committee time and again said we were going to give the unified bill the fairest show in the world, and if the committee did not give the unified plan a fair show, then it is impossible to give it one, because we made every effort to do so. There was not a member of the committee who did not try to give it a fair show.

Before we went to conference, the House had abandoned the plan for a re-

duction to the extent of not including the ECA funds.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will state the reason.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator should tell the whole story. The authorization bill had not been passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was the excuse for it; but it could have been put in just as easy as not.

Mr. President, that is not all. The House abandoned something else. Names were given for the various appropriations, like the "Army bill," the "Navy bill," the "Treasury bill," and the various other bills. The House changed those to "chapters," but the bills are virtually the same as before. The various appropriations are contained as "chapters," instead of being designated "Army bill," and various other bills.

Before I leave the subject of the 10-percent reduction, I wish to say that we have reduced the bill more than 10 percent. As I remember the figure, it is reduced by nearly 12 percent. It has not been reduced by guess, not by a formula that says it shall be reduced 10 percent whether the appropriation is good, bad, or indifferent. We have not reduced it in that way. We have taken proof, we have heard evidence on the bill, and after taking the proof and after cutting as much as we could, we had to make provision for war expenses. Some might have conceived that we would have a war, but I do not think all did. That changed the action of the committee to some extent. It should have changed it. We had to change it.

Mr. President, I am a realist when it comes to some things. Looking at both sides of the Senate, not leaving out the Republicans on the other side, I ask if there is a Senator who thinks we should not have increased the war items when requested to do so by the President after we got into the Korean war. If there is one, I would like to have him hold up his hand. I want to see what Senator would have reduced those items by 10 percent or any other percentage.

Under our rules, the committee hears the evidence and determines on the evidence what the appropriations shall be, and after we pass a bill we have a conference with the House. As I have said, we worked on this bill for more than 7 months and we worked on it daily, not merely when Senators happened to be in town.

While I am talking about what the committee itself has done, I wish to say a word or two about those in the employ of the committee, from Mr. Everard Smith on down to the last employee. I have never known the employees of a committee to do such outstanding work as has been done by the attachés of the Committee on Appropriations in this case, and I take my hat off to them. I would not say a word in criticism of any of them. I cannot agree with my friends who are so violently opposed to the conference report. I believe six or seven Senators already have spoken stating this was the most outrageous bill

ever to be passed. These men are well-intentioned, but the members of the Committee on Appropriations are not violent characters one would assume they were from what has been heard from five or six speakers. They are fine men, and they want to do what is right, and have tried to do what is right. As God is my judge, I have had but one idea, and that was to do the best I could for the people of the country. That has been emphasized as we met the unfortunate circumstance of being in war. We have had to increase the appropriations. We could not decrease them by 10 percent.

Mr. President, what has been the history of this body? The Senate has been in existence since 1789, and the committees have been in existence for that time. There is nothing in the law, there is nothing in the rules, providing that appropriations shall be reduced according to percentages.

My good friend the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is seated just in front of me. He is one of the finest men God ever made; there never was a finer. I have known him since he was a youngster, and there is nothing but good I could say about him. But he cannot demonstrate that a straight cut of 10 percent would be a cure-all for the difficulties in which we find ourselves with regard to appropriations. They have to be investigated. They have to be examined. The committee has to take testimony. It has to know where to make a cut and where not to make a cut.

Mr. President, I am asking the Senate to stand by the committee. Of course, errors have been made by the members of the committee. I know errors have been made by the chairman of the committee. I freely confess to mistakes and errors. But we were trying to do our best for the country, and that was emphasized when the war unexpectedly came on. It was unexpected to me. I never dreamed we would be in a war. That made the condition worse and made the obligation on the members of the committee greater. I want to say to Senators who are for this bill and Senators who are against the bill that the committee has done its best to do what is right.

At this point I wish to read the remainder of the recapitulation to show what the committee has done. From what has been said about the committee's action one might think it had not done anything. One might think that perhaps the members of the committee had looked into the committee room occasionally, but had not really done anything. One would think our employees have not done anything. Mr. President, I wish to say that in all my life I have never seen any employees work like those of the committee.

What are the savings the committee has effected? I have the figures before me. I shall state first of contract authority. The amount carried in the House bill was \$2,147,626,500. The amount carried in the Senate bill was \$2,184,570,000. The conference action left the amount at \$2,170,145,000. The reduction made in conference is \$14,-

425,000. That is in contract authority alone.

In cash the total amount of the reduction made in conference is \$323,906,806, which added to the contract authority reduction of \$14,425,000, makes a total of \$338,331,806.

We have taken \$1,600,000,000 off the bill, and authorized the President to take off more. Some say we should not have done that. As a general thing, I should say it would have been better not to have done so. It was done this time, however, because the President wrote a letter to the Congress, which he gave out to the press, as well, in which he told us what he wanted to do. The Constitution says he must do so. He merely carries out his duty as President. He may be wrong. I do not know. Presidents are sometimes wrong. But certainly there is no reason in the world to think that he would disregard the wishes of Congress. The Congress said, "We will cut off 10 percent and give you authority to change the percentage if you want to." We have appropriated for the specific items. We have told the President what we wanted. It is going to be done, too. We all know that.

Those of us who have been here these many years, who have seen Presidents come and go, and some have even seen Senators and Representatives come and go, know how these matters are carried out. I believe that President Truman will do his duty. He did his duty when he was a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. He was a member of that committee for a number of years. He is familiar with the committee, its operations, and the thoughts of the members of the committee. In my judgment, he wants to do the right thing.

I have seen a number of Presidents ever since President McKinley. I have seen President McKinley, President Theodore Roosevelt, President Taft, President Wilson—one of the greatest human beings I ever laid my eyes on, one of the most remarkable statesmen who ever walked these halls. I have seen President Harding, President Coolidge, President Hoover, President Franklin Roosevelt, and President Truman. I think every one of them was an honorable man and wanted to do what was best for his country.

Mr. President, I do not have much sympathy for abuse of men. Perhaps that is because I myself have received too much of it in my own life. But I think we could get along better perhaps by looking at things in a kindlier way. Sometimes it is necessary to use somewhat stern language, but it is not often necessary, and we should endeavor to avoid the use of such language as much as we can. Why should the Appropriations Committee be abused in view of the hard work it has done? We have passed on every item it was necessary for us to act upon. We have dealt with every problem with which we were confronted. We have heard every witness who desired to be heard. We have denied to no one the right to come before the committee and testify. Believe me, many witnesses came before us. There

are 10,000 printed pages of hearings in connection with this one bill.

Mr. ECTON rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield for a question.

Mr. ECTON. No, Mr. President. I wanted to make a few remarks.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought the Senator from Montana wanted to ask me a question.

Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two about some other matters. Much has been said about the Byrd-Bridges amendment. More has been said about that particular item than any other item in the bill. The Congress has never adopted such a method of dealing with appropriations. I know the Senator from Virginia so well and I know the Senator from New Hampshire so well that I know they want to save money, and that they honestly believe their method is the best way to save money. I have the same feeling as they do; that is, I want to save every dollar that can be saved. The bill resulted in saving more than \$2,000,000,000, when all items are included. The bill was \$2,000,000,000 under the budget estimate. It is not often a committee reports a saving of \$2,000,000,000. Did anyone hear of that having been done before? Any Senator who has ever heard of the Appropriations Committee saving more than 2,000,000,000 in one bill let him hold up his hand. I do not see any hands held up. I did not see any hands held up a while ago when a similar question was asked. We have taken \$1,600,000,000 off the bill and authorized the President to take off \$550,000,000 more. The committee has saved more than \$2,000,000,000 in this one bill, Mr. President. Why has that been done? It has been done because of a plan.

Mr. President, it is a remarkable thing that today we have reached the rather unusual situation in which a man cannot be a statesman unless he has a plan. We have the Jones plan, the Smith plan, innumerable plans. If a Senator is to be regarded as a statesman, he must have a plan. Let me say to the Senator from Virginia, whom I know affectionately as Harry, that I think that is one mistake he and I have made; I do not believe either of us ever has reached the point of having a plan. Under present circumstances, it seems to be obvious that a Senator cannot be a statesman unless he has a plan; he must have a plan. Similarly, legislation is not regarded as the kind of legislation it should be unless it is based on a plan; there must be a plan.

My friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is looking at me now, and is smiling—delightful gentleman that he is. I say to him that he had better get a plan as soon as possible.

My good friend—I started to say my lifelong friend, for he is very nearly that—the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], one of the handsomest and one of the best men I know, has a plan, does he not? He has been so successful

that I am rather inclined to think he does have some plan.

Mr. President, not long ago I was talking to an outsider about the same thing. He said the mistake I have made in my official life has been that I never had a plan; and he pointed out that if a man is to be a statesman he must have a plan. I suppose that is so.

Of course, Mr. President, there are plans and plans—some of them very good, some not so good.

Although I have not had a plan, I wish to assure the Senate, Mr. President, in the presence of Almighty God, that I have had but one desire in connection with this bill, and that has been, and still is, to save as much money as possible and, at the same time, to provide the necessary funds in order to permit the Government to realize its ideals and to effectuate its policies to the greatest extent possible. I believe that has been the attitude which all of us have maintained, and certainly it has been mine.

The able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who preceded me as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is one of the finest men in the world. Despite all he has had to say about this measure, I think that inwardly he knows that this is the way to legislate, namely, to legislate item by item, to take the proof, to obtain the facts, and to legislate on the basis of the facts, not on the basis of guesses.

Mr. President, let us not legislate on the basis of percentages. Whenever I think of percentages, I think of my early days, when I had to borrow some money. I did not like percentages then because I had to pay a good deal more than is required to be paid in these days when a person borrows money. I never liked percentages then, and I am still not wedded to percentages. They are all right in a way, but I am not wedded to them insofar as legislation is concerned. I think we should be more reasonable, more accurate, and more aware of exactly what should be done so that we can deal in exact amounts rather than in percentages.

Mr. President, complaint is made because the conferees voted to provide a little more money for ECA—although we voted to reduce the amount by \$200,000,000—than some persons thought should be provided. Some Members of Congress think we should reduce that amount by an additional 10 percent.

I wonder whether the Senators who now are listening to my remarks—and I thank them very much for doing so—remember that about a year ago I tried my best to have the Senate reduce the amount of the appropriation for ECA. I am in favor of the ECA appropriation carried in this bill because the Senate directed me to be in favor of it. The Senate voted for the largest amount proposed for that purpose, and so I have tried to do my duty, just as my friend who is sitting across the aisle—I refer to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is smiling, as he always is—always tries to do his duty. The Senate will recall that a majority of the Senate voted against me in connection with that item, and a majority of my

own committee voted against me then. After my own committee opposed me on the question of reducing our gifts to foreign countries, I accepted the judgment of my friends in the Senate, for this is a wonderful body, made up of wonderful men, and all Senators should stand by its collective judgment. I am not one of those who disbelieve in the Senate or who disbelieve in our form of government. I am not one who believes in a one-man government. In my opinion the time will never come when we have a one-man Government.

I am in favor of the United States Government as it is constituted under our wonderful Constitution. I held up my hand before Almighty God and took an oath forever to defend this Government of the United States, and I will always do so.

I think the Senate is a great body—although not because the Senate usually goes along with me, for actually the Senate usually goes against me. Many of my friends on the committee have voted against me at this time. Nevertheless, I know that the Senate does what it thinks is best for the Republic, and I commend the Senate.

Mr. President, there is another thing which I do not think should be done. I refer to the way some Senators voted in regard to the appropriation for Spain. I shall not go into the details of that matter, other than to say that the committee voted in favor of the proposal, and the House agreed to it, and the item is carried in the conference report. So I think it is our duty to uphold what has been done by the committee, by the House and by the Senate up to this time.

Mr. President, I hope to heaven this conference report will be adopted promptly. I was in hope that it would be agreed to very quickly, as quickly as I have seen many other conference reports on appropriation bills agreed to—in short, without any discussion at all. In fact, I was so much in hope of having that done that, as Senators know, I had not even prepared a speech on this measure.

A short time ago I was talking about the conference report to another member of the committee, and he wished to know how long I would speak on it. I told him I would not speak at all, if I could avoid doing so. He said, "I think the report will be adopted in about 45 minutes." Well, Mr. President, we have already been considering the conference report for over an hour now, and we have not yet begun to vote on it.

Ordinarily the Senate does not take long to act on a conference report on an appropriation bill which has been thoroughly considered, a bill which the committee has gone over thoroughly, item by item, and then has reported to the Senate, and after the Senate has gone over all the items and has argued every one of them. Every one of the items which has been referred to in the debate today has been argued before this body and has been approved by this body by an overwhelming majority, and then has gone to the House, and the House conferees have agreed to it; and the House itself has agreed to all these items, with

one exception, which I shall mention in a moment. Certainly the Senate already has voted in favor of these items. Under these circumstances, the Senate usually takes very prompt action on a conference report on such a measure.

By the way, Mr. President, one of the finest men I ever knew was a predecessor of mine. Some persons know him simply because he was General Pershing's father-in-law, but I knew him as Francis E. Warren, a Senator from Wyoming, an able and splendid man, conscientious to the highest degree. He served as governor of his State, and he served his people well and faithfully; he served them as few men ever did.

I have seen him do as I have done, when I attempted quietly to lay a conference report before the Senate and move that it be agreed to. I have seen Senator Warren time and again rise to say, "Mr. President, I submit the conference report, and ask for its immediate consideration"—and he got what he wanted. He would then say, "Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report." Without objection, the conference report would be agreed to. Frequently I have seen conference reports agreed to without objection, though, of course, if any Senator opposed it and wanted a vote he could have a vote and be recorded as voting against it.

Mr. President, I wonder whether Senators knew that some of those who supported the bill seem now to be against it. I am not referring to my friend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], because he told us when he signed the report that there was one item in it which he did not like, but he would sign the report because he thought the bill ought to pass.

Mr. President, this bill ought to pass. It is now nearly 2 months overdue. That, by the way, brings up something else. I wonder whether I can state it. In doing so I hope I may be able to state it without offense to anyone. Senators will remember that when early in the session the question came up of a unified appropriation bill—not 12 or 13 separate appropriation bills, as we had before that, but of combining them all in one bill—I did not favor it. We were informed by Members of the House that a unified bill would be passed by the House and sent to us for consideration by April 15, and that we would have 2½ months in which to pass it. It was not long until, judging from the newspapers, it appeared that it would be impossible for the House to pass it by April 15. June 1 was being discussed. First, it was thought it could be passed by May 15, I think it was, and then by June 1. I called upon our committee to begin work on it. We took testimony on the bill before it ever came to us. I was about to say we took tons of testimony—it was not tons, but there were 10,000 pages of it, all told. We began in January, and when we concluded, about April 15, we were informed it would be about May 1 before the bill would reach the Senate; which was later changed to May 15, then to June 15, and then to July 1. I think it came to the Senate about June 26. Am I correct in that? Mr. President, I believe this is the

first time I have ever wanted to ask a question of one of our able assistants to the Appropriations Committee when they were not on hand. I see that Mr. Everard Smith is on hand. He is always on hand. He informs me the bill passed the House on May 10. But it reached the Senate later than that. I desire to be accurate in my statements, and if I am in error I shall ask to have it corrected. I have no desire to say anything except what is the truth.

Senators see how the unified bill works. I may say it has worked the Senate Appropriations Committee tremendously hard. But we have done our duty. I ask Senators, not as members of the Democratic Party or as members of the Republican Party, but as Senators to stand by the good work which the committee has done in cutting one bill—think of it—more than \$2,000,000,000. I am very proud of that. I may be the only Senator who is proud of it. Other Senators may think it should have been cut less. It may be said we could have saved a great deal more than that by adopting certain rules. Yes, Mr. President, by adopting a rule, perhaps we could have saved the entire \$34,000,000,000, the amount we are to appropriate this year. We could have saved the entire amount, not by cutting it 10 percent, but by cutting it all out.

Mr. President, I believe I have now said everything I wanted to say, except on the subject of Spain. Let me return to that for a moment. I have never talked to Mr. Franco. In fact, I have not talked with any of the men who control the affairs of other countries. But, in times gone by, when I did not have so much work to do, when I had a little free time after the courts had adjourned for the summer, I occasionally went to Europe. In fact, I went a number of times. I saw the people there. All their governments are very similar. Why should Spain be excluded? Why should we treat her differently from other European countries? I am not going to argue the question at all. A lady once wrote me a letter in which she gave me, if I may use the expression, "unshirtd Hades" for favoring such a tyrant as Franco. I do not know Mr. Franco. There may be other Senators who know him, and if so, they know whether he is a tyrant; I do not know. I did not make my decision on that basis. I decided it upon the facts. I am a great believer in that. I know there were many people in the city of Memphis where I lived who sold goods to Spain. I took it up with them, and they informed me that the Spaniards paid their debts certainly as well if not better than the people of any other European nation. That is a pretty good recommendation. In these days it is an exceedingly good recommendation. I like people who pay their debts.

I was trying to reach a conclusion, and I did so. I believe that if we lend them money they will pay it back. We are not giving it to them; we are loaning it to them.

With that, Mr. President, I leave things to take care of themselves.

One other point, and I am through. It has been stated that they should be a horizontal cut. I want to have an experience meeting here. I wonder if there is a Senator listening to me—and there are a goodly number on both sides who, I think, are my friends—I wonder if there is a Senator in this body, including my very dear friend whom I see before me now, Mr. CORDON, who believes we should reduce expenditures by horizontal cuts. If there is such a Senator present, I should like to have him hold up his hand.

I see no hands held up.

In what do Senators believe? They believe, with me, that we should get the facts and pass upon the items of the bill, just as the committee did, and cut certain items.

I see my friend from Oregon looking at me rather quizzically.

Mr. CORDON. And approvingly.

Mr. McKELLAR. He is one of the ablest members of the committee. I want to take time to say that, Mr. President. He is one of the ablest men on the committee. I have told him, confidentially, of course, that if I should get into trouble, if I were ever prosecuted for any offense, I wanted to engage him as my lawyer so that I would be certain that he was on my side and not on the other side.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield. I yield to the Senator every day.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon would suggest that this is the first time he has ever found the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee off base.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall take a chance on that. I have taken a great many chances in my life, and I shall probably take a great many more.

Mr. President, I have already consumed too much time. I say to those who are taking such a strong stand on the other side that they may be right and I may be wrong, but there is no chance to put through their plan this time. If there is anything in the plan, it will certainly be adopted in days to come. The appropriation bill is on its last legs. We have fought over it for nearly 8 months. Let it go through. Ordinarily, the chairman of a committee, when he presents a bill to the Senate, makes a speech about it, and he should do so. I have already done that. I had hoped that after the bill had gone through all the processes, when it came to agreeing to the conference report, there would be an agreement without debate. When I talked to my friend from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] it was his idea that it would take approximately three-quarters of an hour to agree to the conference report. I did not think it would take that long.

Mr. President, we should adopt the report now. It does not give the President any greater powers than any President has had. The statement of the President was in every way a proper and able statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The question

is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I think we all appreciate what the very able and distinguished Senator from Tennessee has said. We likewise appreciate the long months of hard work which he devoted to the consideration of this bill. I do not believe there is any Member of the Congress who would even intimate that he did not think the Senator from Tennessee and his committee had done a good job.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ECTON. I want my very good friend to understand that what I am going to say is absolutely no reflection on him, on the members of his committee, or on any member of the conference committee, but I still do not like the conference report. I appreciate the fact that there are many thousands of words printed with reference to the appropriation bill. I also appreciate the fact that the Senator from Tennessee and his committee labored day and night listening to everyone, on both sides, with reference to the intended appropriations. I want to compliment them on their judgment and their recommendations. They made some splendid recommendations to the Senate, and the Senate supported them by a substantial majority on most of their recommendations. But what concerns some of us is that after they had devoted to the bill many months of consistent hard work, they felt they had to abdicate in conference.

I am not blaming them. I realize what they were up against. I realize they could not do anything else. But, Mr. President, I think it behooves us all to recognize now what happened in the conference committee and in the conference report. If we open our eyes we can really see bureaucracy in action behind what has been done.

I am not talking about the cuts on various items. I am going to talk about something about which I think I know a little bit, for it pertains to my own State. Otherwise I would have nothing to say. I believe in the importance of each and every man who represents a State knowing the problems which confront his State a little better than they are known by anyone else.

I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee on the way he and his committee have always treated me in connection with the problems concerning my State when I have appeared before the committee and asked for consideration. I could not wish for any better attention or for any more wholehearted consideration than I have received.

Mr. President, I do not know whether we realize just what is happening in this country. We are going a long way toward a goal, and I think we shall be very sorry about it some time. Not only have the people been warned but time and time again over the years, and yet it is being said, "Oh, it cannot happen in America. This is America. It cannot happen here."

I believe the Senate of the United States recognizes what can happen and what might happen in this country. I

congratulate the Senator from Tennessee and his committee again for making specific recommendations in the report which was submitted to the Senate on this bill some time ago.

At this time, the Reclamation Bureau is busily engaged in building numerous dams and making plans for building many more in my State. We have all been in favor of reclamation. We all recognize that the arid West must have dams, electricity, and new acres of land brought under cultivation and under irrigation.

It has been recommended by the Senate time and time again that the Government should work in cooperation and in unison with private capital and private industry to help bring these things about. The Committee on Appropriations has made such recommendations. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to read from the committee report at page 145. It relates to a power company which operates in Montana, and tries to formulate a policy which Congress should follow.

The funds appropriated in the fiscal year 1950 were appropriated with the understanding that the funds would not be used by the Bureau if a wheeling agreement could be entered into with the Montana Power Co. whereby the REA's in the area involved could be supplied with power at the Reclamation Bureau rate. Such a wheeling agreement was not entered into and testimony at the Senate hearing this year was to the effect that the Reclamation Bureau felt it should build these facilities even though a wheeling agreement should be entered into with the Montana Power Co. On April 12, 1950, the Montana Public Service Commission approved a 5½ mills per kilowatt-hour rate for all REA's on the Montana Power Co. system, which rate is identical with the rate offered REA's by the Reclamation Bureau. Inasmuch as any savings to REA's in Montana resulting from the construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations by the Reclamation Bureau have been met by the new REA rate of the Montana Power Co. approved by the Montana Public Service Commission, the committee does not believe the Reclamation Bureau should continue its work on these facilities, which was only recently begun.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The chairman of the subcommittee which has the matter in charge is not present today. I refer to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He is in Arizona. I am sorry he is not present, because probably he could give the Senate the reason why the Senate conferees yielded on this amendment. However, I have the idea—and the Senator can correct me if I am wrong—that it involved a fight between the power companies in Montana and the REA, and the House would not accept the amendment under the circumstances after hearing all the proof.

Mr. ECTON. I believe the Senator has been misinformed in that respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am asking the Senator for information.

Mr. ECTON. I do not think it is a controversy between the power companies and the REA. The difficulty lies with the Reclamation Bureau in Washington, which wants to monopolize all

the power in Montana, and put our own companies out of business. That is where the trouble lies. Nine REA's signed contracts with the Montana Power Co. after the first of the year under which the REA's were to get a rate equal to the Bureau's rate. All they had to do was to have their contracts O. K.'d in Washington. What happened? The contracts have not been O. K.'d yet.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not correct to say that the nine REA's had to sign the contracts?

Mr. ECTON. They did.

Mr. LANGER. But they did not sign it until after the construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line had commenced.

Mr. ECTON. They were not in on the Havre-Shelby transmission line.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the line which the Senator is discussing was supposed to have been completed on the first day of September?

Mr. ECTON. It will be completed.

Mr. LANGER. It will be?

Mr. ECTON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, the entire matter was gone into very carefully, and it would have meant the loss of over a million dollars if the line had not been completed.

Mr. ECTON. It would mean a loss of \$3,000,000 to the Federal Government.

Mr. LANGER. But it would have meant the loss of over a million dollars to the Bureau of Reclamation, because the work would have to be abandoned.

Mr. ECTON. I realize nothing can be done about it now. What I am trying to have the Senate understand is that after the Montana Power Co. reduced its rate to the level of the Bureau rate, and the Senate committee had recommended that construction of the line be not continued, the Bureau went ahead and worked practically day and night to get the line as nearly completed as possible. I admit they have gone so far that no one can buy them out. The Government is in the power business in Montana at the expense of the taxpayers. The Bureau would never have needed to build that line in the first place if they had let the Montana Power Co. take it over and operate it.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not correct to say that unless the Bureau of Reclamation had built it the farmers in that area would not have obtained the cheap rate.

Mr. ECTON. No; that is not correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ECTON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. What were the farmers charged before the Bureau of Reclamation put in the line?

Mr. ECTON. The Bureau of Reclamation operating through the REA's told them they would never get electricity unless the Government built the line. That is what they said.

Mr. LANGER. That is true, is it not?

Mr. ECTON. When the Bureau of Reclamation was first created it was designed to bring land under irrigation.

They have forgotten all about irrigation. The main thing they are interested in is corraling all the power in the country. I venture to say, Mr. President, that one investigation that will have to be made within the near future is an investigation of the policy and determination of the Bureau of Reclamation to get into the power business.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator knows, does he not, that literally thousands of farmers in Montana and North Dakota would not have REA current on their farmers if it were not for the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. ECTON. The Bureau of Reclamation had nothing to do with setting up the REA. We were all in favor of rural electrification long before the Bureau of Reclamation ever thought about it. They had nothing to do with it. We had REA in Montana before the Bureau of Reclamation ever started to get in there.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ECTON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator knows, does he not, that the Bureau of Reclamation has built lines in North Dakota.

Mr. ECTON. I do not know anything about North Dakota. I will leave the interests of that State to be taken care of by the Senator from North Dakota. I would appreciate it if sometimes someone else thought that I knew something about my own State. When the Bureau of Reclamation was created, it was established on a bipartisan basis. It was not ever designed as a political medium. I venture to say that the Bureau has resorted to the direst kind of questionable politics during the past few years, and it will continue to do so. It condemns the private power companies on the ground they have a monopoly. That is what the Bureau want themselves. They want a Government monopoly. To my way of thinking, it is 10 times worse to have a Government monopoly than a private monopoly, which is financed by individual stockholders. I do not own any stock in any private power company. If I did, I could at least sell the stock and get something out of it. I would like to know how much the Federal taxpayers can get out of the stock if they own Federal power lines all over the United States.

Mr. President, I wish to make it plain that I never opposed Federal power lines where they were necessary. What I am disgusted with, and what I condemn Congress for, and what I condemn the bureaucracy for furthering, is the building of power lines at taxpayers' expense, parallel to power lines which have already been built by private enterprise.

We hear many people condemning capitalism in this country. When they talk about it, they are talking about the old feudal capitalistic system of Europe. Our economy is based on a people's capitalism. It is from the people that the money comes to form the corporations to manufacture the articles which we use—automobiles, refrigerators, radios, and the like. The people individually invest in the companies. It is people's capitalism.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I know it is true in Montana, because the same company operates there that operates in North Dakota, but is it not true that before the REA's came in, a utility company line would go by a farmer's house, even though it was only four or five poles away, and the company would charge from a thousand to fifteen hundred dollars to hook the farm up to the company line? That is why the REA came into existence.

Mr. ECTON. I do not know about that, but I do know what happened in my own experience. I was in an REA one time trying to get electricity to my ranch, and we were to obligate ourselves to pay in the neighborhood of \$10 every month for 20 years. I never figured it out. We had to guarantee that we would put up that much to the REA in order to get them to hook up.

We fooled around 2 or 3 years and we could not complete the project. Then the Montana Power Co. in that neighborhood offered to permit us to hook up to their line. They built the first 1,000 feet free, and if we were more than 1,000 away from their line, they built the line, and we paid them 15 cents a foot for building it. We did not have to look after the wire, or poles, or insulators, or transformers, or anything of that kind. They gave every farmer the first 1,000 feet, and then charged 15 cents a foot thereafter. We had the same rate after that as if we had lived in town. If one had a pumping station or shop equipment, he got a reduced rate, just as the industrialist in town gets a little reduction on the quantity he uses. So do not say they did this and did that. I know what happened in my own actual experience.

Mr. President, probably some private companies did have bad relationships with public officials; I do not know anything about that. I am not here defending anyone. I am merely telling what could have been done and what the Senate was willing to do and recommended being done. But the conferees on the part of the House had the advantage. There are more of them, they are backed up by the bureaucracy down town and all they have to do is to sit tight. The conferees on the part of the Senate do not have a chance. They have to accept what is offered.

Does anyone think the men on the conference committee over there would do anything about parallel lines in Montana? They did not ask me about conditions. I doubt if they asked the other Senator from Montana.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is one time we did not have to do what the Senator has indicated we did.

Mr. ECTON. I have the information here. I can almost prove it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I ask the Senator to prove it. The Senator made a

statement a while ago that the bureaucrats in Washington—

Mr. ECTON. I said it was bureaucracy in action.

Mr. McKELLAR. That it was a bureaucracy matter. I wish to say that not a single member from a Government bureau called on me at any time.

Mr. ECTON. Certainly not; they would know better than that.

Mr. McKELLAR. No lobbyists called on me, either.

Mr. ECTON. They did not have to. They get the job done. The Senator has been around here for a good many more years than I hope to be—

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator does not mean what he said, surely. He does not mean that I am controlled by anybody, surely. I resent that statement.

Mr. ECTON. I beg the Senator's pardon; I am not accusing the Senator of anything.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, the Senator is. I desire to say it is absolutely without the slightest foundation in fact that anyone controls me. I have been controlling myself a long time, and I still do it, and I am very active about it. I do not talk to a lobbyist that I know of, and I think they all know me and that I do not talk to them at all. I do not talk to lobbyists in the Government or lobbyists out of the Government. I think they all know it. The Senator has not been here long enough, or he would not have made such a statement about me.

Mr. ECTON. I am not accusing the Senator of anything. I said that the Senate conferees did not have a chance.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is wholly incorrect. The Senate conferees got more out of this appropriation bill from the conferees of the House than they have ever received in any conference since I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and that has been a long time.

Mr. ECTON. That may be, but at the same time they restored all the items for parallel public power lines, and that is what I am objecting to, after the Senate recommended that they be left out. The testimony was brought out.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was not on the subcommittee, therefore, I do not know what the facts are. I am taking the facts as the Senator has stated them. I believe the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was chairman of the subcommittee having this matter in charge, and he is not now present, but I had the very distinct impression, as a member of the committee, that there was a fight between the private power companies and the rural electrification people.

Mr. ECTON. Oh, sure, that is the old gag.

Mr. McKELLAR. It may be an old gag, but it is a well-known gag, I tell the Senator. I do not believe there are many here who do not know the difference between the power companies and the Rural Electrification Administration. The latter has done wonders in my State, and I hope it has done wonders in the Senator's State. I like to see the whole country improved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana can yield only for a question.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I want the Senator from Tennessee to understand that I have not intended to impugn his motives in any wise.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is very kind of the Senator, and I accept what he says in the spirit in which he says it.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, in order to show that this is not merely a question of the REA's, raised under amendment 273, the conference committee provided an appropriation of \$295,828,000, instead of \$297,467,000 as proposed by the House, and \$294,713,000 as proposed by the Senate. That is for construction of the Brighton-Brush transmission line substations, Colorado-Big Thompson project.

But with the following exceptions to such ratification:

(a) In addition to \$343,000 allowed by the Senate for the Fort Peck project, Montana, \$750,000 is also allowed to complete construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations. This is in lieu of the \$1,400,000 allowed by the House and of the entire disallowance of funds for this line as proposed by the Senate.

In other words, money was provided so as to insure that the Havre-Shelby line would be completed after the Montana Power Co. on April 12 reduced their rates to equal the Bureau rates. On top of that, the Montana Power Co. offered to purchase from the Government at cost all the materials which had been delivered on the project at that time. After they built that line as fast as they could, the Montana Power Co. made a cash offer in addition to a stretch of line between two places in Montana that did not have a line. The company offered to purchase that, and hook it up to their own line in order to supply the farmers and the people in that section of the State at the same rate as that charged by the Bureau. The Senate recommended that that be done.

I agree with the Senator from Tennessee that now it is too late to take corrective action. I agree with the recommendations of the conference committee in that respect for the line has been completed at public expense, at the taxpayers' expense, although the Montana Power Co. has a line there, and another line was not needed. So there is nothing to do but to proceed with the line and operate it at the taxpayers' expense. That is what happened.

Let us now consider item (b) of amendment No. 273. This is the thing that makes one's hair stand on end. This is what prompted me to say what I have said. The Bureau of Reclamation is building what they call the Canyon Ferry Dam in Montana. I think I know what I am talking about when I speak of that project, because it is only about 80 miles from where I live. What did the conference committee do? They put back in the bill \$365,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to build a line from Canyon Ferry Dam to Great Falls. The Bureau of Reclamation knows that the

Montana Power Co. has two 100,000-volt lines into Great Falls from East Helena. It is only 17 miles from East Helena to the Canyon Ferry Dam, and the Montana Power Co. offered to build a line to take the power off the Canyon Ferry Dam when the dam is completed. Then the conferees put back \$365,000 for the Government to build a parallel line from Canyon Ferry into Great Falls, when there are already two 100,000-volt lines running between the two points. Money has been provided in the bill to build a 115,000-volt line. That line will serve no REA's in that territory.

The contention is made that it is REA versus Montana Power Co. No, Mr. President; it is not. The farmers of that area are told that the Montana Power Co. is out to get them. That argument is made for political reasons. The line from Canyon Ferry to Great Falls will serve no REA. It will be a duplicate transmission line. That is all it will be, pure and simple.

Mr. President, I realize it is useless for me to make any comments on this subject now. I realize it is useless for me to oppose the conference report because of this item. The damage has already been done. We thought we might be able to have inserted a proviso that if the power company did not permit the use of their lines into Great Falls, that is, enter into an agreement or complete negotiations to that effect with the Bureau within a reasonable time, then the Bureau could proceed and build these lines. But no, Mr. President, there is nothing in the bill like that; \$365,000 was put back in the bill with which to proceed and duplicate power lines at the taxpayers' expense.

The people of my State are becoming tired of such things, Mr. President. We have a public service commission which regulates the power companies within my State. The three members of the commission are elected directly by the people. Then we find some board or bureau in Washington, in the name of reclamation, going into Montana and putting up parallel power lines. When we come down to the real nub of the matter, we cannot blame the Bureau of Reclamation. The fault lies with Congress. It is our fault because we give the Bureau the money. Those in the Bureau would not amount to a hill of beans if they did not have the Federal Treasury behind them. You and I, Mr. President, could be big shots, too, if we had the Federal Treasury to back us in all our plans. We could then be statesmen, as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] said earlier today. We could all formulate plans if we could dig into the Treasury and back up our plans with the Treasury's dollars.

Mr. President, I say the time has come when a halt must be called on the actions of the Bureau of Reclamation. As I said before, they are no longer interested in irrigation. They are interested in creating power and controlling it. There was a man some years ago in the Bureau whose name was Raushenbush, or something like that. I remem-

ber he made the statement that one man within the Bureau with his plans is worth a hundred outside. Sometimes I believe there is not only one man with a plan in the Bureau, but that there are many such men, and that it will take thousands on the outside, yes it will take more than that, it will take the Congress of the United States to put a stop to their doings.

I am not against the Government building transmission lines where it is necessary, but I am against the Bureau of Reclamation building power lines at taxpayers expense, duplicating and paralleling already existing facilities. I am mighty sorry that the conferees saw fit to restore to the bill the \$365,000 item with which to build the line from Canyon Ferry to Great Falls when it is not at all needed.

As I said before, it is useless to say anything now about the matter. It was railroaded through the conference committee. I cannot hold up the plan, and I suppose the Senate cannot either, because the conference report has already been adopted by the House. It was adopted there under such rules that no Representative dared speak on the subject except the chairman of the subcommittee, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield, provided I do not lose my right to the floor. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Montana without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to support the conference report. I regret very much that my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. ECTON] finds it necessary to make a serious attack upon the conference report. I think he is making a great error when he says that the people of Montana are tired of the program which has been carried on in respect to these transmission lines in our State.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I cannot yield, for I have been yielded to by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. ECTON. When the Senator says the people are not tired of the program which has been carried on—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor, and can yield only for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Montana may make a brief reply, without causing me to lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRIDGES. For how many minutes will the Senator from Montana speak?

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to speak for 5 or 6 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us provide 6 minutes for the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the senior Senator from Montana is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not rise to make any criticism of my colleague. He has a perfect right to take the stand he has taken. I know his position very well. Since he has been a Member of the Senate, he and I have cooperated very nicely, and I do not criticize him for the stand he now takes. He has a perfect right to attack the program which has been carried out in Montana, but I think he makes a great mistake when he does so.

Heretofore the farmers of Montana have been compelled to pay high rates for electric power. Transmission lines did not reach some parts of Montana, and as a result it was necessary for the REA to undertake a program of making power available to the farmers. As a result of the building of the Hungry Horse Dam, it has also been necessary to build transmission lines. A huge transmission line carrying electric power from that dam to Anaconda, to serve the area there, has been built. It has also been necessary to build transmission lines in the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls area.

With reference to the Havre-Shelby transmission line, let me say that matter has been a subject of controversy here for a number of years. Last year we had a long debate in regard to that project, and after a full discussion the Senate finally voted in favor of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and provided appropriations for its construction.

Later on the Montana Power Co. sought to have construction of that line discontinued; but the line was in the course of construction, and as authorized it was completed. It already had been approved by the Congress. So it seems to me it is very unwise now for Senators to talk about discontinuing a line which has been wholly completed and will be of great benefit to the people of Montana.

As a result of this power development in Montana, our State now, for the first time in 40 years, is beginning to develop industries and, as a result, new settlers are beginning to come into the State. As a result of the reclamation program and the power-development program we have instituted, new industries are coming into Montana and the population is increasing, whereas theretofore the population had been decreasing.

So I think it is a great mistake for anyone now to attack a program so beneficial to Montana, especially after there was complete debate on it in 1949, and inasmuch as the program and the appropriations for its construction have been settled so far as the conference report is concerned. I submit that it is a very valuable program for the State of Montana and will be of tremendous benefit to all our people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of directing my remarks to the portion of the conference report pertaining to the elimination of

the International Children's Emergency Fund, under the United Nations.

Before I refer directly to that portion of the conference report, let me say that I appreciated and enjoyed very much and, I am sure, benefited from the remarks of the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Many comments have been made today regarding the conference report. I suppose several of us are a little unhappy about the report. Nevertheless, all of us realize the great responsibility involved in connection with the preparation of an appropriation bill.

I, for one, as a newcomer in the Senate, wish to say that I did not find the over-all, one-package appropriation bill very desirable as it has operated to date. I believe it was much easier for us to know what is going on and to know the facts behind each appropriation request and recommendation when the appropriations were handled individually. With only one, large appropriation bill and one over-all report on it, the detailed factual material we needed was not available. To be sure, the members of the Appropriations Committee are fully informed; and, as the Senator from Tennessee has said, they act on the basis of the facts and the testimony, not on the basis of guesses and percentages. Nevertheless, those of us who are not on the Appropriations Committee, but who have a vote—a vote which is just as important as that of the committee members—must form our judgments on the basis of the report the committee makes. I have found that on the basis of the over-all, one-package appropriation bill, the one-package committee report was not as documented or detailed as it could have been under the procedure of handling the appropriations under a series of bills, as has been done in former years.

I shall not speak in regard to how best to make the proposed cuts, except I wish to say it should be clearly understood that substantial cuts were made in the appropriation items. It is always difficult to know whether there should be percentage-wise cuts or cuts straight across the board, or whether certain exclusions should be provided for when cuts are made in the appropriations.

Be that as it may, the committee has reached its decision. The committee has decided to make a cut of approximately half a billion dollars in the appropriations—in fact, almost the same cut as would have been provided by the Byrd-Bridges amendment. Of course the exact method of making the cut is a matter of judgment which I shall not discuss now.

Neither shall I debate the merits of the Franco loan or of the loan to Yugoslavia. I listened with keen interest to the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who made a very persuasive argument. I feel that any loan which is made should meet uniform conditions. However, once the decision is made, we have no choice but to follow it. After all, we operate on the principle of majority rule.

A decision has been made in reference to the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund. Certainly I am not going to balk at adoption of the conference report and try to prevent its approval, as one Member of the Senate, just because I do not care for this particular decision. However, I feel that it is important to have the record clear in regard to what happened in the conference committee to the appropriation for the children's fund. I understand that a deficiency appropriation bill is being prepared. Therefore, I make these remarks now for the benefit of the RECORD and for the benefit of the committee. The points I shall make in this connection have been fairly well substantiated, I think, by the evidence produced before the committee.

I was literally shocked and amazed when I read in the newspapers that the provision in the appropriation bill for the International Children's Fund had been eliminated from the conference report. The appropriation for that purpose was \$12,500,000, and it had been voted by the Senate after considerable debate. I cannot understand how the Senate conferees could recede from supporting that appropriation, when it had been strongly supported by the Senate.

Let me remind the Senate what happened in regard to that item.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Does the Senator realize that, as I have been told, the House conferees were under the impression that \$25,000,000 was left over from last year's appropriation and would be available this year? However, that appropriation expired; and our whole point in providing \$12,500,000 in this measure was because the previous appropriation had expired and had not been extended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is my judgment that the conferees were laboring under a misapprehension in regard to the facts.

I am entirely in accord with the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, and I think this point should be made for the RECORD, because the Children's Fund is one of the finest enterprises which has been underway since the war; but now it must go by the board, because no appropriation will be made for it, so far as this measure is concerned.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much for bringing up this question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his remarks, for he has been in the forefront of the fight to obtain this appropriation. I recall very well the valiant effort he made a few months ago in its behalf, and I thank him for the observation he has made and for the information he has given the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—
Mr. HUMPHREY. I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to say that there was such a statement made before the committee, as the Senator

from New Jersey says. For myself, I am very much in favor of the fund designed to aid children. I think the Government of the United States should participate, and later on, we shall have a bill coming up at this session of the Congress, at which time it might be well to submit the matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for his last words, because it is our hope that we may come before his committee to plead again the cause of the children's fund.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee will be glad to have the Senator do that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The distinguished chairman has always been most courteous and most generous with his time, and I know he will give us a friendly hearing.

I desire now to go over the record, so that we have it clear in the RECORD as to what happened. Twenty Senators, from both sides of the aisle, including the very distinguished leaders of the minority and of the majority, sponsored the original authorization for \$25,000,000. On the floor of the Senate this authorization was confirmed without a dissenting vote in connection with the Foreign Assistance Act of 1951. Then, thirdly, the conferees under the authorization bill cut the authorization from \$25,000,000 to \$15,000,000, and gave the President wide discretion in the use of the money.

Fourth. When the conference report was returned to the Senate floor it was severely criticized for the changes made by the conference committee.

Fifth. The Appropriations Committee tightened the legislation, but at the same time made another cut to \$12,500,000, which is 50 percent of the original authorization. This appropriation was again supported, and I remind the Senate that it was supported without a dissenting vote, on the floor of the Senate. Then, later, on my request for a ye-and-nay vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to exclude the Children's Fund from the 10 percent, this body voted 44 to 41 against the 10-percent reduction. Right down the line there is a record of support in the Senate of the United States for the Children's Fund that is without equal. What is the logic then in exempting this organization from the 10-percent reduction, and then ultimately eliminating it entirely?

There has been much criticism of the United Nations on the floor of the Senate, and I am sure that most of that criticism has resulted generally from the idea that the United Nations is purely a public forum in which the delegates talk about international problems but never make an attempt to do anything about them. I do not concur in that statement, but there are some people who feel that way. But the United Nations Children's Fund program is a No. 1 demonstration that the United Nations can and has acted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be necessary to have order on the floor of the Senate. Let the Chair observe

that the speakers would be more limited in their remarks if they were getting closer attention. I think we can all save time by giving the speakers undivided attention, thereby letting this bill move along.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this speaker has not very much more to say. But he is talking about a subject which is important in terms of world peace and world understanding. This program is a demonstration that the United Nations can and has acted to save millions of children from malnutrition and disease. At the same time it is establishing permanent services for child health and welfare. I still think that the value of this program must be measured not only in the terms of direct assistance to millions of children in 54 countries throughout the world but also in terms of the measure of cooperation which it has stimulated. I point out that this program operates in 54 nations of the world. First of all, there are 43 governments which have made voluntary contributions in the sum total of \$30,000,000. In addition, the people of 45 countries have contributed another \$10,000,000. In turn the recipient governments where the Children's Fund is used have provided more than another \$100,000,000 in local supplies and services. The administrative costs of this fund have been from 2 to 4 percent—as low as 2 percent and 4 percent.

Mr. President, I point out that every newspaper in America, with very few exceptions, has supported this fund, and that many prominent citizens have supported it. I have a list here of people from public life, from agriculture, from labor, and others, starting, first of all, with former President Hoover, who, in April of this year wrote a letter to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] supporting this program. There are also endorsing letters from William Green, president, AFL; Philip Murray, president, CIO; John Lynn, legislative director, American Farm Bureau; Wallace Campbell, the Cooperative League; Mr. Sanders, the National Grange; and Russell Smith, National Farmers Union.

There were also endorsing letters from all the church organizations. How in the name of common sense, with all that support, with the House and with the Senate of the United States again and again reiterating support of this fund, it could have been dropped in conference is more than I can understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say in answer to the Senator's question—and he put it in the form of a question—that I was a member of the conference committee. I voted for the international children's fund in the subcommittee and also in the full committee. I tried to retain it in the bill. The only reason the Senate conferees allowed it to be dropped was that they were convinced that it would be impossible to get a conference report without doing so. The

conferees on the part of the House were adamant in their opposition to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I see.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If there is any method by which an appropriation for the children's fund can be provided, as the Senator wishes, that is another matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very grateful for the action and statement of the Senator from Massachusetts. I also understand that our State Department was not in support of the children's fund.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The State Department was not enthusiastically in favor of the International Children's Fund, either before the subcommittee or the full committee. In spite of that, the Senate voted a substantial amount for it, which it yielded in conference, when it became perfectly clear, in the opinion of one conferee—myself—that it would be impossible to obtain an agreement to have the item included.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Being a member of the conference, I want to assure the Senator from Minnesota that the Senator from Michigan was in favor of the Children's Fund. It had passed the Senate, and he felt that it had a place in our scheme of things. But I am also satisfied, as was the Senator from Massachusetts, that it was impossible to get agreement with the House on a report on the omnibus appropriation bill with the Children's Fund in it, and it was therefore removed, over the protests of conferees on the part of the Senate. In the final compromise it had to be omitted in order to get a bill. It was not because of the merits or the lack of them, so far as the Senate was concerned at all. As the Senator has indicated, the State Department was not enthusiastic about it, but that was not a reason for omitting it from the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very grateful for that information.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I may say that I desire to submit a report from the Committee on Foreign Relations. It will only take a moment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall conclude in a moment.

Mr. GREEN. I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I am not through, but when I have concluded, I shall be more than happy to yield the floor to my friend from Rhode Island.

All I want to say is this: We are appropriating billions and billions of dollars for the war—and that is absolutely essential. Here is one program which

is directed toward the lives of children who have not made up their minds what kind of politics they favor, whether they are going to be Communists or non-Communists, whether they are going to be social democrats or Christian democrats, who have not made up their minds as to what their party politics may be. To think that the Congress of the United States would miss this opportunity for psychological advantage, for what I call effective political advantage, is something that I simply cannot quite understand. I shall go before the Appropriations Committee, and I understand my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], is going to appear before that committee, and, if the House of Representatives is adamant in its resistance, then we shall have to break down the resistance, because this is an important program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that the State Department must bear a large share of responsibility for the defeat of this program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was referring to that but a moment ago. I want to say now that if the State Department is opposed to this program, the State Department is wrong, it is lacking in vision, and it is about time that some of us who have supported the State Department told the State Department to get in line, where it belongs, which is on the side of the people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is my judgment that the State Department has been almost a malignant enemy of the children's fund, that it is not interested in saving the lives of children, that it is primarily interested in conferences, where there is talk, talk, talk, with very little action. In my judgment, the State Department should be told to keep out of appropriation matters and to let the Congress of the United States legislate. I say that as one who has supported most of the proposals of the State Department.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I concur in the statement of my friend from Illinois and tell him, very frankly, that I think his position is sound. The Senator from Minnesota is very much aware of the validity of the comment of the Senator from Illinois. I had taken upon myself, as one Member, to express a very sharp rebuke to members of the State Department for opposing this appropriation measure. They always seem to get themselves, on this issue, on the wrong side. Why, in the name of common sense, they cannot understand that this is an operating agency of the United Nations where we learn to work together before we get together politically, I do not know.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota mean to emphasize the word

"this" when he says the State Department is on the wrong side of this issue?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota put the proper emphasis on the proper word at the right time. We will take up the other issues one by one. This is the children's fund.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, when the appropriation bill was under consideration in the Senate, and before final passage on August 4, I made some remarks about it. These remarks appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 12012. I do not need to repeat at this time what I then said. What I said about the bill I believe to be equally true of the conference report. It is my belief that the report is unrealistic in that it does not take into consideration the demands upon the Government and upon the American people for national defense at this time. It represents the thinking of the Appropriations Committee prior to the time the bill was reported, and in that sense it is not in keeping with the present situation. This is unfortunate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the conference report on the omnibus appropriation bill.

There being no objection, Mr. O'CONOR's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

In acting today upon the conference report on the omnibus appropriations bill, the Congress of the United States has opened the way for deserved consideration to the already overburdened taxpayers of the country. With approval of the conference report it remains for the President to take decisive action to affect substantial reductions in the budget.

It is a tribute to the earnestness and patriotism of the American people that they have expressed such a general willingness to supply whatever funds are needed to see us through the emergency caused by the conflict in Korea. This state of mind entails a great responsibility on the part of the Congress and of the Executive Department of the Government. There is an imperative need for elimination of nondefense items for the saving of critical material and manpower in this time of crisis.

There is ample authority under the bill for the President to cut nondefense spending to the limit. In fact there is unmistakable evidence of the determination of the people, speaking through their elected legislative representatives that numerous projects be eliminated or reduced.

I feel it is the will of the Congress and of the people that such items should be cut to the fullest extent possible, without impairment of any essential functions of Government, and I sincerely trust that the sum of \$550,000,000, recommended in the bill be realized by deferment of the nondefense projects. This action by the Executive will go far to convince the citizenry of the readiness of Government to curtail in times of grave emergency.

In this connection I ask that an editorial from this morning's Baltimore Sun entitled

"Nondefense Spending Is the Place To Save" be inserted in the RECORD as an appendix to my remarks, as follows:

"NONDEFENSE SPENDING IS THE PLACE TO SAVE"

"Now that the House has passed the \$16,771,384,479 emergency defense bill we begin to realize what the operation in Korea and other defense measures are going to cost us. This is just a beginning. We are warned that the Defense Department is preparing an additional request for approximately \$10,000,000,000.

"In his report from Washington on the action of the House, Mr. William Knighton, Jr., calls attention to the unpleasant prospect that the total budget for the fiscal year ending next June 30 will be around \$70,000,000,000. In short, \$20,000,000,000 to \$25,000,000,000 are being added to military outlay.

"It should be obvious that with this vast emergency expenditure for defense involving all-out war in Korea, partial mobilization and arms for our allies, life in this country cannot go on without change. Unless we are to invite financial disaster drastic efforts must be made to meet a part of these excessive expenditures as they occur.

"Without question there must be an increase in taxes. The Senate is debating a bill that would raise personal income taxes by \$2,700,000,000 and corporation taxes by \$1,500,000,000 for a total of \$4,200,000,000. But that will go a small way to balance the emergency defense costs.

"Another means of bringing expenditures more into line with income is to cut down on nondefense expenditures. Attention already has been called here to the claim of Senator BYRD, of Virginia, that nondefense spending can be cut as much as \$10,000,000,000. Yet, he says, that would still leave the administration as much to spend for its domestic schemes as it had in 1948.

"It is not necessary to check Senator BYRD's estimate to the exact dollar to know that there are many public works projects and other programs for the outlay of Federal funds that are not urgent. They have nothing to do with national defense. They could easily wait until more propitious times. But as yet, little more than a start has been made in this direction. Our best efforts at defense will be useless if they result in national bankruptcy. Our enemies know that all too well. The safeguard is to cut down on non-defense spending."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I shall not, so far as I am personally concerned, ask a record vote on the adoption of the conference report. I think it is quite evident from the speeches of Senators today that there is dissatisfaction with certain sections of the report. I think there is an over-all need of passing the bill; as has been stated, the major portion of the bill is satisfactory. On most points the conference committee did a good job; but I think what I said earlier, and what other Senators have said, should show that there is dissatisfaction with some parts of the report which are very fundamental. I think the necessity for the adoption of the report and the fact that such an excellent job was done on most sections of it warrants the position I take in not asking for a record vote.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as a member of the conference on the omnibus appropriation bill, I desire to make a few remarks.

I am not satisfied with the report. I feel that \$550,000,000 is not a sufficient reduction in the nonessential expendi-

tures provided for by the bill. There are other items with which the Senator from Michigan is not at all pleased, but he had to come to the conclusion, after the sessions with the House conferees, that it was necessary to take the bill as it now stands. Otherwise, we would be unable to agree upon the report.

That does not mean, Mr. President, that we do not at times have to compromise on some figures. I hope the President of the United States, when he receives the bill, will revamp his thinking and that the Budget Director and his organization will revamp their thinking as to where they can cut certain items and reduce the cost of Government. I have come to the conclusion that it is very difficult, if not impossible, for committees to take the fat out of the cost of Government. Every department which appears before the committee lays stress upon the fact that every item is essential; every project must be given its full amount in order that the agency requesting the appropriation may function at all. That is not a fact, but we are unable to get from the witnesses who come before the committee any idea as to where we can cut the budget.

Last year the Senator from Michigan was of the opinion that there should be a cut very similar to the one recommended this year, and that the President of the United States should do the cutting, because he would be able to eliminate the excess and get down to rock bottom. The Senate thought otherwise. This year there may be a reason why the President will decide actually to take \$550,000,000 out of the various funds. Let me say, for one, that if he should take much more out, \$550,000,000 should not be a limitation; it should be only a suggestion. He will find many places in which he can eliminate more than that amount. He saw last year places in the defense budget amounting to more than a billion dollars, which could be eliminated, and he said he would not expend the amount. Therefore, Mr. President, I hope he will find in the civilian end of the budget this year that there are items as to which he can save money, that it is unnecessary to spend the full amount of money which we have appropriated and which we shall appropriate for national defense, and that he can save more than a billion dollars, even though we have limited the reduction he may make to \$550,000,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Was not the Byrd-Bridges amendment, on which the Senator from Michigan worked so hard over a number of months, the most practical method which could be found by the group who worked on it, without hurting any Government agency or any of the defense departments involved?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan feels that the Byrd-Bridges amendment, of which he was a cosponsor, together with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], was the ideal way of saving a part of the cost of government without in any way adversely affecting the De-

fense Department or any of the other essential departments of government; but in the conference committee we discovered that the House conferees argued about the method we had been using, which was, in effect, a scientific method, which had been taken up with the Office of the Comptroller General, with the Office of the Director of the Budget, and had been worked out so that it would not create any hardship. They had a small rider they wished to insert which would not compel the President to do the cutting, so that no one would be on the spot.

It is the old practice of passing the buck. We could have made the cut under a scientific method. That was the proper way of doing it. However, it could not be done that way, and therefore it was essential that we take the bill as we find it now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator from Michigan agree—and I am satisfied that I should also ask the same question of the Senator from Massachusetts, in view of the fact that he raised the question—that approving the conference report in no way convinces the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Massachusetts, or the Senator from Nebraska that the formula which was submitted is not the proper way to make the cuts in the appropriations. If the conference report is adopted without a record vote, it does not mean that the Senator from Michigan is repudiating in any way the formula that ought to be used in making cuts in appropriation bills. To the contrary, we are accepting the conference report because apparently there is no other way of getting the bill passed.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Nebraska is correct. It is not a repudiation. If I had the right to vote on a method of effecting cuts in the appropriation bill, I would vote to do it under the Bridges-Byrd amendment, because I think that is the proper way. However, in the Senate of the United States one does not always get a vote on the exact issue involved. Sometimes we get a vote, as we are getting one today, on what it is possible to get through the Senate. Therefore if we can save \$550,000,000, as I said before, as a suggestion to the President that Congress wants a cut in unnecessary expenditures, he should do the rest and make a real cut in expenditures.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in connection with the pending conference report, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION
ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D. C., August 28, 1950.

HON. TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: The news which greeted me upon my return to Washington that the Congress is considering a further

\$200,000,000 cut in the ECA appropriation came as a great shock. We requested from the Senate Appropriations Committee an appropriation of \$2,653,000,000. Since that request was made, prices of goods to be purchased under the program (largely in the United States of America) have increased by approximately \$300,000,000. That means, of course, that there must be a cutback in the goods supplied under the program to offset this increased cost. Then the Senate made a further cut of \$203,000,000, which, of course, involved another cutback. Now an additional cut of \$200,000,000 is proposed. I would be derelict in my duties as administrator of ECA if I did not state that this latest cut represents a serious threat to the effectiveness of our program.

It is also proposed that there be a reduction of ECA administrative funds by \$1,250,000. This comes at a time when the administrative task of ECA has become more difficult and complicated as a result of superimposing an intensive rearmament effort upon our program for economic recovery. We will, of course, continue to operate this program as economically as possible, but if we are effectively to supervise the expenditure of funds entrusted to us, it may be necessary to apply to Congress after the first of the year for additional administrative funds.

I stated that the cuts made in the ECA appropriation came as a shock to me. I was shocked because these cuts indicated that too many people have not yet recognized that to safeguard the security of the United States we must not only step up our military program, but also our programs in the economic, political and informational fields in those areas of the world vital to our security, which certainly include the areas in which ECA now operates. In those areas, we must, in my opinion, help (1) to build up the military strength so that aggression can successfully be resisted, (2) to build up economic strength so the people will have a real incentive to resist communism, and (3) to promote an understanding through intensive informational activities of the advantages to them of democracy and of the perils of communism.

In closing, I would like to extend my thanks to you as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the other members of your committee, and all those Senators who have fought so stalwartly for the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL G. HOFFMAN, Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7786, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered

(Chapter II) 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 26, 28, 39, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51;

(Chapter III) 94, 107;

(Chapter V) 142, 148, 151;

(Chapter VI) 157, 166, 201, 223, 224, 232, 234;

(Chapter VII) 254, 275, 277, 278, 279, 285, 295, 300, 302, 306;

(Chapter VIII) 342, 353;

(Chapter IX) 398;

(Chapter X) 417, 418, 451, 456;

(Chapter X-B) 474, 478, 480, 481, 482, 483, 485, 486, 488; to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In line 13 of the Senate amendment, strike out "\$832,000" and insert the following: "\$722,000, and the affairs of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, provided for in Senate Resolution 298, Eighty-first Congress, shall be liquidated not later than August 31, 1950."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "of which sum \$100,000 may be available for the purpose of preserving friendships with the peoples of western European countries by means of radio broadcasts, said programs to be created and produced under the supervision and control of the Department of State by experienced private international broadcasting organizations; and"

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$17,500."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 175, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert the following: "including \$30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 189, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$1,250,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 192, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$750,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 198, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$700,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 200, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$41,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 209, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$8,315,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 215, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allotted with the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any

purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 238, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the words "on or before August 1, 1950" in said amendment insert the following: "within 30 days after enactment of this act."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 284, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws;"

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 288, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert: "Provided, That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except \$7,200,000 under the head 'General administrative expenses' and \$1,193,205 (\$197,925 for reconnaissance, \$769,080 for basin surveys, and \$226,200 for general engineering and research) under the head 'General investigations.'"

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 289, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In the last line of the matter proposed by said amendment, before the period, insert: "Provided, That amounts equal to the value of all property transferred hereunder and used shall be charged, in the same manner as appropriations are charged, as part of the construction or appropriate other costs of the Columbia Basin project, such value to be determined by appraisal approved by the Administrator of General Services of the market value of such property current at the time of transfer hereunder less expenditures on such property by the Bureau of Reclamation prior to such transfer."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 319, and concur to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended by the act of June 16, 1950 (Public Law 555), including personal services and rents in the District of Columbia; travel expenses, including travel expenses outside continental United States without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; purchase (not to exceed three) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); expenses incident to the primary and secondary education of American children who are dependents of Government personnel paid from this appropriations and stationed overseas; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; and

payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; \$8,000,000: *Provided*, That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further*, That the Commission may enter into agreements with United States governmental agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this act."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 337 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$4,350,000".

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 338 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$1,324,000".

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 345 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$9,889,600 (and any part of the amounts of \$100,000 for valuations of pipelines, and \$3,831,920 for the work of the Bureau of Motor Carriers, contained in this paragraph, may be transferred as the Commission may determine for carrying out other functions of the Commission)."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 354 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "or, in any case involving charges of such collaboration or disloyalty which have not been adjudicated by any such court, where the Commission, after hearing and evidence, certifies that it is satisfied that the person so charged is guilty of such collaboration or disloyalty."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 361 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided, That not to exceed \$64,875,000 of the funds and contract authority made available for new ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, shall continue to be available until December 31, 1950: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used (1) to start any new ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year; or (2) to start any new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construction and the Director shall submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, as used herein, the term 'budget' includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 363 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for obligation, nor any obligation made, for the payment of an operating-differential subsidy for any number of ships in excess of the number of 263, unless a certificate has been received from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, that an operating-differential subsidy is required for a larger number of such ships in connection with national defense."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 373 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$15,024,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 388 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In line 13 of said amendment, and after the figure \$76,000, change the colon to a period and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 399 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In line 2 of said amendment strike out the words "not to exceed 23."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 467 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the language proposed by the said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "During the current fiscal year, appropriations, funds, and contract authorizations, available for military functions under the Department of Defense, shall not be subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1111 of this act."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 471 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in line 15 of said amendment insert "\$2,250,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 472 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in line 6 of said amendment insert "\$62,500,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 473 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$14,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 475 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$500,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 476 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Provided further, That after November 1, 1950, no funds herein appropriated shall be made available to any nation of which a dependent area falls in the opinion of the President to comply with any treaty to which the United States and such dependent area are parties."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 477 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to provide assistance to any

participating country which, in the opinion of the President, has failed, refused, or neglected to support the United Nations in resisting aggression."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 68, 72, 92, 175, 189, 192, 198, 200, 209, 215, 238, 284, 288, 289, 319, 337, 338, 345, 354, 361, 363, 373, 388, 399, 467, 471, 472, 473, 475, 476, and 477.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to be recognized on his motion?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think not. They are all inconsequential amendments. The one disagreement will be explained by the Senator from Nevada in a few moments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed by the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, it is proposed to insert the following:

Eight hundred and thirty-two thousand dollars, and the affairs of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, provided for in Senate Resolution 298, Eighty-first Congress, shall be liquidated not later than August 31, 1950.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment proposed by me to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands it is the remaining amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is on what is known as the watchdog committee. It will be explained by the Senator from Nevada, the chairman of the subcommittee. It is the only remaining amendment in the conference report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is an amendment adopted by the House with reference to the watchdog committee, which would eliminate the joint committee. The amendment which came over from the House reduced the amount of the appropriation by \$100,000. The Senate amendment would reinstate the \$100,000, to which we understand the House will agree. However, the Senate agrees that the watchdog committee as a joint committee will, under the language of the Senate amendment, go out of business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire where the money is to come from? Under the present arrangement, does it come out of the contingent fund?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is an appropriation which goes into the contingent fund of the Senate, the same as any other appropriation that goes to the contingent fund.

Mr. LUCAS. The joint committee would be eliminated by the adoption of the amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. It would go out of business on August 31, 1950, by the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LUCAS. We would have a watchdog committee composed of Senators only?

Mr. McCARRAN. Probably we would have a watchdog committee composed only of Senators.

Mr. LUCAS. How much is involved in the amendment? What is the total amount involved?

Mr. McCARRAN. One hundred and ten thousand dollars.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not quite clear what is happening. As a member of the watchdog committee, may I inquire what responsibility we are assuming?

Mr. McCARRAN. The language of the amendment adopted on the floor of the House would eliminate the joint committee entirely. As the Senator will recall, in July or August the House passed an appropriation bill declaring that the joint committee should wind up its affairs on June 31 of this year. In the meantime the Senate passed a resolution giving the joint committee \$130,000 to carry on its work. In order to get that money it had to go into the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Was that action taken by the watch dog committee when the Senator from New Jersey was absent? I do not recall any action authorizing that appropriation.

Mr. McCARRAN. It was taken by the Committee on Appropriations, providing \$130,000 to continue the work of the watchdog committee. It came entirely out of the contingent fund of the Senate. It did not come about by the joint action of the House and Senate. It came entirely out of the contingent fund of the Senate. The House amendment strikes out the language which would continue the joint Committee, strikes out \$110,000 from the appropriations which would go into the contingent fund of the Senate and declares that the affairs of the joint committee shall be terminated on August 31. That is the language of the House amendment. In the meeting today of the Committee on Appropriations the committee decided to accept the language of the House, thereby doing away with the joint committee, but restored the \$110,000 to the contingent fund of the Senate. The Senate Committee on Appropriations can do as it likes about watching its own appropriations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. May I understand what we are doing? Do I understand what is left of the watchdog committee is only the Senate part of it, and the committee will have \$130,000 to spend for its operations?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Is that still in abeyance?

Mr. McCARRAN. The joint committee goes out of business. Therefore the

entire committee goes out of business. It applies to both the Senate and the House parts of the committee. As I understand, it will go out of business by August 31, 1950. As chairman of that committee, I say I think we are in a position so that we can finish the business of the committee by August 31, and the balance we have on hand will go into the contingent fund of the Senate.

The House struck \$110,000 completely out of the appropriation for the contingent fund of the Senate. The House is now content that we restore the \$110,000 to the contingent fund of the Senate, but we agreed to the language of the House which abolishes the joint committee.

The House language is really an amendment to a legislative bill. We could have amended it, but we did not do so. We thought it best not to hold up the appropriation bill, but rather to agree to the House language, let the joint committee go out of business, and the Committee on Appropriations, if it sees fit, can set up its own committee, or do as it likes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement, in view of what the Senator from New Jersey has said about having a joint committee, which has taken no action whatever on this appropriation, yet the Committee on Appropriations assumed the jurisdiction to appropriate \$110,000 for a committee that is not in existence.

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon for interrupting—

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is in error. Let me again clear the atmosphere as best I can. By the language inserted by the House, the joint committee goes out of business. By the change which the Senate committee would suggest, we restore \$110,000 to the contingent fund of the Senate, that is all. We give nothing to the joint committee whatever. The joint committee goes out of business.

Mr. LUCAS. Who is going to handle the \$110,000 if the joint committee is out of business?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senate of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Another committee will have to be appointed if a watchdog committee is desired?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; if the Senate wants a watchdog committee, another committee will have to be appointed. It can be appointed by the Committee on Appropriations or by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think I understand the situation. I was under the impression in the beginning that \$110,000 had been appropriated for a committee that was not in existence; but the Senator from Nevada has explained that the \$110,000 goes into the contingent fund.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The Committee on Appropriations has agreed that that be done. Perhaps that is the best thing to do. However, the committee that has

been called the watchdog committee, according to what the Senator from New Jersey has said, has had nothing to say about this particular \$110,000 item.

I thought it was a mistake for the Congress to appropriate money for the joint committee out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and I so stated on the floor of the Senate when this matter was up a couple of months ago. It did not seem to me to be the way to do business. In other words, we were paying all the freight.

I am very glad we have gotten completely out from under the joint committee, and are now appropriating a certain amount of money to go into the contingent fund. Whether or not the committee will be established remains for the Senate to say in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 272, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of H. R. 7786, the general appropriation bill, 1951, is authorized and directed to correct chapter and section numbers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3659) to amend title IV of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the issuance of dealers' identification tags for use on trailers, to provide for the revocation and suspension of dealers' registration and identification tags, to change the fee for dealers' identification tags, to provide for the issuance of special use identification tags, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2887. An act to amend the Architects' Registration Act for the District of Columbia in order to safeguard life, health, and property, and to promote the public welfare;

H. R. 6804. An act for the relief of certain Italian aliens;

H. R. 7447. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to sound-recording materials for use in connection with moving-picture exhibits and news reels; and

H. R. 8726. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to exempt from duty sound recordings for news broadcasts.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 6343. An act relating to customs duties on articles coming into the United States from the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 6832. An act for the relief of Choko Nishida; and

ing particularly about what is described here as big-time gambling.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

[Mr. TACKETT addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(By unanimous consent the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.)

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JACKSON of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3357) to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, pursuant to House Resolution 807, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BARING. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualified. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BARING moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further study and investigation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARING) there were—yeas 10, noes 116.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 272. Concurrent resolution authorizing correction of chapter and section numbers in the enrollment of H. R. 7786.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] be excused as conferee on the bill H. R. 9176, entitled "An act to establish a system of priorities and allocations for

materials and facilities, authorize the requisitioning thereof, provide financial assistance for expansion of productive capacity and supply, strengthen controls over credit, regulate speculation on commodity exchanges, and by these measures facilitate the production of goods and services necessary for the national security, and for other purposes," and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] be appointed in his stead.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7786) entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 68, 72, 92, 175, 189, 192, 198, 200, 209, 215, 238, 284, 288, 289, 319, 337, 338, 345, 354, 361, 363, 373, 383, 399, 467, 471, 472, 473, 475, 476, and 477; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, with an amendment to the above-entitled bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and consider the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Amendment No. 35: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House amendment, insert the following: "\$832,000, and the affairs of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, provided for in Senate Resolution 298, Eighty-first Congress, shall be liquidated not later than August 31, 1950."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House concur in the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 35.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3546) to extend the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, to Puerto

Rico and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (b) of the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Whenever in this act the word 'State' or 'States' is used, it shall be understood to include Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

Sec. 2. Section 5 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts from time to time as the Congress may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

"(b) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State which (i), except in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, has an unemployment compensation law approved by the Secretary under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and is found to be in compliance with section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, and (ii) is found to be in compliance with the Act of June 6, 1933 (43 Stat. 113), as amended, such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its public employment offices."

Sec. 3. Sections 6 and 7 of the act are hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAKE ASHTABULA

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 163) to designate the reservoir above the Baldhill Dam in North Dakota as Lake Ashtabula.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the reservoir located above the Baldhill Dam in North Dakota shall hereafter be known as Lake Ashtabula, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir under and by the name of Lake Ashtabula.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNARD F. ELMERS

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4803) for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BYRNE of New York, DENTON, and KEATING.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, I was unavoidably absent. If present on roll call No. 255, I would have voted "nay." This is the roll call by which the bill H. R. 9526, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, was passed.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION SUPPRESSION OF GENERAL MACARTHUR'S REPORT ON DEFENSE OF FORMOSA

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the action of President Truman directing General Douglas MacArthur to suppress his communication to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, constituting his appraisal of the necessity to defend Formosa, is an unfortunate act.

It is to be taken by the American people as another flagrant example of the incredible bungling by the administration over the past 5 years, bungling which delivered Manchuria and most of China to the Communists and which culminated in the Korean conflict. It is simply another chapter in a long series of blunders whereby sound military advice was suppressed and political decisions, in keeping with the policy of appeasing the Soviet Union, were superimposed for political reasons. It is simply another exhibit of a bankrupt leadership which suppressed the Wedemeyer report for 2 years because it urged aid for the enemies of communism in China.

General MacArthur is not only the supreme commander in Japan for the allied forces, but he is the Commander in the Field for the United Nations, and in the latter capacity has already submitted two reports to the United Nations Security Council, which is presided over by Jacob Malik, the Soviet Union's delegate. Certainly, if the Soviet Union is entitled to MacArthur's views, through Jacob Malik, then the American people likewise have a right to them.

Although the White House has authority to suppress the utterances of the military, we in America still are fortunate enough to have a free press. Therefore, I am able to hold in my hand a copy of the suppressed MacArthur communication to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which has been printed in the United States News and World Report in its issue which will appear on the newsstands tomorrow and which was already off the press and in the mails and could not be recalled. Thus, the White House scheme to withhold General MacArthur's views has been thwarted by one of the cornerstones of American liberty, a free press.

Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of this document, I now ask unanimous consent to have General MacArthur's communication, as published in the United States News and World Report, appear in the RECORD at this point

as part of my remarks and the proceedings of the House.

I would call the attention of the House to one of the probable reasons for the suppression of this report. You will recall that last January 12 Secretary of State Acheson, in a speech to the National Press Club here in Washington, declared that our (and I quote) "defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus," (unquote) thus virtually inviting the Communists to go in and take Korea and Formosa, both of which were beyond Mr. Acheson's "perimeter."

General MacArthur, in his suppressed communication to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, lays down a much more realistic defense perimeter which embraces all free lands off-shore Asia in the Pacific—which, of course, includes Formosa. I would also like to call your attention to the General's words, in contrast to those of our political Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and I quote General MacArthur: "If we hold this line, we may have peace—lose it and war is inevitable."

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot conclude the rest of this statement, but I hold in my hand a copy of General MacArthur's statement which appears in the United States News and World Report of September 1, 1950, which undoubtedly will go to every part of the United States. If this publication is permitted to use it, certainly the rest of the people of the country should have it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in my remarks as part of my statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The statement is as follows:)

FORMOSA MUST BE DEFENDED—A DECLARATION BY GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, SUPREME COMMANDER IN JAPAN FOR THE ALLIED POWERS

To Clyde A. Lewis, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Chicago, Ill.:

Your inspiring message of the 17th has moved me deeply, and I trust that you will convey to all of my comrades in arms of the Veterans of Foreign Wars assembled on the occasion of our fifty-first annual national encampment my assurance that their confidence and support will give this command much added strength to meet the tests of battle which lie immediately ahead. Tell them that I am happy to report that their successors in arms now engaging the enemy along our battle lines in South Korea are exemplifying that same high standard of devotion, fortitude, and valor which characterized their own march to victory when they themselves engaged in combat in the field. From senior commanders down through all ranks, their tactical skill, their invincible determination, and their fighting qualities against a fanatical foe, well trained, expertly directed, and heavily armed, have upheld our country's finest traditions. Toward victory, however, difficult the road, they are giving an account of themselves which should make every American heart beat with pride and infinite satisfaction.

In view of misconceptions currently being voiced concerning the relationship of Formosa to our strategic potential in the Pacific, I believe it in the public interest to avail myself of this opportunity to state my views thereon to you, all of whom having fought

overseas understand broad strategic concepts.

To begin with, any appraisal of that strategic potential requires an appreciation of the changes wrought in the course of the past war. Prior thereto the western strategic frontier of the United States lay on the littoral line of the Americas with an exposed island salient extending out through Hawaii, Midway, and Guam to the Philippines. That salient was not an outpost of strength but an avenue of weakness along which the enemy could and did attack us. The Pacific was a potential area of advance for any predatory force intent upon striking at the bordering land areas.

All of this was changed by our Pacific victory. Our strategic frontier then shifted to embrace the entire Pacific Ocean, which has become a vast moat to protect us as long as we hold it. Indeed, it acts as a protective shield for all of the Americas and all free lands of the Pacific Ocean area. We control it to the shores of Asia by a chain of islands, extending in an arc from the Aleutians to the Marianas, held by us and our allies.

From this island chain we can dominate with airpower every Asiatic port from Vladivostok to Singapore and prevent any hostile movement into the Pacific. Any predatory attack from Asia must be an amphibious effort. No amphibious force can be successful without control of the sea lanes and the air over those lanes in its avenue of advance. With naval and air supremacy and modest ground elements to defend bases, any major attack from continental Asia toward us or our friends of the Pacific would be doomed to failure.

Under such conditions the Pacific no longer represents menacing avenues of approach for a prospective invader—it assumes instead the friendly aspect of a peaceful lake. Our line of defense is a natural one and can be maintained with a minimum of military effort and expense. It envisions no attack against anyone nor does it provide the bastions essential for offensive operations, but properly maintained would be an invincible defense against aggression. If we hold this line we may have peace—lose it and war is inevitable.

The geographic location of Formosa is such that in the hands of a power unfriendly to the United States, it constitutes an enemy salient in the very center of this defensive perimeter, 100 to 150 miles closer to the adjacent friendly segments—Okinawa and the Philippines—than any point in continental Asia.

At the present time there is on Formosa a concentration of operational air and naval bases which is potentially greater than any similar concentration on the Asiatic mainland between the Yellow Sea and the Strait of Malacca. Additional bases can be developed in a relatively short time by an aggressive exploitation of all World War II Japanese facilities.

An enemy force utilizing those installations currently available could increase by 100 percent the air effort which could be directed against Okinawa as compared to operations based on the mainland and at the same time could direct damaging air attacks with fighter-type aircraft against friendly installations in the Philippines, which are currently beyond the range of fighters based on the mainland. Our air supremacy at once would become doubtful.

As a result of its geographic location and base potential, utilization of Formosa by a military power hostile to the United States may either counterbalance or overshadow the strategic importance of the central and southern flank of the United States front-line position. Formosa in the hands of such a hostile power could be compared to an unsinkable aircraft carrier and submarine tender ideally located to accomplish offensive strategy and at the same time checkmate defensive or counteroffensive operations by

[PUBLIC LAW 759—81ST CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 896—2D SESSION]

[H. R. 7786]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the support of the Government, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, namely:

CHAPTER I—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For the general fund of the District of Columbia, \$9,800,000, and for the water fund, established by law (D. C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), \$1,000,000, both amounts to be advanced July 1, 1950.

CHAPTER II—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

SALARIES AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF SENATORS, MILEAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND OF SENATORS, AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

For compensation of Senators, \$1,200,000.

For mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, \$51,000.

For expense allowance of the Vice President, \$10,000.

For expense allowance of Senators, \$240,000.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation of officers, employees, clerks to Senators, and others, as authorized by law, including increased and additional compensation provided by the "Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945", as amended, and the "Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950", as follows:

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

For compensation of the Vice President of the United States, \$30,000.

For clerical assistance to the Vice President, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in multiples of \$5 per month, \$50,370.

CHAPLAIN

Chaplain of the Senate, \$2,646.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For office of the Secretary, \$355,230.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

For professional and clerical assistance to standing committees, \$1,441,040.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

For professional and clerical assistance to the Select Committee on Small Business, \$88,645, authorized by S. Res. 272, agreed to May 26, 1950, at rates of compensation to be fixed hereafter in accordance with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, with respect to standing committees.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$30,280.

For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Minority at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$30,280.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

For administrative and clerical assistants and messenger service for Senators, \$5,036,185.

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, including three in lieu of two assistant chief telephone operators at \$2,400 each and thirty-three in lieu of twenty-six telephone operators at \$1,800 each, \$1,028,205.

OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND THE MINORITY

For the offices of the secretary for the majority and the secretary for the minority, \$57,060.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Legislative reorganization: For salaries and expenses, legislative reorganization, including the objects specified in Public Law 663, Seventy-ninth Congress, \$100,000.

Senate policy committees: For salaries and expenses of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, \$45,715 for each such committee; in all, \$91,430.

Joint Committee on the Economic Report: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, \$125,585.

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, including the objects specified in Public Law 20, Eightieth Congress, \$160,135.

Joint Committee on Printing: For salaries for the Joint Committee on Printing, \$22,080, for expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory, \$1,600, and for travel and subsistence expenses at rates provided by law for Senate committees, \$4,500; in all \$28,180.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: To enable the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to engage by contract the services of private firms or corporations for making a survey of

certificated interstate, overseas, and foreign air carrier operations, with a view to drafting legislation requiring the separation of mail compensation from any Federal subsidy payments, \$200,000.

Vice President's automobile: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Vice President, \$5,480.

Automobile for the President pro tempore: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the President pro tempore of the Senate, \$5,480.

Automobiles for majority and minority leaders: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of two automobiles, one for the majority leader of the Senate, and one for the minority leader of the Senate, \$10,960.

Reporting Senate proceedings: For reporting the debates and proceedings of the Senate, payable in equal monthly installments, \$122,785.

Furniture: For services in cleaning, repairing, and varnishing furniture, \$2,900.

Furniture: For materials for furniture and repairs of same, and for the purchase of furniture, \$18,000.

Inquiries and investigations: For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate or conducted pursuant to section 134 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, including compensation for stenographic assistance of committees at such rates and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, but not exceeding the rate of 25 cents per hundred words for the original transcript of reported matter; and including \$50,000 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution Numbered 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, and Public Law 20, Eightieth Congress, \$832,000, and the affairs of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, provided for in Senate Resolution 298, Eighty-first Congress, shall be liquidated not later than August 31, 1950: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses (as defined in the Travel Expense Act of 1949) at rates in excess of \$9 per day except that higher rates may be established by the Committee on Rules and Administration in the case of travel beyond the limits of the continental United States: *And provided further*, That hereafter the provisions of section 134 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, shall be applicable to the Select Committee on Small Business.

Folding documents: For folding speeches and pamphlets at a basic rate not exceeding \$1 per thousand, \$28,875.

Materials for folding: For materials for folding, \$1,500.

Fuel, and so forth: For fuel, oil, cotton waste, and advertising, exclusive of labor, \$2,000.

Senate restaurants: For repairs, improvements, equipment, and supplies for Senate kitchens and restaurants, Capitol Building and Senate Office Building, including personal and other services, to be expended under the supervision of the Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, \$42,500.

Motor vehicles: For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, \$9,560.

Miscellaneous items: For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, \$786,895.

Packing boxes: For packing boxes, \$3,000.

Postage stamps: For office of Secretary, \$500; office of Sergeant at Arms, \$225; offices of the secretaries for the majority and the minority, \$100; in all, \$825.

Air-mail and special-delivery stamps: For air-mail and special-delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate as authorized by law, \$10,250.

Stationery: For stationery for Senators and for the President of the Senate, including \$10,000 for stationery for committees and offices of the Senate, \$58,500.

The Sergeant at Arms is authorized and directed to secure suitable office space in post office or other Federal buildings in the State of each Senator for the use of such Senator and in the city to be designated by him: *Provided*, That in the event suitable space is not available in such buildings and a Senator leases or rents office space elsewhere, the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to approve for payment, from the contingent fund of the Senate, vouchers covering bona fide statements of rentals due in an amount not exceeding \$900 per annum for each Senator.

Commencing with the fiscal year 1949 the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to protect the funds of his office by purchasing insurance in an amount necessary to protect said funds against loss. Premiums on such insurance shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Salaries or wages paid out of the foregoing items under "Contingent expenses of the Senate" shall be computed at basic rates as authorized by law, plus increased and additional compensation as provided by the "Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945", as amended, and the "Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950".

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES, MILEAGE, AND EXPENSES OF MEMBERS

For compensation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, \$5,492,500.

For mileage and expense allowance of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, as authorized by law, \$1,273,500.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation of officers and employees, as authorized by law, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER

For Office of the Speaker, \$13,400.

THE SPEAKER'S TABLE

For the Speaker's table, including \$2,000 for preparing Digest of the Rules, \$27,895.

OFFICE OF THE CHAPLAIN

For the Office of the Chaplain, \$6,555.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

For the Office of the Clerk, \$537,875.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

For committee employees, including a sum of not to exceed \$232,000 for the Committee on Appropriations, \$1,600,000.

OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS

For Office of the Sergeant at Arms, \$325,600.

OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

For Office of the Doorkeeper, \$570,710.

SPECIAL AND MINORITY EMPLOYEES

For six minority employees, \$48,455.

For three special employees, \$8,430.

For office of the majority floor leader, including \$2,000 for official expenses of the majority leader, \$37,515.

For office of the minority floor leader, \$27,650.

For two messengers, one in the majority caucus room and one in the minority caucus room, to be appointed by the majority and minority whips, respectively, \$6,050.

For two printing clerks, one for the majority caucus room and one for the minority caucus room, to be appointed by the majority and minority leaders, respectively, \$6,805.

For two clerks, one for the majority whip and one for the minority whip, to be appointed by said whips, respectively, \$9,700.

For technical assistant in the office of the attending physician, to be appointed by the attending physician, subject to the approval of the Speaker, \$5,720.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER

For Office of the Postmaster, \$161,240.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

For official reporters of debates, \$114,935.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS TO COMMITTEES

For official reporters to committees, \$94,390.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses, studies and examinations of executive agencies, by the Committee on Appropriations, and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, 1946, and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed, \$150,000.

CLERK HIRE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

For clerk hire necessarily employed by each Member and Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, in the discharge of his official and representative duties, as authorized by law, \$8,844,150.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

Furniture: For furniture and materials for repairs of the same, including labor, tools, and machinery for furniture repair shops, and for the purchase of packing boxes, \$236,000.

Miscellaneous items: For miscellaneous items, exclusive of salaries unless specifically ordered by the House of Representatives, including the sum of \$47,500 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 208 of the Act approved October 9, 1940 (Public Law 812); the sum of not to exceed \$3,200 for the exchange, operation, maintenance, and repair of the Clerk's motor vehicles; the sum of \$500 for the exchange, operation, maintenance, and repair of the folding room motortruck; the sum of \$2,200 for the purchase, exchange, maintenance, operation, and repair of the post-office motor vehicles for carrying the mails; the sum of \$600 for hire of automobile for the Sergeant at Arms; and materials for folding; in all, \$237,000.

Reporting hearings: For stenographic reports of hearings of committees other than special and select committees, \$100,000.

Special and select committees: For salaries and expenses of special and select committees authorized by the House, \$600,000.

Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: For the payment of the salaries and other expenses of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, \$180,000.

Office of the Coordinator of Information: For salaries and other expenses of the Office of the Coordinator of Information, \$69,000.

Telegraph and telephone: For telegraph and telephone service, exclusive of personal services, \$377,000.

Stationery (revolving fund): For a stationery allowance of \$500 for each Representative, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, for the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, and for stationery for the use of the committees, departments, and officers of the House (not to exceed \$8,000), \$227,000, to remain available until expended.

Attending physician's office: For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency room and for the attending physician and his assistants, including an allowance of \$1,500 to be paid to the attending physician in equal monthly installments as authorized by the Act approved June 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 629), and including an allowance of not to exceed \$30 per month each to four assistants as provided by the House resolutions adopted July 1, 1930, January 20, 1932, and November 18, 1940, \$6,985.

Postage stamps: Postmaster, \$200; Clerk, \$400; Sergeant at Arms, \$250; Doorkeeper, \$100; United States air-mail and special-delivery postage stamps for each Representative, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and each standing committee of the House, as authorized by law, and beginning with the current fiscal year and for each fiscal year thereafter, an additional amount of \$225

each for the Speaker, the majority floor leader, the minority floor leader, the majority whip, and the minority whip, \$35,400.

Folding documents: For folding speeches and pamphlets, at a rate not exceeding \$1 per thousand or for the employment of personnel at a rate not to exceed \$5.20 per day per person, \$90,000.

Revision of laws: For preparation and editing of the laws as authorized by the Act approved May 29, 1928 (1 U. S. C. 59), \$12,600, to be expended under the direction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Speaker's automobile: For exchange, driving, maintenance, repair, and operation of an automobile for the Speaker, \$10,675.

Salaries or wages paid out of the items herein for the House of Representatives shall be computed at basic rates as authorized by law, plus increased and additional compensation as provided by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950.

No part of the appropriation contained in this chapter for the contingent expenses of the House of Representatives shall be used to defray the expenses of any committee consisting of more than six persons (not more than four from the House and not more than two from the Senate), nor to defray the expenses of any other person except the Sergeant at Arms of the House or a representative of his office, and except the widow or minor children, or both, of the deceased, to attend the funeral rites and burial of any person who at the time of his or her death is a Representative, a Delegate from a Territory, or a Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

CAPITOL POLICE

General expenses: For purchasing and supplying uniforms; purchase, exchange, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; contingent expenses, including \$25 per month for extra services performed for the Capitol Police Board by such member of the staff of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or the House, as may be designated by the chairman of the Board; \$17,900.

Capitol Police Board: To enable the Capitol Police Board to provide additional protection for the Capitol Buildings and Grounds, including the Senate and House Office Buildings and the Capitol Power Plant, \$14,515. Such sum shall only be expended for payment for salaries and other expenses of personnel detailed from the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to make such details upon the request of the Board. Personnel so detailed shall, during the period of such detail, serve under the direction and instructions of the Board and is authorized to exercise the same authority as members of such Metropolitan Police and members of the Capitol Police and to perform such other duties as may be assigned by the Board. Reimbursement for salaries and other expenses of such detail personnel shall be made to the government of the District of Columbia, and any sums so reimbursed shall be credited to the appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries and expenses are payable.

and be available for all the purposes thereof: *Provided*, That any person detailed under the authority of this paragraph or under similar authority in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1942, and the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1940, from the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia shall be deemed a member of such Metropolitan Police during the period or periods of any such detail for all purposes of rank, pay, allowances, privileges, and benefits to the same extent as though such detail had not been made, and at the termination thereof any such person who was a member of such police on July 1, 1940, shall have a status with respect to rank, pay, allowances, privileges, and benefits which is not less than the status of such person in such police at the end of such detail.

The foregoing amounts under "Capitol Police" shall be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

For salaries and expenses of maintenance of the Office of the Legislative Counsel, as authorized by law, including increased and additional compensation as provided by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, \$199,500, of which \$105,000 shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and \$94,500 by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

For an amount to enable the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to carry out the duties imposed upon it by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726), to remain available during the existence of the committee, \$20,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

EDUCATION OF SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES

For education of congressional pages and pages of the Supreme Court, pursuant to section 243 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, 1946, \$32,800, which amount shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation of the District of Columbia, and the Board of Education of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized to employ such personnel for the education of pages as may be required and to pay compensation for such services in accordance with such rates of compensation as the Board of Education may prescribe.

STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

For the preparation, under the direction of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, of the statements for the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, showing appropriations made, indefinite appropriations, and contracts authorized, together with a chronological history of the regular appropriation bills as required by law, \$4,000, to be paid to the persons designated by the chairmen of such committees to supervise the work.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Salaries: For the Architect of the Capitol, Assistant Architect of the Capitol, Chief Architectural and Engineering Assistant, and other personal services at rates of pay provided by law; and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall act as Architect of the Capitol during the absence or disability of that official or whenever there is no Architect, and, in case of the absence or disability of the Assistant Architect, the Chief Architectural and Engineering Assistant shall so act; \$132,700.

Appropriations under the control of the Architect of the Capitol shall be available for expenses of travel on official business not to exceed in the aggregate under all funds the sum of \$3,000.

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Capitol Buildings: For necessary expenditures for the Capitol Building and electrical substations of the Senate and House Office Buildings, under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including minor improvements, maintenance, repair, equipment, supplies, material, fuel, oil, waste, and appurtenances; furnishings and office equipment; special and protective clothing for workmen; personal and other services; cleaning and repairing works of art; purchase or exchange, maintenance and driving of motor-propelled passenger-carrying office vehicle; not exceeding \$300 for the purchase of necessary reference books and periodicals; not to exceed \$150 for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the Architect of the Capitol, at meetings or conventions in connection with subjects related to work under the Architect of the Capitol; \$582,000.

Capitol Grounds: For care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, Senate and House Office Buildings; Capitol Power Plant; personal and other services; care of trees; planting; fertilizers; repairs to pavements, walks, and roadways; waterproof wearing apparel; maintenance of signal lights; and for snow removal by hire of men and equipment or under contract without compliance with section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; \$216,000.

Legislative garage: For maintenance, repairs, alterations, personal and other services, and all other necessary expenses, \$31,800.

Subway transportation, Capitol and Senate Office Buildings: For maintenance, repairs, and rebuilding of the subway transportation system connecting the Senate Office Building with the Capitol, including personal and other services, \$2,600.

Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel and for personal and other services, including four female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms at \$1,500 each and one at \$1,560, for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building; to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, \$643,900.

House Office Buildings: For maintenance, including equipment, waterproof wearing apparel, miscellaneous items, and for all necessary services, \$875,800.

Capitol Power Plant: For lighting, heating, and power (including the purchase of electrical energy whenever such energy cannot be supplied by the Capitol Power Plant and also as provided by the Act of October 26, 1949 (Public Law 413, Eighty-first Congress)), for the Capitol, Senate and House Office Buildings, Supreme Court Building, Congressional Library Buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, legislative garage, and for air-conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; for heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office and for light and power therefor whenever available, reimbursement for which shall be made and covered into the Treasury; personal and other services, fuel, oil, materials, waterproof wearing apparel, and all other necessary expenses in connection with the maintenance and operation of the plant, \$1,316,500.

Changes and improvements, Capitol Power Plant: Toward carrying out the changes and improvements authorized by the Act of October 26, 1949 (Public Law 413, Eighty-first Congress), \$4,000,000, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of the House Office Building Commission.

LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

MECHANICAL AND STRUCTURAL MAINTENANCE

Salaries: For chief engineer and all personal services at rates of pay provided by law, \$215,300.

Salaries, Sunday opening: For extra service of employees and additional employees under the Architect of the Capitol to provide for the opening of the Library Buildings on Sundays, at rates to be fixed by the Architect, \$14,700.

Repairs and maintenance: For the necessary expenditures for mechanical and structural maintenance, including minor improvements, equipment, supplies, waterproof wearing apparel, and personal and other services, \$74,100.

Furniture and furnishings: For furniture, partitions, screens, shelving, and electrical work pertaining thereto and repairs thereof, office and library equipment, apparatus, and labor-saving devices, \$72,000.

BOTANIC GARDEN

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses incident to maintaining, operating, repairing, and improving the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, collections, and equipment pertaining thereto, including personal services (including not exceeding \$3,000 for temporary labor without regard to the Classification Act of 1949); waterproof wearing apparel; not to exceed \$25 for emergency medical supplies; traveling expenses including streetcar fares, not to exceed \$275; the prevention and eradication of insect and other pests and plant diseases by purchase of materials and procurement of personal services by contract without regard to the provisions of any other Act; purchase and exchange of motortrucks; purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; purchase of botanical books, periodicals, and books of reference, not to exceed \$100; and repairs and improvements to Director's

residence; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library; \$196,500: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the distribution, by congressional allotment, of trees, plants, shrubs, or other nursery stock.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Salaries, Library proper: For the Librarian, the Librarian Emeritus, and other personal services including special and temporary services and extra special services of regular employees (not exceeding \$5,000) at rates to be fixed by the Librarian, services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and personal services for printing and binding, \$3,044,000, of which so much as may be necessary may be transferred to other agencies of the Government for the purpose of investigating the loyalty of Library employees, and for health service program as authorized by law.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

Salaries: For the Register of Copyrights and other personal services, including personal services for printing and binding, \$890,000.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

Salaries and expenses: For necessary personal services to enable the Librarian to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, including not to exceed \$20,000 for employees engaged by the day or hour at rates to be fixed by the Librarian; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); printing and binding; and supplies and materials; \$790,000.

DISTRIBUTION OF CATALOG CARDS

Salaries and expenses: For the distribution of catalog cards and other publications of the Library, including personal services (including not to exceed \$30,000 for employees engaged in piecework and work by the day or hour and for extra special services of regular employees at rates to be fixed by the Librarian), personal services for printing and binding, freight and expressage, postage, traveling expenses connected with such distribution, and expenses of attendance at meetings when incurred on the written authority and direction of the Librarian, \$552,100.

UNION CATALOGS

Salaries and expenses: To continue the development and maintenance of the Union Catalogs, including personal services (including not to exceed \$700 for employees engaged by the day or hour at rates to be fixed by the Librarian); personal services for printing and binding; traveling expenses including expenses of attendance at meetings when incurred on the written authority and direction of the Librarian; and other necessary expenses; \$77,000.

INCREASE OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

General increase of the Library: For purchase of books, miscellaneous periodicals and newspapers, photocopying supplies and

photocopying labor, and all other material for the increase of the Library, including payment in advance for subscription books and society publications, and for freight and expressage, postage, commissions, and traveling expenses not to exceed \$25,000, including expenses of attendance at meetings when incurred on the written authority and direction of the Librarian in the interest of collections, and all other expenses incidental to the acquisition of material for the increase of the Library by purchase, gift, bequest, or exchange, \$270,000, to continue available during the next succeeding fiscal year.

Increase of the law library: For the purchase of books and for legal periodicals for the law library, including payment in advance for legal periodicals and for legal society publications, and for freight and expressage, postage, commissions, traveling expenses not to exceed \$2,500, including expenses of attendance at meetings when incurred on the written authority and direction of the Librarian in the interest of collections, and all other expenses incidental to the acquisition of material for the increase of the law library, \$85,500, to continue available during the next succeeding fiscal year.

Books for the Supreme Court: For the purchase of books and periodicals for the Supreme Court, to be a part of the Library of Congress, and purchased by the Librarian of the Supreme Court, under the direction of the Chief Justice, \$22,500.

BOOKS FOR ADULT BLIND

To enable the Librarian of Congress to carry out the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to provide books for the adult blind", approved March 3, 1931 (2 U. S. C. 135a), as amended, \$1,000,000, including not exceeding \$70,000 for personal services, not exceeding \$200,000 for books in raised characters, and the balance remaining for sound-reproduction records and for the purchase, maintenance, and replacement of the Government-owned reproducers for sound-reproduction records for the blind and not exceeding \$1,000 for necessary traveling expenses connected with such service and for expenses of attendance at meetings when incurred on the written authority and direction of the Librarian; and for printing and binding.

PRINTING AND BINDING

General printing and binding: For miscellaneous printing and binding for the Library of Congress, including the Copyright Office, and the binding, rebinding, and repairing of Library books, \$450,000.

Printing the Catalog of Title Entries of the Copyright Office: For the publication of the Catalog of Title Entries of the Copyright Office and the decisions of the United States courts involving copyrights, \$39,500.

Printing catalog cards: For the printing of catalog cards and of miscellaneous publications relating to the distribution of catalog cards, and for duplication of catalog cards by methods other than printing, \$550,500.

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES OF THE LIBRARY

Miscellaneous expenses: For miscellaneous expenses connected with the administration of the Library, and not otherwise provided for, including domestic and foreign postage, payment of claims pursuant

to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, travel expenses, including not exceeding \$500 for expenses of attendance at meetings when incurred on the written authority and direction of the Librarian, printing and binding, and personal services, supplies, and other necessary expenses for the operation of a photoduplication service, and for the purchase of photoduplications, \$85,000.

LIBRARY BUILDINGS

Salaries and expenses: For personal services, including personal services for printing and binding, and necessary miscellaneous expenses in connection with the custody, care, and maintenance of the Library buildings; including not to exceed \$750 for employees engaged by the day or hour at rates to be fixed by the Librarian, and including mail and delivery service, telephone service, special clothing, cleaning of special clothing of separated employees, medical supplies, equipment, and expenses for the emergency rooms, housekeeping and miscellaneous supplies and equipment, and other incidental expenses; \$698,680.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS TRUST FUND BOARD

For any expense of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, \$500.

Not to exceed ten positions in the Library of Congress may be exempt from the provisions of section 1102 of chapter XI of this Act, but the Librarian shall not make any appointment to any such position until he has ascertained that he cannot secure for such appointment a person in any of the three categories specified in such section 1102 who possesses the special qualifications for the particular position and also otherwise meets the general requirements for employment in the Library of Congress.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WORKING CAPITAL AND CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

To provide the Public Printer with a working capital for the following purposes for the execution of printing, binding, lithographing, mapping, engraving, and other authorized work of the Government Printing Office for the various branches of the Government: For salaries of Public Printer and Deputy Public Printer; for salaries, compensation, or wages of all necessary officers and employees additional to those herein appropriated for, including employees necessary to handle waste paper and condemned material for sale; to enable the Public Printer to comply with the provisions of law granting holidays and half holidays and Executive orders granting holidays and half holidays with pay to employees; to enable the Public Printer to comply with the provisions of law granting leave to employees with pay, such pay to be at the rate for their regular positions at the time the leave is granted; rental of buildings and equipment; fuel, gas, heat, electric current, gas and electric fixtures; bicycles, motor-propelled vehicles for the carriage of printing and printing supplies, and the maintenance, repair, and operation of the same, to be used only for

official purposes including operation, repair, and maintenance of passenger motor vehicles for official use of the officers of the Government Printing Office when in writing ordered by the Public Printer; freight, expressage, telegraph and telephone service, furniture, typewriters, and carpets; traveling expenses, including not to exceed \$1,000 for attendance at meetings or conventions when authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing; stationery, postage, and advertising; directories, technical books, newspapers, magazines, and books of reference (not exceeding \$1,000); adding and numbering machines, time stamps, and other machines of similar character; purchase of uniforms for guards; rubber boots, coats, and gloves; machinery (not exceeding \$500,000); equipment, and for repairs to machinery, implements, and buildings, and for minor alterations to buildings; necessary equipment, maintenance, and supplies for the emergency room for the use of all employees in the Government Printing Office who may be taken suddenly ill or receive injury while on duty; other necessary contingent and miscellaneous items authorized by the Public Printer; for expenses authorized in writing by the Joint Committee on Printing for the inspection of printing and binding equipment, material, and supplies and Government printing plants in the District of Columbia or elsewhere (not exceeding \$1,000); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 921); for salaries and expenses of preparing the semimonthly and session indexes of the Congressional Record under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing (chief indexer at \$5,546, one cataloger at \$5,111, two catalogers at \$4,068 each, and one cataloger at \$3,515); and for all the necessary labor, paper, materials, and equipment needed in the prosecution and delivery and mailing of the work; in all, \$15,500,000; to which sum shall be charged the printing and binding authorized to be done for Congress, including supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriations; the printing, binding, and distribution of the Federal Register in accordance with the Act approved July 26, 1935 (44 U. S. C. 301-310) (not exceeding \$475,000); the printing and binding of the Code of Federal Regulations and supplements thereto, as authorized by the Act of July 26, 1935, as amended (44 U. S. C. 311) (not exceeding \$150,000); the printing and binding for use of the Government Printing Office; the printing and binding (not exceeding \$5,000) for official use of the Architect of the Capitol upon requisition of the Secretary of the Senate; in all to an amount not exceeding \$8,000,000: *Provided*, That not less than \$7,500,000 of such working capital shall be returned to the Treasury as an unexpended balance not later than six months after the close of the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), no part of the foregoing sum of \$8,000,000 shall be used for printing and binding part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture (known as the Year-book of Agriculture).

Printing and binding for Congress chargeable to the foregoing appropriation, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year for which this appropriation is made.

During the current fiscal year any executive department or independent establishment of the Government ordering printing and binding or blank paper and supplies from the Government Printing Office shall pay promptly by check to the Public Printer upon his written request, either in advance or upon completion of the work, all or part of the estimated or actual cost thereof, as the case may be, and bills rendered by the Public Printer in accordance herewith shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment: *Provided*, That proper adjustments on the basis of the actual cost of delivered work paid for in advance shall be made monthly or quarterly and as may be agreed upon by the Public Printer and the department or establishment concerned. All sums paid to the Public Printer for work that he is authorized by law to do; all sums received from sales of waste paper, other waste material, and condemned property; and for losses or damage to Government property; shall be deposited to the credit, on the books of the Treasury Department, of the appropriation made for the working capital of the Government Printing Office and be subject to requisition by the Public Printer.

No part of any money appropriated in this chapter shall be paid to any person employed in the Government Printing Office while detailed for or performing service in the executive branch of the public service of the United States unless such detail be authorized by law.

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents, including personal services in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, and compensation of employees who shall be subject to the provision of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate and fix rates of pay for employees and officers of the Government Printing Office", approved June 7, 1924 (44 U. S. C. 40); traveling expenses (not to exceed \$1,500); printing and binding including price lists and bibliographies; repairs to buildings, elevators, and machinery; and supplying books to depository libraries; \$2,699,800: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be used to supply to depository libraries any documents, books, or other printed matter not requested by such libraries, and the requests therefor shall be subject to approval by the Superintendent of Documents: *Provided further*, That hereafter employees in the Office of the Superintendent of Documents may be paid compensation for night, Sunday, holiday, and overtime work at rates not in excess of the rates of additional compensation for such work allowed to other employees of the Government Printing Office under the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate and fix rates of pay for employees and officers of the Government Printing Office", approved June 7, 1924.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Purchases may be made from the foregoing appropriations under the "Government Printing Office", as provided for in the Printing Act approved January 12, 1895, and without reference to the Act approved June 30, 1949 (Public Law 152), concerning purchases for the Federal Government.

SEC. 103. In order to keep the expenditures for printing and binding

for the current fiscal year within or under the appropriations for such fiscal year, the heads of the various executive departments and independent establishments are authorized to discontinue the printing of annual or special reports under their respective jurisdictions: *Provided*, That where the printing of such reports is discontinued the original copy thereof shall be kept on file in the offices of the heads of the respective departments or independent establishments for public inspection.

SEC. 104. No part of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles.

SEC. 105. Whenever any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 is appropriated for herein or whenever the rate of compensation or designation of any position appropriated for herein is different from that specifically established for such position by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation of the position, or either, appropriated for or provided herein, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions relating to positions and salaries thereof carried in H. Res. 255, 303, 315, 370, 394, 414, and 453 (Eighty-first Congress) shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 106. No part of any appropriation contained in this chapter shall be paid as compensation to any person appointed after June 30, 1935, as an officer or member of the Capitol Police who does not meet the standards to be prescribed for such appointees by the Capitol Police Board: *Provided*, That the Capitol Police Board is hereby authorized to detail police from the House Office, Senate Office, and Capitol Buildings for police duty on the Capitol Grounds.

This chapter may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER III—DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Department of State not otherwise provided for, including personal services in the District of Columbia; expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801–1158), not otherwise provided for; expenses of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 287o, 287q, 287r); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation of aircraft outside the continental United States; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not to exceed \$1,000 for payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law; purchase of uniforms; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; dues for

library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; rental of tie lines and teletype equipment; employment of aliens, by contract, for services abroad; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for passports; establishment, maintenance, and operation of passport and despatch agencies; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; ice and drinking water for use abroad; excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; loss by exchange; radio communications; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and similar services abroad; relief, protection, and burial of American seamen, and alien seamen in foreign countries and in the United States Territories and possessions; expenses incurred in acknowledging services of officers and crews of foreign vessels and aircraft in rescuing American seamen, airmen, or citizens from shipwreck or other catastrophe abroad; rent and expenses of maintaining in Egypt, Morocco, and Muscat, institutions for American convicts and persons declared insane by any consular court, and care and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane; expenses, as authorized by law (18 U. S. C. 3192), of bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons charged with crime; and procurement by contract or otherwise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1) translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical information, (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids, (4) maintenance, improvement, and repair of diplomatic and consular properties in foreign countries, including minor construction on Government-owned properties, (5) not to exceed \$200,000 for maintenance and operation of commissary and mess services, (6) fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased property abroad, and (7) rental or lease, for periods not exceeding ten years, of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for the use of the Foreign Service, for which payments may be made in advance; \$77,800,000: *Provided*, That pursuant to section 8 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 118d-1), passenger motor vehicles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be exchanged or sold and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be available without fiscal year limitation for replacement of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not exceed \$3,000 in the case of the chief of mission automobile at each diplomatic mission and \$1,400 in the case of all other such vehicles except station wagons: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated herein, not to exceed \$30,000 shall be expended for carrying out the provisions of the Act of July 31, 1945 (5 U. S. C. 168d).

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

For representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131), \$675,000.

BUILDINGS FUND

For carrying into effect the Act of July 25, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 295b), including the initial alterations, repair, and furnishing of buildings acquired under said Act, \$6,500,000, which is exclusively for expenditure under the provisions of said Act which relate to payments representing the value of foreign property or credits: *Provided*, That,

when specifically authorized by the Secretary of State or such Assistant Secretary as he may designate, section 6 of the Act of May 7, 1926, may be construed as including leaseholds of not less than ten years.

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of State to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, to be expended pursuant to the requirement of section 291 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 107), including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$9,900,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State may delegate to subordinate officials the authority vested in him by section 291 of the Revised Statutes pertaining to certification of expenditures.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to meet annual obligations to international organizations, the Government of Panama, and Gorgas Memorial Institute, pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific Acts of Congress, \$54,449,297, together with such additional sums due to increase in rates of exchange as the Secretary of State may determine and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury to be necessary to pay, in foreign currencies, the quotas and contributions required by the several treaties, conventions, or laws establishing the amount of the obligation: *Provided*, That the Department of State, when requested by the United Nations, is authorized to acquire surplus property for the United Nations in accordance with existing surplus property disposal laws and regulations, and the contribution of the United States to the United Nations shall be reduced by the value of the surplus property and necessary expenses, including transportation costs, incidental to the acquisition thereof.

MISSIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary for permanent representation to certain international organizations in which the United States participates pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific Acts of Congress, including expenses authorized by the pertinent Acts and Conventions providing for such representation; attendance at meetings of societies or associations concerned with the work of the organizations; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); purchase (not to exceed two, for replacement only, including one at not to exceed \$3,000) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); and purchase of uniforms for guards and chauffeurs, \$1,600,000: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 8 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that Act, shall be applicable to the obligation and expenditure of funds in connection with United States participation in the International Civil Aviation Organization.

INTERNATIONAL CONTINGENCIES

For necessary expenses of participation by the United States upon approval by the Secretary of State, in international activities which arise from time to time in the conduct of foreign affairs and for which specific appropriations have not been provided pursuant to treaties, conventions, or special Acts of Congress, including personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere without regard to civil-service and classification laws; salaries, expenses and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); employment of aliens; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and without regard to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949; transportation of families and effects under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; not to exceed \$15 per diem in lieu of subsistence for persons serving without compensation in an advisory capacity while away from their homes or regular places of business; stenographic and other services; rent of quarters by contract or otherwise; hire of passenger motor vehicles; contributions for the share of the United States in expenses of international organizations; and printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); \$2,900,000, of which not to exceed a total of \$100,000 may be expended for representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Act of August 13, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131) and for entertainment.

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES
AND MEXICO

For expenses necessary to enable the United States to meet its obligations under the treaties of 1884, 1889, 1905, 1906, 1933, and 1944 between the United States and Mexico, and to comply with the Act approved August 19, 1935, as amended (22 U. S. C. 277-277d), including operation and maintenance of the Rio Grande rectification, canalization, flood control, bank protection, boundary fence, and sanitation projects; examinations, preliminary surveys, and investigations; detailed plan preparation and construction (including surveys and operation and maintenance and protection during construction); Rio Grande emergency flood protection; construction and operation of gaging stations; purchase and exchange of map-reproduction machines and other equipment and machinery; personal services in the District of Columbia; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem; travel expenses, including, in the discretion of the Commissioner, expenses (not to exceed \$500) of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the activities of the International Boundary and Water Commission which may be necessary for the efficient discharge of the responsibilities of the Commission; printing and binding; purchase of four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; hire, with or without personal services, of work animals, and animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles and aircraft and equipment; acquisition by donation, purchase, or con-

demnation, of real and personal property, including expenses of abstracts and certificates of title; purchase of ice and drinking water; inspection of equipment, supplies, and materials by contract; drilling and testing of foundations and dam sites, by contract if deemed necessary, purchase of planographs and lithographs; leasing of private property to remove therefrom sand, gravel, stone, and other materials, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672), and the Act of August 27, 1935, as amended (22 U. S. C. 277e); and payment of official telephone service in the field in case of official telephones installed in private houses when authorized under regulations established by the Commissioner; as follow

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses, regular boundary activities, including examinations, preliminary surveys, and investigations, \$1,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For detail plan preparation and construction of projects authorized by the Convention concluded February 1, 1933, between the United States and Mexico, the Acts approved August 19, 1935, as amended (22 U. S. C. 277-277d), August 29, 1935 (Public Law 392), June 4, 1936 (Public Law 648), June 28, 1941 (22 U. S. C. 277f), and the projects stipulated in the treaty between the United States and Mexico signed at Washington on February 3, 1944, \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made for the lower Rio Grande flood-control project for construction on any land, site, or easement in connection with this project except such as has been acquired by donation and the title thereto has been approved by the Attorney General of the United States: *Provided further*, That expenditures for the Rio Grande bank-protection project shall be subject to the provisions and conditions contained in the appropriation for said project as provided by the Act approved April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 89): *Provided further*, That unexpended balances of appropriations for construction under the International Boundary and Water Commission available for the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with this appropriation and shall continue available until expended.

RIO GRANDE EMERGENCY FLOOD PROTECTION

For emergency flood-control work, including protection, reconstruction, and repair of all structures under the jurisdiction of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, threatened or damaged by floodwaters of the Rio Grande, which have heretofore been authorized and erected under the provisions of treaties between the United States and Mexico, or in pursuance of Federal laws authorizing improvements on the Rio Grande, \$30,000, to be merged with the unobligated balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the next preceding fiscal year, and to remain available until expended.

AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

For expenses necessary to enable the President to perform the obli-

gations of the United States pursuant to conventions between the United States and Canada signed May 26, 1930 (50 Stat. 1355) and January 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 1351), and treaties between the United States and Great Britain, in respect to Canada, signed January 11, 1909 (36 Stat. 2448) and February 24, 1925 (44 Stat. 2102), including personal services in the District of Columbia; stenographic reporting services by contract; printing and binding; hire of passenger motor vehicles; the United States share of the expenses of the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission and the International Fisheries Commission, which except for the expenses of the members, may be advanced to the respective Commissions; \$508,000, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State and to be available also for additional expenses of the American Sections, International Commissions, as hereinafter set forth:

International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, the salary of one Commissioner on the part of the United States who shall serve at the pleasure of the President (the other Commissioners to serve in that capacity without compensation therefor); salaries of clerks and other employees appointed by the Commissioners on the part of the United States with the approval solely of the Secretary of State; travel expenses and compensation of witnesses in attending hearings of the Commission at such places in the United States and Canada as the Commission or the American Commissioners shall determine to be necessary; and special and technical investigations in connection with matters falling within the Commission's jurisdiction, including purchase for replacement only of two passenger automobiles: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State is authorized to transfer to any department or independent establishment of the Government, with the consent of the head thereof, funds from this appropriation for direct expenditure by such department or establishment for such investigations.

International Boundary Commission, United States, Alaska, and Canada, the completion of such remaining work as may be required under the award of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal and the existing treaties between the United States and Great Britain; commutation of subsistence to employees while on field duty, not to exceed \$6 per day each (but not to exceed \$3 per day each when a member of a field party and subsisting in camp); hire of freight and passenger motor vehicles from temporary field employees; and payment for timber necessarily cut in keeping the boundary line clear.

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of State to carry out international information and educational activities as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U. S. C. 1431-1479) and the Act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 501), and to administer the program authorized by section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b)) and the program authorized by the Act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 265), including personal services in the District of Columbia; employment, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, of persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed \$60,000) and aliens within the United States; salaries, expenses, and

allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation (not to exceed \$11,000); printing and binding; entertainment within the United States (not to exceed \$5,000); hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons, not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; establishment and operation of agricultural and other experiment and demonstration stations in other American countries, on land acquired by gift or lease, and construction of necessary buildings thereon; radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, narration and script-writing, by contract or otherwise; and purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations; \$32,700,000, of which sum \$100,000 may be available for the purpose of preserving friendships with the peoples of western European countries by means of radio broadcasts, said programs to be created and produced under the supervision and control of the Department of State by experienced private international broadcasting organizations; and of which not to exceed \$2,875,000 may be transferred to other appropriations of the Department of State: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Department of State is authorized in making contracts for the use of the international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That in the acquisition of leasehold interests payments may be made in advance for the entire term or any part thereof: *Provided further*, That funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 per centum of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be available for payment to private organizations abroad in pursuance of contracts entered into for the processing and distribution of motion-picture films.

PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1949, \$10,000,000, to be consolidated with appropriations heretofore made under said head; and the unobligated balance of such consolidated appropriation shall remain available during the current fiscal year upon the terms and conditions specified under this head in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1950, for carrying out the purposes of sections 302 (a) and 303 (a) of the Philippine Reha-

bilitation Act of 1946, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1782, 1783), as authorized by the Act of September 7, 1949 (Public Law 295), and for carrying out the purposes of section 311 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as authorized by section 3 of the Act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 882).

THE INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act of August 5, 1947 (22 U. S. C. 281-281l), as amended by the Act of September 3, 1949 (Public Law 283), including purchase (not to exceed eighteen for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, and in addition, the Institute is authorized, prior to June 30, 1953, to enter into contracts for the purposes of such Act, as amended, in an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SEC. 102. Contracts entered into in foreign countries involving expenditures from any of the appropriations under this title shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22).

SEC. 103. The provision of law prescribing the use of vessels of United States registry by any officer or employee of the United States (46 U. S. C. 1241) shall not apply to any travel or transportation of effects payable from funds appropriated, allocated, or transferred to the Secretary of State or the Department of State.

SEC. 104. The exchange of funds for payment of expenses in connection with the operation of diplomatic and consular establishments abroad shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543).

SEC. 105. Appropriations under this title available for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the continental United States, including travel of dependents and transportation of personal effects, household goods, or automobiles of such personnel, shall be available for such expenses when any part of such travel or transportation begins in the current fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not be completed during the current fiscal year.

SEC. 106. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 16a of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78 (a)), Government-owned vehicles may be used in foreign countries for transportation of United States Government employees from their residence to the office and return when public transportation facilities are unsafe or are not available: *Provided*, That each Chief of Mission shall have prior authority from the Secretary of State to approve such transportation.

SEC. 107. Appropriations under this title for "Salaries and expenses", "International contingencies", and "Missions to international organizations" are available for reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files.

This title may be cited as the "Department of State Appropriation Act, 1951".

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

For expenses necessary for the administration of the Department of Justice and for investigation of the official acts, records, and accounts of officers and offices of United States and territorial courts, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle at not to exceed \$4,000, for replacement only; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); miscellaneous and emergency expenses authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his Administrative Assistant; special attorneys and special assistants to the Attorney General; and examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; \$2,175,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice not otherwise provided for, including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); miscellaneous and emergency expenses authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his Administrative Assistant; and advances of public moneys pursuant to law (31 U. S. C. 529); \$7,475,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, including personal services in the District of Columbia and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$3,750,000, of which \$125,000 shall be available exclusively for activities in connection with railroad reparations cases: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be expended for the establishment and maintenance of permanent regional offices of the Antitrust Division.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS AND MARSHALS

For necessary expenses of the offices of United States attorneys and marshals and United States district attorneys in Alaska, including purchase of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles (including four for Alaska at not to exceed \$2,200 each, one van for replacement only at not to exceed \$2,500, and one bus for replacement only at not to exceed \$15,000); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); expenses incident to the transfer of prisoners in the custody of United States marshals to narcotic farms; services in Alaska in collecting evidence for the United States when specifically directed by the Attorney General; meals and lodging for deputy marshals in attendance upon juries when ordered by the court; notarial fees or like services; and firearms and ammunition; \$12,847,000, of which not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for the employment of temporary deputy marshals in lieu of bailiffs at a rate not to exceed \$10 per day.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For expenses, mileage, and per diems of witnesses and for per diems in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law; and not to exceed \$115,000 for such compensation and expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses) or informants as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his Administrative Assistant, which approval shall be conclusive; \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used to pay any witness more than one attendance fee for any one calendar day.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

For expenses necessary for payment of claims of persons of Japanese ancestry, pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U. S. C. 1981-1987), including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$1,300,000, of which not to exceed \$250,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States; protection of the person of the President of the United States; acquisition, collection, classification and preservation of identification and other records and their exchange with the duly authorized officials of the Federal Government, of States, cities, and other institutions; and such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice and the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed five hundred for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase at not to exceed \$10,000, for replacement only, of one armored motor vehicle; firearms and ammunition; not to exceed \$10,000 for taxicab hire to be used exclusively for the purposes set forth in this paragraph; not to exceed \$4,500 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; not to exceed \$3,000 for membership in the International Commission of Criminal Police; payment of rewards when specifically authorized by the Attorney General for information leading to the apprehension of fugitives from justice; and not to exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General and to be accounted for solely on his certificate; \$57,400,000: *Provided*, That of the amount herein appropriated \$100,000 is to be held as a reserve for emergencies arising in connection with kidnaping, extortion, and bank robbery, to be released for expenditure in such amounts and at such times as the Attorney General may determine: *Provided further*, That the compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be \$20,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

None of the funds appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, including personal services in the District of Columbia; advance of cash to aliens for meals and lodging while en route; payment of allowances (at a rate not in excess of \$1 per day) to aliens, while held in custody under the immigration laws, for work performed; payment of rewards for information leading to the apprehension or conviction of violators of the immigration laws; not to exceed \$20,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General and accounted for solely on his certificate; not to exceed \$5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase (not to exceed one hundred and fifty, for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not to exceed four for replacement only) and maintenance and operation of aircraft; firearms and ammunition; free distribution of citizenship textbooks; refunds of head tax, maintenance bills, immigration fines, and other items properly returnable, except deposits of aliens who become public charges and deposits to secure payment of fines and passage money; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); operation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; and maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and transportation of alien enemies and their wives and dependent children, including return of such persons to place of bona fide residence or to such other place as may be authorized by the Attorney General; \$31,400,000: *Provided*, That the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization may contract with officers and employees for the use, on official business, of privately owned horses: *Provided further*, That provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the employment of aliens in the Government service shall not apply to the employment of interpreters in the Immigration and Naturalization Service (not to exceed ten permanent and such temporary employees as are required from time to time) where competent citizen interpreters are not available.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

For expenses necessary for the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutions, including not to exceed \$425,000 for departmental personal services; not to exceed \$13,500 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase of not to exceed nineteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including two busses at not to exceed \$20,000 each; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); compilation of statistics relating to prisoners in Federal and

non-Federal penal and correctional institutions; furnishing of insignia, uniforms, and other distinctive wearing apparel necessary for employees in the performance of their official duties; payment pursuant to law of claims of employees for loss, damage, or destruction of personal property (63 Stat. 167); firearms and ammunition; payment of rewards for the apprehension, or for information leading to the recapture, of escaped prisoners; purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock; construction of buildings at prison camps; and not to exceed \$35,000 for acquisition of land adjacent to any Federal penal or correctional institution when in the opinion of the Attorney General the additional land is essential for health or safety; \$21,730,000: *Provided*, That collections in cash for meals, laundry, barber service, uniform equipment, and any other items for which payment is made originally from appropriated funds may be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That there may be transferred to the Public Health Service such amounts as may be necessary, in the discretion of the Attorney General, for direct expenditure by that Service for medical relief for inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account, \$800,000, of which \$540,000 is for liquidation of authority granted under this head in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1950, to enter into contracts for replacement of a power plant at the United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas, and of which \$170,000 is for replacement of a power plant at the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia; and in addition, the Attorney General is authorized to enter into contracts and incur obligations in an amount not to exceed \$700,000 for completion of the latter project at a total cost not to exceed \$870,000: *Provided*, That labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed under this appropriation.

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For support of United States prisoners in non-Federal institutions and in the Territory of Alaska, including necessary clothing and medical aid, and payment of rewards for the apprehension, or for information leading to the recapture, of escaped prisoners; \$1,875,000.

OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Attorney General, or such officer as he may designate, is hereby authorized to pay out of any funds or other property or interest vested in him or transferred to him pursuant to or with respect to the Trading with the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.), necessary expenses incurred in carrying out the powers and duties conferred on the Attorney General pursuant to said Act: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$4,150,000 shall be available in the current fiscal year for the general administrative expenses of the Office of Alien

Property, including rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia; purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); personal services in the District of Columbia; and expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this authorization: *Provided further*, That on or before November 1 of the current fiscal year, the Attorney General shall make a report to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives giving detailed information on all administrative and nonadministrative expenses incurred during the next preceding fiscal year in connection with the activities of the Office of Alien Property: *Provided further*, That of the total amount herein authorized the amount of \$100,000 is to be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, general administration", Department of Justice.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

SEC. 202. Not to exceed \$350,000 in the aggregate from the appropriations made in this title for general administration, general legal activities, and United States attorneys and marshals shall be available, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, for compensation (not to exceed \$11,000 per annum) of special attorneys and special assistants to the Attorney General and to United States attorneys not otherwise provided for: *Provided*, That reports be submitted to the Congress on the 1st of July and January showing the names of the persons employed under the foregoing limitation, the annual rate of compensation or amount of any fee paid to each, together with a description of their duties.

SEC. 203. None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used to pay the compensation of any person hereafter employed as an attorney (except foreign counsel employed in special cases) unless such person shall be duly licensed and authorized to practice as an attorney under the laws of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

SEC. 204. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for the offices of the United States attorney and the United States marshal for the District of Columbia from all appropriations in this title shall be reimbursed to the United States from any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 205. Appropriations and authorizations made in this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 206. Appropriations and authorizations made in this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150).

SEC. 207. Appropriations and authorizations made in this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for printing and binding.

SEC. 208. Appropriations and authorizations made in this title which are available for expenses of attendance at meetings shall be expended for such purposes in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1951".

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary) including personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per diem; and teletype news service (not exceeding \$1,000); \$1,350,000.

Technical and scientific services: For necessary expenses in the performance of activities and services relating to the collection, compilation, and dissemination of technological information as an aid to business in the development of foreign and domestic commerce, including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed \$2,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and printing and binding, \$225,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized, upon request of any public or private organization or individual, to reproduce by appropriate process, independently or through any other agency of the Government, any scientific or technical report, document, or descriptive material, foreign or domestic, which has been released for public dissemination, and to sell such reproductions at a price not less than the estimated total cost of reproducing and disseminating same as may be determined by the Secretary, the moneys received from such sale to be deposited in a special account in the Treasury, such account to be available for reimbursing any appropriation which may have borne the expense of such reproduction and dissemination and making refunds to organizations and individuals when entitled thereto.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Salaries and expenses, age and citizenship certification: For expenses necessary for searching census records and supplying information incident to carrying out the provisions of the Social Security Act, and other statutory requirements with respect to age and citizenship certification, including personal services at the seat of government, travel, microfilm, printing and binding, and photographic supplies, \$109,000: *Provided*, That the procedure hereunder for the furnishing from census records of evidence for the establishment of age of individuals shall be pursuant to regulations approved jointly by the Secretary and the Social Security Administration.

Current census statistics: For expenses necessary for collecting, compiling, and publishing current census statistics provided for by law; enumerators at rates to be fixed without regard to the Classification Act; printing and binding; the cost of obtaining State, municipal, and other records; preparation of monographs on census subjects and other work of specialized character by contract; and purchase, construction, repair, and rental of mechanical and electrical tabulating equipment and other labor-saving devices; \$6,000,000, of which \$100,000 shall be available exclusively for vessel shipping statistics.

Seventeenth decennial census: For expenses necessary for taking, compiling, and publishing the seventeenth decennial census including

the census of housing as authorized by law (13 U. S. C. 201-219; Public Law 171, approved July 15, 1949), including personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and compensation of employees of the Department of Commerce and other departments and independent establishments of the Government who may be detailed for field work; \$28,500,000, to remain available until December 31, 1952, and to be merged with the appropriation made under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1950.

General administration, Bureau of the Census: For expenses necessary for general administration, and printing and binding, \$898,000.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), and other Acts incident to the enforcement of safety regulations; maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities and air traffic control; furnishing advisory service to States and other public and private agencies in connection with the construction or improvement of airports and landing areas; and the disposal of surplus airports; including personal services in the District of Columbia; hire of aircraft (not exceeding \$420,000); the operation and maintenance of eighty-five aircraft; printing and binding; contract stenographic reporting services; fees and mileage of expert and other witnesses; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; purchase (not to exceed ten, for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; and salaries and traveling expenses, together with tuition (not to exceed \$20,000) and other contractual expenses in connection therewith, of employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the Government or other organizations serving aviation; \$98,500,000, and the Departments of the Air Force, Army and Navy, are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Administration without charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, flight equipment, and hangar, line, and shop equipment surplus to the needs of such Departments: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, and other public authorities for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of airport traffic control towers.

Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For the acquisition and establishment by contract or purchase and hire of air-navigation facilities, including the equipment of additional civil airways for day and night flying; the construction of additional necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling and communicating structures and apparatus; the alteration and modernization of existing air-navigation facilities; the acquisition of the necessary sites by lease, condemnation or grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and

related accommodations for officers and employees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Weather Bureau stationed at remote localities not on foreign soil where such accommodations are not otherwise available; personal services in the District of Columbia; hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding; and not to exceed \$200,000 for emergency repairs and replacement of facilities damaged by fire, flood, or storm; \$27,500,000, of which \$22,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes; and, in addition, the Civil Aeronautics Administration is authorized to enter into contracts and incur obligations for purposes contained in this paragraph in an amount not exceeding \$16,000,000: *Provided*, That authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts for such purposes may be exercised until June 30, 1951: *Provided further*, That the consolidated appropriation under this head for the next preceding fiscal year is hereby consolidated with and made a part of this appropriation to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund: *Provided further*, That transfers may be made from this appropriation to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration," for costs of maintenance and operation of aircraft for initial flight checking of facilities established under this appropriation (not to exceed \$171,000); for necessary expenses in connection with the transportation by air to and from and within the Territories of the United States of materials and equipment secured under this appropriation (not to exceed \$115,000); and for necessary administrative costs (not to exceed \$389,000): *Provided further*, That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized during the current fiscal year to transfer without charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, air-navigation and communication facilities, including appurtenances thereto, to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Technical development and evaluation: For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), relative to such developmental work and service testing as tends to the creation of improved air-navigation facilities, including landing areas, aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, appliances, personnel, and operation methods, and personal services in the District of Columbia; acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; operation and maintenance of five aircraft, which shall be in addition to the number authorized herein under the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration"; and printing and binding; \$1,375,000.

Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport: For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, and protection of the Washington National Airport, including purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; printing and binding; not to exceed \$3,380 for the purchase, cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; \$1,300,000.

Construction, Washington National Airport: For an additional amount for construction at the Washington National Airport, including acquisition of an existing fuel system and necessary related facilities, \$540,000, to remain available until expended.

Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of May 13, 1946 (except

section 5 (a)), to be available until June 30, 1953, \$37,000,000, of which \$34,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes; and in addition, the Civil Aeronautics Administration is authorized until June 30, 1953, to enter into contracts and incur obligations for purposes of this paragraph in an amount not exceeding \$36,700,000, of which \$36,000,000 shall be for projects in the States in accordance with section 6 of said Act, \$500,000 for projects in Puerto Rico, \$150,000 for projects in the Territory of Hawaii, and \$50,000 for projects in the Virgin Islands: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated herein, \$3,000,000 shall be available as one fund for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses; including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed twenty-five for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and printing and binding; of which \$3,000,000 not to exceed \$600,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration", to provide for necessary administrative expenses, including the maintenance and operation of aircraft and printing and binding: *Provided further*, That the appropriation under this head for the next preceding fiscal year is hereby merged with this appropriation.

Construction of public airports, Territory of Alaska: For an additional amount for construction of public airports, Territory of Alaska, \$3,200,000, to remain available until expended for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority granted in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, to enter into contracts for such purpose.

Air navigation development: For expenses necessary for planning and developing a national system of aids to air navigation and air traffic control common to military and civil air navigation, including research, experimental investigations, purchase, and development, by contract or otherwise, of new types of air navigation aids (including plans, specifications, and drawings); personal services in the District of Columbia; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem; acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; payments in advance under contracts for research or development work; and not to exceed \$130,000 for administrative expenses, of which \$17,500 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration" for such expenses, including the maintenance and operation of aircraft; \$6,000,000, of which \$2,885,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes, and, in addition, the Civil Aeronautics Administration is authorized to enter into contracts and incur obligations for the purposes contained in this paragraph in an amount not exceeding \$2,250,000.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia; contract stenographic reporting services; employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; salaries and traveling expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of

training conducted by the Government or industries serving aviation; expenses of examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; and printing and binding; \$3,500,000: *Provided*, That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Board without charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, and accessories surplus to the needs of such Departments.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Salaries and expenses, departmental: For expenses necessary to carry out in the District of Columbia the provisions of the Act of August 6, 1947 (33 U. S. C. 883a-883i), including personal services; purchase of maps and nautical and aeronautical charts; maintenance of an instrument shop and procurement or exchange of metalworking and woodworking supplies and equipment; chart paper, drafting, photographic, photolithographic, and printing supplies and equipment; printing and binding; instruments (except surveying instruments); and stationery for field use; \$3,800,000.

Salaries and expenses, field: For expenses necessary to carry out in the field the provisions of the Act of August 6, 1947 (33 U. S. C. 883a-883i), including the operation and maintenance of ships and other field units; replacement of observatories and auxiliary buildings where necessary; purchase of plans and specifications of vessels; lease of sites where necessary and the erection of temporary magnetic and seismological buildings; hire of aircraft; operation, maintenance and repair of an airplane for photographic surveys; packing, crating, and transporting personal household effects of commissioned officers when transferred from one official station to another, and of commissioned officers who die on active duty, and funeral expenses of commissioned officers, as authorized by law; and extra compensation at not to exceed \$15 per month to each member of the crew of a vessel when assigned duties as bomber or fathometer reader or duties of a similar nature, and at not to exceed \$1 per day for each station to employees of other Federal agencies while observing tides or currents or tending seismographs; \$6,200,000: *Provided*, That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized during the current fiscal year to transfer to the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, landing craft, launches, marine engines, electronic equipment, automotive vehicles, parts, equipment, and supplies, excess to the needs of such Departments, which will serve to expedite surveys in Alaska for the national defense.

Pay, commissioned officers: For pay and allowances prescribed by law for not to exceed one hundred and seventy-one commissioned officers on the active list and of officers retired in accordance with existing law, including payment of six months' death gratuity as authorized by law, \$1,515,000.

The foregoing appropriations for the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and (not to exceed \$25,000) for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Departmental salaries and expenses: For personal services and other necessary expenses of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce at the seat of government, including printing and binding, the purchase of commercial and trade reports, and not to exceed \$50,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$5,150,000: *Provided*, That expenses of field studies or surveys conducted by departmental personnel of the Bureau shall be payable from the amount herein appropriated.

Field office service: For expenses necessary to operate and maintain regional, district, and cooperative branch offices for the collection and dissemination of information useful in the development and improvement of commerce throughout the United States and its possessions, including not to exceed \$90,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, and printing and binding, \$2,155,000.

Export control: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949 (Public Law 11, approved February 26, 1949), relating to export controls, including personal services in the District of Columbia and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals, and printing and binding, \$2,000,000, of which not to exceed \$828,000 may be transferred to the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, for enforcement of the export control program, and of which not to exceed \$40,000 may be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses" under the Office of the Secretary.

PATENT OFFICE

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$75 per diem (not to exceed \$25,000); expenses of transporting to foreign governments publications of patents issued by the Patent Office; defense of suits instituted against the Commissioner of Patents: travel; printing and binding; and other contingent expenses of the Patent Office: *Provided*, That the headings of the drawings for patented cases may be multigraphed in the Patent Office for the purpose of photolithography, \$11,500,000.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

General administrative expenses: For the employment of persons and means, including rent, advertising (including advertising in the city of Washington for work to be performed in areas adjacent thereto), printing and binding, purchase of periodicals, purchase of one hundred passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), and the preparation, distribution, and display of exhibits, in the city of Washington and elsewhere for the purpose of conducting research and investigational studies, either independently or in cooperation with State highway departments, or other agencies, including studies of highway administration, legislation, finance, economics, transport, construction, operation, maintenance, utilization, and safety, and of

street and highway traffic control; investigations and experiments in the best methods of road making, especially by the use of local materials; studies of types of mechanical plants and appliances used for road building and maintenance, and of methods of road repair and maintenance suited to the needs of different localities; for maintenance and repairs of experimental highways; for furnishing expert advice on these subjects; for collating, reporting, and illustrating the results of same; and for preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins and reports; to be paid from any moneys available from the administrative funds provided under the Act of July 11, 1916, as amended (23 U. S. C. 21), or as otherwise provided.

In carrying out the provisions of "An Act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes", as amended and supplemented (23 U. S. C. 1-117), none of the money appropriated for the work of the Bureau of Public Roads during the current fiscal year shall be paid to any State on account of any project on which convict labor shall be employed, except this provision shall not apply to convict labor performed by convicts on parole or probation: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, whenever performing authorized engineering or other services in connection with the survey, construction, and maintenance, or improvement of roads for other Government agencies, cooperating foreign countries and State cooperating agencies the charge for such services may include depreciation on engineering and road-building equipment used, and the amounts received on account of such charges shall be credited to the appropriation concerned: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year the appropriations for the work of the Bureau of Public Roads shall be available for meeting the expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment stored therein for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Bureau of Public Roads, and for sale and for distribution to other Government activities, cooperating foreign countries and State cooperating agencies, the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling) to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment are procured, from the appropriation chargeable with the cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment: *Provided further*, That the appropriations available to the Bureau of Public Roads may be used in emergency for medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of employees engaged on hazardous work under that Bureau, and for temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,000,000, to be derived from the administrative funds provided under the Act of July 11, 1916, as amended or supplemented (23 U. S. C. 21), shall be available until expended for continuing the construction of a laboratory, on a site already acquired, for permanent quarters for the testing and research work of the Bureau of Public Roads.

For all necessary expenses to enable the President to utilize the services of the Bureau of Public Roads in fulfilling the obligations

of the United States under the Convention on the Pan-American Highway Between the United States and Other American Republics, signed at Buenos Aires, December 23, 1936, and proclaimed September 16, 1937 (51 Stat. 152), for the continuation of cooperation with several governments, members of the Pan American Union, in connection with the survey and construction of the Inter-American Highway as provided in public resolution, approved March 4, 1929 (Public Resolution 104), as amended or supplemented, and for performing engineering service in pan-American countries for and upon the request of any agency or governmental corporation of the United States, \$100,000 to be derived from the administrative funds provided under the Act of July 11, 1916, as amended or supplemented (23 U. S. C. 21), or as otherwise provided.

Federal-aid postwar highways: For carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1944 and 1948 (58 Stat. 838; 62 Stat. 1105), to remain available until expended, \$385,000,000, which sum is composed of \$263,491,000, the remainder of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the third postwar fiscal year by section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 \$115,509,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1950 by section 1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, and \$1,828,050 and \$4,171,950, the latter sums being for reimbursement of the sums expended for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, or landslides, as provided by section 3 of the Act approved June 18, 1934, and section 7 of the Act approved July 13, 1943 (23 U. S. C. 13a and 13b).

Elimination of grade crossings: For the elimination of hazards to life at railroad grade crossings, including the separation or protection of grades at crossings, the reconstruction of existing railroad grade-crossing structures, and the relocation of highways to eliminate grade crossings, to remain available until expended, \$4,600,000, which sum is a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1943 by section 5 of the Act approved September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 869).

Forest highways: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), in accordance with section 3a of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1105), to remain available until expended, \$22,500,000, which sum is composed of \$4,900,000, the remainder of the amount authorized by section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 842) to be appropriated for the second postwar fiscal year and \$17,600,000, a part of the amount authorized by section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1950: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings and sites necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such item under this authorization shall not exceed \$15,000.

Access roads: During the current fiscal year, not to exceed \$70,000 of funds remaining unexpended upon completion of access road projects authorized to be constructed under the provisions of the Defense

Highway Act of 1941, as amended by the Act of July 2, 1942 (23 U. S. C. 106), shall be available for the maintenance of roads and bridges under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Public Roads on Government-owned land in Arlington County, Virginia.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (5 U. S. C. 591, 597; 15 U. S. C. 271-278), and Acts supplementary thereto affecting the functions of the Bureau and the functions set forth under the Bureau of Standards in the "Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1935", including personal services in the District of Columbia; rental of laboratories in the field; repairs and alterations to buildings and other plant facilities, and not to exceed \$700,000 for improvements to buildings, grounds, and other plant facilities including construction of minor buildings and other facilities in the District of Columbia and in the field to house special apparatus or material which must be isolated from other activities; building of temporary experimental structures; expenses of the visiting committee; demonstration of the results of the Bureau's work by exhibits or otherwise as may be deemed most effective; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards; printing and binding; not to exceed \$100,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and purchase of reprints from trade journals or other periodicals of articles prepared officially by Government employees, as follows:

Operation and administration: For the general operation and administration of the Bureau; improvement and care of the grounds; plant equipment; maintenance and protection of buildings, including repairs and alterations thereto; \$1,270,000.

Research and testing: For calibrating and certifying measuring instruments, apparatus, and standards in terms of the national standards; the preparation and distribution of standard materials; the testing of equipment, materials, and supplies in connection with Government purchases; the improvement of methods of testing; advisory services to governmental agencies on scientific and technical matters; the maintenance and development of national standards of measurement; the development of improved methods of measurement; the determination of physical constants and the properties of materials; the investigation of mechanisms and structures, including their economy, efficiency, and safety; the study of fluid resistance and the flow of fluids and heat; the investigation of radiation, radioactive substances, and X-rays; the development of methods of chemical analysis and synthesis, and the investigation of the properties of rare substances; investigations relating to the utilization of materials, including lubricants and liquid fuels; the study of new processes and methods of fabrication; the solutions of problems arising in connection with standards; cooperation with Government purchasing agencies, industries, and national organizations in developing specifications and facilitating their use; encouragement of the application of the latest developments in the utilization and standardization of building materials; the development of engineering and safety codes, simplified practice recommendations, and commercial standards

of quality and performance; and the compilation of and dissemination of scientific and technical data; \$4,300,000.

Radio propagation and standards: For development and maintenance of primary standards of measurement of electrical quantities at radio frequencies; calibrating and certifying radio measuring instruments, apparatus, and standards in terms of the national primary standards; investigation of the phenomena affecting the propagation of radio waves; the broadcasting of radio signals of standard frequency; the compilation and dissemination of scientific and technical data relating to the propagation of radio waves, and measurement of electrical quantities at radio frequencies: *Provided*, That for employees conducting observations on radio propagation phenomena in the Arctic region, the funds appropriated and the funds transferred or advanced from other Government agencies to the National Bureau of Standards shall be available for the appointment of such employees at base rates not in excess of \$5,000 per annum without regard to the civil service and classification laws and titles II and III of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945; and for the furnishing of food, shelter, and protective clothing and equipment, without repayment therefor, to employees of the Government assigned to Arctic stations; and the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to transfer without charge to the National Bureau of Standards materials, equipment, and supplies, surplus to their needs and necessary for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of Arctic ionosphere observation stations, \$3,000,000.

Construction of laboratories: For the acquisition of sites, the preparation of drawings and specifications, and the construction and equipping of a radio laboratory building and a guided missile laboratory building, together with necessary utilities and appurtenances, as authorized by Acts of October 25, 1949 (Public Laws 366 and 386), \$500,000, to remain available until expended; and, in addition, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to enter into contracts and to incur obligations for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed \$5,675,000.

WEATHER BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Weather Bureau, including personal services in the District of Columbia; maintenance and operation of aircraft; printing and binding; not to exceed \$25,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and not to exceed \$10,000 for maintenance of a printing office in the City of Washington, as authorized by law; not to exceed \$10,000 for the United States contribution to the cost of the secretariat of the International Meteorological Committee; \$24,897,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the maximum amount authorized under section 3 (a) of the Act of June 2, 1948 (Public Law 573), for extra compensation to employees of other Government agencies for taking and transmitting meteorological observations, shall be \$5 per day; and the maximum base rate of pay authorized under section 3 (b) of said Act, for employees conducting meteorological investigations in the Arctic region, shall be \$5,000 per annum, except that not more than five of such employees at any one

time may receive a base rate of \$7,500 per annum, and such employees may be appointed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SEC. 302. During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations and funds available to the Department of Commerce shall be available for the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949 (Public Law 390), to the extent and in the manner prescribed by said Act.

SEC. 303. The appropriations of the Department of Commerce available for salaries and expenses shall be available for health programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), and for the payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 304. Appropriations of the Department of Commerce available for salaries and expenses shall be available for attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the activities for which the appropriations are made.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1951".

TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES

For the Chief Justice and eight Associate Justices, and all other officers and employees, whose compensation shall be fixed by the Court, except as otherwise provided by law, and who may be employed and assigned by the Chief Justice to any office or work of the Court, \$915,000.

PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS

For printing and binding the advance opinions, preliminary prints, and bound reports of the Court, \$91,200.

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

For miscellaneous expenses to be expended as the Chief Justice may approve, \$52,100.

CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS

For such expenditures as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry out the duties imposed upon him by the Act approved May 7, 1934 (40 U. S. C. 13a-13d), including improvements, maintenance, repairs, equipment, supplies, materials, and appurtenances; special clothing for workmen; and personal and other services (including temporary labor without reference to the Classification and Retirement Acts, as amended), and for snow removal by hire of men and equipment or under contract without compliance with sections 3709, as amended, and 3744 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5, 16); \$159,200.

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges, and all other officers and employees of the court, and necessary expenses of the

court, including exchange of books, traveling expenses, and printing and binding, as may be approved by the chief judge, \$192,200.

CUSTOMS COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of the chief judge, eight judges, and all other officers and employees of the court, and necessary expenses of the court, including exchange of books, traveling expenses, and printing and binding, as may be approved by the chief judge, \$417,465: *Provided*, That traveling expenses of judges of the Customs Court shall be paid upon the written certificate of the judge.

COURT OF CLAIMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges, seven regular and six additional commissioners, and all other officers and employees of the court, and for other necessary expenses, including stenographic and other fees and charges necessary in the taking of testimony, travel, and printing and binding, \$575,000.

REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary repairs and improvements to the Court of Claims buildings, to be expended under the supervision of the Architect of the Capitol, \$10,700.

OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

HAWAII

For salaries of the chief justice and two associate justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, of judges of the circuit courts in Hawaii, and of judges retired under title 28, United States Code, section 373, \$106,500.

SALARIES OF JUDGES

For salaries of circuit judges; district judges (including judges of the district courts of Alaska, the Virgin Islands, and the Panama Canal Zone); and justices and judges retired or resigned under title 28, United States Code, sections 371, 372, and 373; \$5,095,000.

SALARIES OF CLERKS OF COURTS

For salaries of clerks of United States courts of appeals and United States district courts, their deputies, and other assistants, \$1,470,000.

PROBATION SYSTEM

For salaries of probation officers and their clerical assistants, as authorized by title 18, United States Code, sections 3654 and 3656, \$2,145,000: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to abridge the right of the district judges to appoint probation officers, or to make such orders as may be necessary to govern probation officers in their own courts: *Provided further*, That no

part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any probation officer who, in the judgment of the chief or presiding judge certified to the Attorney General, fails to carry out the official orders of the Attorney General with respect to supervising or furnishing information concerning any prisoner released conditionally or on parole from any Federal penal or correctional institution.

SALARIES OF CRIERS

For salaries of criers as authorized by title 28, United States Code, sections 713 (a) and 755, \$520,000.

FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

For fees of the United States commissioners and other committing magistrates acting under title 18, United States Code, section 3041, including fees and expenses of conciliation commissioners, United States courts, including the objects and subject to the conditions specified for such fees and expenses of conciliation commissioners in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1937, \$475,000.

FEES OF JURORS

For fees, expenses, and costs of jurors; meals and lodging for jurors in Alaska, as provided by section 193, title II, of the Act of June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 362); and compensation for jury commissioners; \$2,700,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of jury commissioners for the District of Columbia shall conform to the provisions of section 1401, title 11 of the District of Columbia Code, but such compensation shall not exceed \$250 each per annum.

MISCELLANEOUS SALARIES

For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, \$2,600,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, except that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the General Schedule grades (GS) 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, as the appointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk shall conform with that of the General Schedule grades (GS) 5, 7, 9, 11, or 12, as the appointing judge shall determine, subject to review by the judicial council of the circuit if requested by the Director, such determination by the judge otherwise to be final: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of step-increases corresponding with those provided for by title VII of the Classification Act of 1949 and of compensation paid for temporary assistance needed because of an emergency) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed \$9,600 per annum, except in the case of the chief judge of each circuit and the chief judge of each district court having five or more district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed \$13,050 per annum.

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

For miscellaneous expenses of the United States courts and their officers; rent in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; pur-

chase of firearms and ammunition; and purchase of envelopes without regard to the Act of June 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 476); \$675,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for payment of the cost of contract statistical services for the Office of Register of Wills of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the payment of fees to attorneys appointed in accordance with the Act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 625), not exceeding \$25 in any one case.

TRAVEL EXPENSES

For necessary traveling expenses, not otherwise provided for, incurred by the Judiciary, including traveling expenses of probation officers and their clerks, \$725,000: *Provided*, That this sum shall be available, in an amount not to exceed \$8,500, for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of Federal probation when incurred on the written authorization of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

SALARIES OF COURT REPORTERS

For salaries of court reporters for the district courts of the United States, as authorized by title 28, United States Code, section 753, \$972,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

For necessary expenses of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, including personal services in the District of Columbia, travel, printing and binding, advertising, rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and examination of estimates for appropriations in the field, \$520,000.

REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For repairs and improvements to the courthouse, including repair and maintenance of the mechanical equipment, and for labor and material and every item incident thereto, \$7,100, to be expended under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol.

REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For repairs and improvements to the United States Court of Appeals Building, including repair and maintenance of the mechanical equipment and for labor and material and every item incident thereto, \$6,200, to be expended under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol.

SALARIES OF REFEREES

For salaries of referees as authorized by the Act of June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68), \$879,000 to be derived from the referees' salary fund established in pursuance of said Act.

EXPENSES OF REFEREES

For miscellaneous expenses of referees, United States courts, including the salaries of their clerical assistants, travel, printing and bind-

ing, purchase of envelopes without regard to the Act of June 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 476), \$995,000 to be derived from the referees' expense fund established in pursuance of the Act of June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68 (c) (4)).

Any surplus arising in the referees' salary and expense funds for the fiscal years 1949 and 1950 shall remain available until June 30, 1951, for the payment of salaries and expenses of referees within the limitations prescribed hereinbefore.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE JUDICIARY

SEC. 402. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia from all appropriations under this title and 30 per centum of the expenditures for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia from all appropriations under this title shall be reimbursed to the United States from any funds in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 403. The reports of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall not be sold for a price exceeding that approved by the court and for not more than \$6.50 per volume.

This title may be cited as the "Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1951".

TITLE V—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

The following corporations, respectively, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for each such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated: Not to exceed \$327,000 of the funds of the Corporation shall be available for its administrative expenses, and not to exceed \$388,000 for the expenses of vocational training of prisoners, both amounts to be computed on an accrual basis and to be determined in accordance with the Corporation's prescribed accounting system in effect on July 1, 1946, and shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, expenditures which the said accounting system requires to be capitalized or charged to cost of commodities acquired or produced, including selling and shipping expenses, and expenses in connection with acquisition, construction, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of facilities and other property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Institute of Inter-American Affairs: Not to exceed \$600,000 of the funds available to the Corporation shall be available during the current fiscal year for its administrative expenses, including adminis-

trative services performed for the Corporation by other Government agencies.

This title may be cited as "Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, and The Institute of Inter-American Affairs Appropriation Act, 1951".

This chapter may be cited as the "Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER IV—TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES

For personal services in the District of Columbia, \$940,000.

DAMAGE CLAIMS

For payment of claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672), \$30,000.

HEALTH SERVICE PROGRAMS

For health service programs, as authorized by law, in the District of Columbia, \$80,000: *Provided*, That other appropriations in this title shall be available for such programs in the field.

OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

SALARIES

For personal services in the District of Columbia, \$340,000.

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

SALARIES

For personal services in the District of Columbia, including the operating force of the Treasury, Liberty Loan, and Auditors' buildings, and annexes thereof, \$1,185,000.

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of bureaus and offices of the Treasury Department, not otherwise provided for, including operation of the Treasury, Auditors', and Liberty Loan buildings and annexes thereof, purchase of uniforms for elevator operators, printing and binding and purchase of materials for the use of the bookbinder located in the Treasury Department; \$308,500.

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in the District of Columbia, including contract stenographic reporting services and printing and binding,

\$2,100,000: *Provided*, That Federal Reserve banks and branches may be reimbursed for printing and binding and other necessary expenses incident to the deposit of withheld taxes in Government depositories.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DIVISION OF DISBURSEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Division of Disbursement, including personal services in the District of Columbia, and printing and binding, \$10,750,000: *Provided*, That with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget there may be transferred or advanced to this appropriation from Railroad Retirement Board, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture", and from available corporate funds of Government owned or controlled corporations, such sums as may be necessary to cover the expense incurred in performing the function of disbursement therefor.

RELIEF OF THE INDIGENT, ALASKA

For relief of persons in Alaska (not to exceed 10 per centum of the receipts from licenses collected outside of incorporated towns in Alaska), as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 41), \$4,000.

GOVERNMENT LOSSES IN SHIPMENT

Fund for payment of Government losses in shipment (revolving fund): For the payment of losses in accordance with provisions of the Government Losses in Shipment Act, approved July 8, 1937 (50 Stat. 479-484), as amended, \$100,000.

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For necessary expenses connected with any public-debt operations authorized by the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 760-762), and with the administration of any public debt or currency issues of the United States with which the Secretary of the Treasury is charged, \$50,505,000, to be expended as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct, and the Secretary is authorized to accept services without compensation: *Provided*, That Federal Reserve banks and branches may be reimbursed for expenditures as fiscal agents of the United States on account of public-debt transactions for the account of the Secretary of the Treasury, and advances to the Postmaster General may be made in accordance with the provisions of section 22 (e) of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 757c (e)): *Provided further*, That the indefinite appropriation provided by section 10 of said Act, as amended, shall not be available for obligation during the current fiscal year.

DISTINCTIVE PAPER FOR UNITED STATES CURRENCY AND SECURITIES

For expenses necessary for distinctive paper for United States currency and securities, including personal services and allowance, in lieu of expenses, not to exceed \$50 per month each when actually on duty, of officers detailed from the Treasury Department, \$1,845,000: *Provided*, That in order to foster competition in the manufacture of distinctive paper for United States securities, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, in his discretion, to split the award for such

paper for the current fiscal year between the two bidders whose prices per pound are the lowest received after advertisement.

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Treasurer, including printing and binding, \$5,200,000: *Provided*, That with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, there may be transferred or advanced to this appropriation, from Railroad Retirement Board, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture", and from available corporate funds of Government owned or controlled corporations, such sums as may be necessary to cover the expenses incurred in the clearing of checks, servicing of bonds, handling of collections, and rendering of accounts therefor.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, PUBLIC MONEYS

For the collection, safekeeping, transfer, and disbursement of the public money and securities of the United States, \$475,000.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for collecting the revenue from customs, enforcement of navigation laws under section 102, Reorganization Plan Numbered III of 1946, and of other laws enforced by the Bureau of Customs, and the detection and prevention of frauds, including not to exceed \$100,000 for the securing of information and evidence; transportation and transfer of customs receipts from points where there are no Government depositories; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; not to exceed \$12,000 for maintenance and improvement of buildings and sites, acquired under the Act of June 26, 1930 (19 U. S. C. 68); printing and binding; purchase of one hundred passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expenses of seizure, custody, and disposal of property; arms and ammunition; not to exceed \$1,070,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia exclusive of ten persons from the field force authorized to be detailed under law (19 U. S. C. 1525); \$36,600,000.

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in assessment and collection of internal-revenue taxes; administration of the internal-revenue laws; discharge of functions imposed upon the Commissioner of Internal Revenue by or pursuant to other laws; investigations concerning the enrollment or disbarment of practitioners before the Treasury Department in internal-revenue matters; and acquisition, operation, maintenance, and repair of property under title III of the Liquor Law Repeal and Enforcement Act (40 U. S. C. 304f-m), including personal services in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere; expenses, when specifically

authorized by the Commissioner, of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with internal-revenue matters; purchase (not to exceed one hundred and thirty-four for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue; not to exceed \$1,500,000 for stationery; expenses of seizure, custody, and disposal of property; purchase of chemical analyses and expenses of testimony thereon; ammunition; securing of information and evidence; and not to exceed \$500,000 for detecting and bringing to trial persons guilty of violating the internal-revenue laws or conniving at the same, as authorized by law (26 U. S. C. 3792); \$245,547,500: *Provided*, That the amount for personal services in the District of Columbia shall not exceed \$17,800,000.

ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX ON RAILROADS IN ALASKA

For the payment to the Treasurer of Alaska of an amount equal to the tax of 1 per centum collected on the gross annual income of all railroad corporations doing business in Alaska, on business done in Alaska, which tax is in addition to the normal income tax collected from such corporations on net income, the amount of such additional tax to be applicable to general Territorial purposes, \$8,000.

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to enforce sections 2550-2565; 2567-2571; 2590-2603; 3220-3228; 3230-3238 of the Internal Revenue Code; the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 171-184); the Act of June 14, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 282-282c and 21 U. S. C. 197-198) and the Opium Poppy Control Act of 1942 (21 U. S. C. 188-188n), including personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of chemical analyses and testimony thereon; expenses of seizure, custody, and disposal of property; hire of passenger motor vehicles; arms and ammunition; not to exceed \$10,000 for the collection and dissemination of information and appeal for law observance and law enforcement, including cost of printing; securing of information and evidence; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services or information looking toward the apprehension of narcotic law violators who are fugitives from justice; \$1,850,000.

BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for engraving and printing (exclusive of repay work), United States currency and internal-revenue stamps, opium orders and special-tax stamps required under the Act of December 17, 1914 (26 U. S. C. 1040, 1383), checks, drafts, and miscellaneous work, including the Director, two Assistant Directors, and other personal services in the District of Columbia; wages of rotary

press plate printers at per diem rates and all other plate printers at piece rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, such rates not to exceed those usually paid for such work; engravers', printers', and other materials, including distinctive and nondistinctive paper not otherwise specifically provided for; purchase of card and continuous form checks; equipment of, repairs to, and maintenance of buildings and grounds and minor alterations to buildings; not to exceed \$500 for periodicals, examples of engraving and printing, including foreign securities and stamps, and books of reference; not to exceed \$1,500 for travel; printing and binding; and not to exceed \$15,000 for transfer to the Bureau of Standards for scientific investigations; \$16,835,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year proceeds derived from work performed by direction of the Secretary of the Treasury but not covered in this appropriation, instead of being covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts as provided by the Act of August 4, 1886 (31 U. S. C. 176), shall be credited to this appropriation.

SECRET SERVICE DIVISION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary in detecting, arresting, and delivering into other custody dealers and pretended dealers in counterfeit money, persons engaged in counterfeiting, forging, and altering United States notes, bonds, national bank notes, Federal Reserve notes, Federal Reserve bank notes, and other obligations and securities of the United States and of foreign governments (including endorsements thereon and assignments thereof), as well as the coins of the United States and of foreign governments, and persons committing other crimes against the laws of the United States relating to the Treasury Department and the several branches of the public service under its control, and for the protection of the person of the President and the members of his immediate family and of the person chosen to be President of the United States, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed fifteen) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding; arms and ammunition; and not to exceed \$15,000, with the approval of the Chief of the Secret Service, for services or information looking toward the apprehension of criminals; \$2,150,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, WHITE HOUSE POLICE

For necessary expenses, including personal services, uniforms and equipment, and arms and ammunition, purchases to be made in such manner as the President may determine, \$418,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GUARD FORCE

For necessary expenses of the guard force for Treasury Department buildings in the District of Columbia, including the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and elsewhere, including purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; and arms and ammunition; \$700,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$200,000 of the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Engraving and Printing", may be advanced to

this appropriation to cover service rendered such Bureau which is not covered in the direct appropriations for such Bureau: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may detail two agents of the Secret Service to supervise such force.

CONTRIBUTION FOR ANNUITY BENEFITS

For reimbursement to the District of Columbia on a monthly basis for benefit payments made from the revenues of the District of Columbia to members of the White House Police force and such members of the United States Secret Service Division as are entitled thereto under the Act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1118), to the extent that such benefit payments are in excess of the salary deductions of such members credited to said revenues of the District of Columbia during the current fiscal year, pursuant to section 12 of the Act of September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 718), as amended, such amounts as hereafter may be necessary.

BUREAU OF THE MINT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses at the mints at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, San Francisco, California, and Denver, Colorado; the assay offices at New York, New York, and Seattle, Washington; the bullion depositories at Fort Knox, Kentucky, and West Point, New York; and the Office of the Director of the Mint, and for carrying out the provisions of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 and the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, arms and ammunition, purchase and maintenance of uniforms and accessories for guards, cases and enameling for medals manufactured, net wastage in melting and refining and in coining departments, loss on sale of sweeps arising from the treatment of bullion and the manufacture of coins, not to exceed \$1,000 for the expenses of the annual assay commission, and not to exceed \$1,000 for acquisition, at the dollar face amount or otherwise, of specimen and rare coins, including United States and foreign gold coins and pieces of gold used as, or in lieu of, money, and ores for addition to the Government's collection; \$3,800,000.

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for, including personal services at the seat of government; pay and allowances, as authorized by law, for commissioned officers, cadets, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel, on active duty; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); printing and binding; purchase of not to exceed 66 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; maintenance, operation, and repair of aircraft; not to exceed \$190,000 for recreation, amusement, comfort, and contentment of enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard, to be expended pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary; and examinations of estimates of appropriations in the field; \$136,000,000: *Provided*, That the number of aircraft on hand at any one time shall not exceed one hundred and ten

exclusive of planes and parts stored to meet future attrition: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be available for expenses of Reserve training, including pay and allowances of Regular and Reserve personnel on active duty engaged primarily in administration of the Reserve training program, and including drill pay at rates not to exceed those prescribed by or pursuant to law for the Naval Reserve: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any enlisted man of the Coast Guard while detailed for duty at Coast Guard headquarters if such detail increases above thirty the total number of enlisted men so detailed to duty at such time: *Provided further*, That (a) the unobligated balances of appropriations to the Coast Guard for the fiscal years 1949 and 1950 for "Salaries, Office of the Commandant," "Pay and allowances," "General expenses," and "Civilian employees" shall be transferred on July 1, 1950, to the account established by the Surplus Fund-Certified Claims Act of 1949 for payment of certified claims; (b) amounts equal to the unliquidated obligations against such prior year appropriations on July 1, 1950, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation, and such merged appropriation shall be available as one fund, except for accounting purposes of the Coast Guard, for the payment of obligations properly incurred against such prior year appropriations and against this appropriation, but on July 1, 1951, there shall be transferred from such merged appropriation to the appropriation for payment of certified claims (1) any remaining unexpended balance of the 1949 appropriations so transferred, and (2) any remaining unexpended balance of the 1950 appropriations so transferred which is in excess of the obligations then remaining unliquidated against such appropriations.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For establishing and improving aids to navigation; the purchase or construction of additional and replacement vessels and their equipment; the purchase of aircraft and their equipment; the construction, rebuilding, or extension of shore facilities, including the acquisition of sites and improvements thereon when specifically approved by the Secretary; and for expenditures directly relating thereto, including personal services at the seat of government; \$17,000,000, to remain available until expended.

RETIRED PAY

For retired pay for commissioned officers, warrant officers, enlisted personnel, for certain members of the former Life Saving Service authorized by the Act approved April 14, 1930 (14 U. S. C. 431b), and for certain officers and employees entitled thereto by virtue of former employment in the Lighthouse Service engaged in the field service or on vessels of the Coast Guard except persons continuously employed in district offices and shops (33 U. S. C. 763, 765), \$15,575,000.

This title may be cited as the "Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1951".

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

For administration and operation of the Post Office Department and the postal service, there is hereby appropriated the aggregate amount

of postal revenues for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 380; 39 U. S. C. 786), together with an amount from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, equal to the difference between such revenues and the total of the appropriations hereinafter specified and the sum needed may be advanced to the Post Office Department upon requisition of the Postmaster General, for the following purposes, namely:

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

For expenses necessary for general administration of the postal service, operation of the inspection service, and the conduct of a research and development program, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); a health service program as authorized by law; \$250,000 to be available exclusively for procurement by contract of things and services related to design, development, and construction of equipment used in postal operations, and for contracts for management studies; rewards for information and services concerning violations of postal laws and regulations, current and prior fiscal years, in accordance with regulations of the Postmaster General in effect at the time the services are rendered or information furnished; and expenses of delegates designated by the Postmaster General to attend meetings and conventions for the purpose of making postal arrangements with foreign governments pursuant to law; \$16,000,000: *Provided*, That expenses of delegates provided for herein, and not to exceed \$20,000 for rewards as provided for herein, shall be paid in the discretion of the Postmaster General and accounted for solely on his certificate.

POSTAL OPERATIONS

For expenses necessary for postal operations, not otherwise provided for, and for other activities conducted by the Post Office Department pursuant to law, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding; a health service program as authorized by law; \$500,000 to be available exclusively for manufacture and procurement of improved devices for postal operations and other activities; \$7,013,000 to be available exclusively for the purchase of trucks, tractors, and trailers; leasing of space, not exceeding a term of ten years, for the storage and care of vehicles and repair of vehicles owned by, or under control of, units of the National Guard and departments and agencies of the Federal Government where repairs are made necessary because of utilization of such vehicles in the postal service; \$1,786,000,000.

TRANSPORTATION OF MAILS

For payments for transportation of domestic and foreign mails by air, land, and water transportation facilities, including current and prior fiscal years settlements with foreign countries for handling of mail; and for expenses, exclusive of personal services, necessary for operation of Government-owned highway post office transportation service; \$400,000,000.

CLAIMS

For settlement of claims, pursuant to law, current and prior fiscal years, for damages (28 U. S. C. 2672; 31 U. S. C. 224c); losses resulting from unavoidable casualty (39 U. S. C. 49); loss of or damage to mail, and failure to remit collect-on-delivery charges (5 U. S. C. 372; 39 U. S. C. 244, 245a, 245b, 245d, 381, 382, 387); and domestic money orders more than one year old (31 U. S. C. 725k); \$5,500,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 202. Appropriations made in this title for general administration and for postal operations shall be available for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field.

SEC. 203. Appropriations made in this title, except those for payment of claims, shall be available for expenditures in connection with accident prevention.

SEC. 204. The Postmaster General may authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners at such rates as he determines to be fair and reasonable.

This title may be cited as the "Post Office Department Appropriation Act, 1951".

TITLE III—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies, respectively, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for each such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Not to exceed \$965,000 (to be on an accrual basis) of the funds of the Export-Import Bank of Washington shall be available during the current fiscal year for all administrative expenses of the bank, including health-service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), and not to exceed \$5,000 for temporary services, as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided*, That necessary expenses (including special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the bank or in which it has an interest including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, or the investigation or appraisal of any property in respect to which an application for a loan has been made, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Not to exceed \$26,000,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be available

during the current fiscal year for its administrative expenses and the administrative expenses of the Federal National Mortgage Association; purchase (not to exceed twenty for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); use of the services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks: *Provided*, That as used herein the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to include all salaries and wages, services performed on a contract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including the purchases of equipment and supplies, of administrative offices: *Provided further*, That the limiting amount heretofore stated for administrative expenses shall be increased by an amount which does not exceed the aggregate cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside the continental United States; the expenses of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with termination of contracts or in the performance of legal services; and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies: *Provided further*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Corporation shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

This chapter may be cited as the "Treasury-Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER V—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; teletype news service; and payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; \$1,382,000.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$1,861,000.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards: For expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; performance of the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)); and not to exceed \$75,000 for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as authorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of reports and of material for informational exhibits; \$714,000.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights:

For expenses necessary to render assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights of veterans under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 308), the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as amended, and section 9 (h) of title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C., App. 459 (h)), and, under the Act of June 23, 1943, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 1472), of persons who have performed service in the Merchant Marine, including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$281,000.

BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging apprentice training, as authorized by the Act of August 16, 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50), including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$2,788,000.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including personal services in the District of Columbia; temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; for cooperation with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements relating to the employment of foreign agricultural workers, subject to the immigration laws and when necessary to supplement the domestic labor force; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$5,531,000, of which \$1,587,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: For grants to the several States (including Alaska and Hawaii) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49-491), for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment and the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, and for necessary expenses in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of Columbia and for use in carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in Puerto Rico, \$178,500,000, of which \$8,500,000 shall be available only to the extent that the Secretary finds necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from changes in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or salary costs over those upon which the State's basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia or Puerto Rico) was based, which increased costs of administration cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments: *Provided*, That no State shall be required to make any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of said Act of June 6, 1933, prior to July 1, 1952: *Provided further*, That,

notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in section 5 (a) or section 6 of the Act of June 6, 1933, or in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State found to be in compliance with the requirements of the Act of June 6, 1933, and with the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its unemployment compensation law and of its public employment offices: *Provided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Department of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail matter in connection with the administration of unemployment compensation systems and employment services by States receiving grants herefrom.

In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6, 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall apply.

None of the funds appropriated by this title to the Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year payments to States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered; personal services in the District of Columbia; and not to exceed \$15,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$5,720,700.

Revision of consumers' price index: For expenses necessary to enable the Bureau to revise the Consumers' Price Index, including personal services in the District of Columbia; temporary employees at rates to be fixed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service and classification laws and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$2,000,000.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including personal services in the District of Columbia and purchase of reports and material for informational exhibits; \$399,000.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for performing the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1936 (41 U. S. C. 38), including personal services in the District of Columbia; reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered; and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Wage and Hour Division; \$9,396,400.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

SEC. 103. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

SEC. 104. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 105. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for printing and binding.

SEC. 106. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation in this title may be transferred to any other such appropriation but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfer: *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for creation of new functions within the Department.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1951".

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$115,000.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed \$49,600 for the Employees' Compensation Board of Appeals; \$1,935,000, together with not to exceed \$119,000 to be derived from the War Claims Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of compensation and other benefits and expenses (except administrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing during the current or any prior fiscal year, including payments to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital services pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation; continuation of payment of benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in third-party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital services and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial expenses, including transportation and other expenses incidental to such services, treatment, and burial, for such enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital services and treatment at Government expense on June 30, 1943, and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian employees of the United States, and the limitations and authority of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 796), shall apply in providing such services, treatment, and expenses in such cases; \$25,000,000, together with not to exceed \$5,000,000 to be derived from the War Claims Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012) and to be available for payments pursuant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of such Act, which amounts may be accounted for as one fund.

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Columbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements, \$368,200.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392); the Tea Importation Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50); the Import Milk Act (21 U. S. C. 141-149); the Federal Caustic Poison Act (15 U. S. C. 401-411); and the Filled Milk Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64); including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of not to exceed forty-five passenger motor vehicles, of which seventeen shall be for replacement only; reporting and illustrating the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for payment in advance for special tests and analyses by contract; and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement operations; \$5,466,700.

Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services: For expenses necessary for the certification or inspection of certain products in accordance with sections 406, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346, 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of the advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover payment of fees by applicants for certification or inspection of such products, to remain available until expended. The total amount herein appropriated shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia and

elsewhere; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; and the refund of advance deposits for which no service has been rendered.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance, including repairs; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard University" for salaries of technical and professional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of Howard University for instruction of nurses and actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such university; \$2,600,000: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Howard University, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, \$2,500,000.

Plans and specifications: For the preparation of plans and specifications for construction, under the supervision of the General Services Administration, on the grounds of Howard University of a pre-clinical medical building, including engineering and architectural services, printing and binding, advertising, and travel, \$100,000, which amount, except such part as may be necessary for the incidental expenses of the University, may be transferred to the General Services Administration for the above purposes, to remain available until expended.

Construction of buildings: For construction of buildings on the grounds of Howard University, under the supervision of the General Services Administration, to remain available until expended, as follows:

For payment of obligations incurred under authority provided under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1950, for construction of a law school building, biology building and greenhouse, administration building, and men's dormitory units, \$1,250,000;

For payment of obligations incurred under authority provided under this head in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, as amended by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, to enter into contracts for construction of an engineering building and women's dormitory units, \$412,000.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), and section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), \$19,977,760: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States

under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$19,842,760 for the current fiscal year.

Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 329), \$2,480,000.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of public and school library service; coordination of library service on the national level with other forms of adult education; developing library participation in Federal projects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and the development of library service throughout the country; personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education, and repairing the same; \$1,971,500, of which not less than \$533,700 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized: *Provided*, That all receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reimbursement for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of Education performing advisory functions to said agencies shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of this appropriation.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C. ch. 4), including payments, in accordance with regulations of the Administrator, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accordance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be controlled by the State agency, \$20,600,000, of which not to exceed \$170,000 shall be available to the Federal Security Administrator for providing rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District of Columbia, as authorized by section 6 of said Act, which latter amount shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with providing such services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, including the purchase of reprints, and travel: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15 per centum of the appropriation shall be used for administrative purposes.

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (including the objects specified in the preceding paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed \$3,000 for production, purchase, and distribution of educational films; \$705,000.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and other Acts, including (with the exception of the appropriation "Pay, and so forth, commissioned officers, Public Health Service") personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of reports, documents, and other material for publication; preparation and display of posters and exhibits by contract or otherwise; packing, unpacking, crating, uncrating, drayage, and transportation of personal effects of commissioned officers and transportation of their dependents on change of station; and increased allowances to Reserve Officers for foreign service; as follows:

Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases, including the operation and maintenance of centers for the diagnosis, treatment, support, and clothing of persons afflicted with venereal diseases; transportation and subsistence of such persons and their attendants to and from the place of treatment or allowance in lieu thereof; diagnosis and treatment (including emergency treatment for other illnesses) of such persons through contracts with physicians and hospitals and other appropriate institutions; fees for case finding and referral to such centers of voluntary patients; reasonable expenses of preparing remains or burial of deceased patients; recreational supplies and equipment; leasing of facilities and repair and alteration of leased facilities; the purchase of not to exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and for grants of money, services, supplies, equipment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the Act, and with the approval of the respective State health authorities, to counties, health districts, and other political subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon General may determine; \$14,500,000.

Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314 (b) of the Act, including the purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles, \$9,800,000.

Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes of section 314 (c) of the Act; to provide consultative services to States pursuant to section 311 of the Act; to make field investigations and demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the Act; and to provide for collecting and compiling mortality, morbidity, and vital statistics (including procurement by contract of transcripts of State, municipal, and other records), including the purchase of not to exceed fourteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$16,915,000.

Communicable diseases: To carry out those provisions of sections 301, 311, 361, and 704 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression of communicable diseases, and the interstate transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase of not to exceed twenty

passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$6,415,000.

Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out those provisions of sections 301, 311, and 361 of the Act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environmental health, including enforcement of applicable quarantine laws and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carrying out the functions of the Surgeon General under the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466-466 (j)), including purchase of not to exceed twenty-one passenger motor vehicles, of which seven shall be for replacement only; \$3,670,030.

Grants, water pollution control: For grants to carry out section 8 (a) of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466-466 (j)), \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct, in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases, and the establishment and maintenance of health and sanitation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361, 363, and 704 of the Act, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, and hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft, \$1,259,000: *Provided*, That property of the Public Health Service located in Alaska and used in carrying out the activities herein authorized may be transferred, without reimbursement, to the Territory of Alaska at the discretion of the Surgeon General.

Grants for hospital construction: For liquidation of contractual obligations authorized by the Congress to be incurred during the fiscal year 1948 or any subsequent fiscal year for construction grants under part C, title VI, of the Act, as amended, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended. Allotments under such part C to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of \$150,000,000. Whenever the Surgeon General shall have approved an application for a construction project in accordance with section 625 of the Act, subject to the amount of the allotments available to the States for such purposes, the Federal share of the cost of such project, as provided by the Act, shall constitute a contractual obligation of the Federal Government.

Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services: For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI of the Act, as amended, including the purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$1,357,000.

Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the purposes of sections 321, 322, 324, 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the Act, and Executive Order 9079 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock; purchase of not to exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles, including ten ambulances, for replacement only; and firearms and ammunition; \$29,000,000.

Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the purposes of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to preventing the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign countries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance with section 325 of the Act, and the care

and treatment of quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of the Public Health Service are not available, including insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; and the purchase of not to exceed ten passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$3,104,000.

Employee health service programs: For carrying out the functions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), \$50,000: *Provided*, That when the Public Health Service, at the request of any department or agency of the Government, establishes or operates a health service program for such department or agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made in advance by check for deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not otherwise provided for, including research fellowships and grants for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; the regulation and preparation of biologic products; the purchase of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General; and erection of temporary structures for storage of equipment and supplies and housing of animals, \$15,750,000, of which not less than \$3,600,000 shall be available exclusively for grants for studies with adrenocorticotrophic hormone (ACTH) and cortisone (compound E), including grants of adrenocorticotrophic hormone (ACTH), cortisone, and other chemical substances, and for development of other related compounds for treatment of arthritis, rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, neurological and metabolic diseases, and including studies in the basic sciences related to such diseases and including \$200,000 for transfer to the Department of Agriculture for research into utilization of plant material and vegetable sources of cortisone.

National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon General, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer by providing consultative services, demonstrations, and grants-in-aid; for the purchase of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of the Act, \$20,686,000, of which not less than \$5,000,000 shall be available exclusively for payment of obligations for research and training grants incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head.

Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311, 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases, \$10,000,000, of which not less than \$2,375,000 shall be available exclusively for payment of obligations for research and training grants incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head.

National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act, including the purchase of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles, \$14,750,000, of which \$5,350,000 shall be available exclusively for payment of obligations for research

and training grants incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head.

Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental diseases and conditions, including the purchase of twelve passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$2,090,000.

Construction of research facilities: For construction of research facilities, to be transferred (except such part as may be necessary for incidental expenses and purchase of equipment by the Public Health Service) to the General Services Administration, and to remain available until expended, as follows:

For payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction of a combined hospital and research building as authorized under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Acts of 1949 and 1950, \$7,500,000.

For payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction of auxiliary service area structures, as authorized under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1950, \$3,600,000.

For construction of additional auxiliary structures to provide station quarters for personnel and a grounds maintenance building, including necessary distribution facilities and roads and walks, \$1,025,000; and in addition, contracts may be entered into an amount not to exceed \$350,000 toward completion of such construction at a cost not to exceed \$1,375,000: *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe not to exceed twenty-five thousand square feet of land presently included in the site of the National Institutes of Health to the Bethesda Fire Department, a body corporate of the State of Maryland, for the purpose of erecting and maintaining a fire station to provide protection for the facilities of the National Institutes of Health and for the adjacent community: *Provided further*, That such terms and conditions may include an agreement by the Surgeon General to pay to such department on behalf of the United States $33\frac{1}{3}$ per centum of the cost of the construction of the station but not to exceed \$20,000, to be charged to the maximum limits of costs set out in this paragraph.

For purchase and installation of additional equipment and furnishings to partially equip and furnish structures heretofore or herein provided under this head (except structures for station quarters), \$3,000,000.

Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth: For pay, uniforms and subsistence allowances, increased allowances for foreign service and commutation of quarters for not to exceed one thousand five hundred regular active commissioned officers; for medals, decorations, and retired pay of regular and reserve commissioned officers; for payment of claims for private property lost, destroyed, captured, abandoned, or damaged in the military service of the United States, as authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 222c, h; 42 U. S. C. 213); and for six months' death gratuity pay and burial payments for regular commissioned officers; \$1,790,000, and the Surgeon General is authorized to advance to this appropriation from appropriations made avail-

able to the Public Health Service for the current fiscal year such additional amounts as may be necessary for pay and allowances of the officers herein authorized.

Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous expenses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for elsewhere, including conducting research on technical nursing standards and furnishing consultative nursing services; preparing information, articles, and publications related to public health; conducting studies and demonstrations in public health methods; carrying on international health activities, including not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifically authorized by the Surgeon General; and purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; \$2,918,000.

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of the hospital, including purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles, including one bus-ambulance, for replacement only, clothing for patients and cooperation with organizations or individuals in scientific research into the nature, causes, prevention, and treatment of mental illness, \$2,005,000.

Construction and equipment, building for the housing, care, and treatment of mentally sick patients: For payment of obligations incurred under authority provided in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1949, for completion of a building for the housing, care, and treatment of mentally sick patients, Saint Elizabeths Hospital, \$100,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be transferred to the General Services Administration.

Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds: For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including preparation of plans and specifications, advertising, and supervision of construction, \$406,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be transferred to the General Services Administration.

Construction and equipment of treatment building: For construction and equipment, including administrative expenses, of a treatment building (providing separate male and female facilities), and demolition and removal of those buildings designated as Oaks and Toner Buildings with their appurtenances and attachments, within the grounds of Saint Elizabeths Hospital, \$1,500,000, to remain available until expended; and, in addition, contracts may be entered into in an amount not to exceed \$3,938,000 toward completion of such work at a total cost not to exceed \$5,588,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1950, for preparation of plans and specifications for two treatment buildings, shall be consolidated with this appropriation, to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund which shall be available for all of the foregoing purposes, and any part of such consolidated appropriation may be transferred to the General Services Administration.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions: For expenses necessary for the supervision of Federal credit unions, including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$250,000, together with the aggregate of amounts received from certificate, supervision, and examination fees collected from Federal credit unions as authorized by law.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equipment used by building guards; not more than \$45,988,000 may be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, of which not more than \$404 shall be available for payment in advance when authorized by the Federal Security Administrator for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public: *Provided*, That any sums received by the Administrator as payment for services performed for any department or agency of the Government by persons whose salaries are paid from the amount made available under this paragraph shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation for the fiscal year in which such sums are received, and shall be available for the same purposes.

Reimbursement to Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund: For reimbursement to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund for benefits paid during the fiscal year 1949 to the survivors of veterans of World War II eligible for benefits as provided under section 210 of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 410), \$3,694,000.

Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind as authorized in titles I, IV, and X of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. I, IV, and X), \$1,200,000,000, of which such amount as may be necessary shall be available for grants for any period in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance, including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$1,413,400.

Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as amended (29 U. S. C. 18a), and title V of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), including personal services in the District of Columbia and purchase of reports and material for the publications of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution, \$1,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry out any instruction, order, or regulation relating to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*, That any State plan which provides standards

for professional obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State shall be approved.

Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For grants to States for maternal and child-health services, services for crippled children, and child-welfare services as authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), \$22,000,000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not be included in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or estimated to be expended by the State.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner for Social Security, including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$223,000, together with not to exceed \$112,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States under titles I, IV, V, and X, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

In the administration of titles I, IV, V, and X, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, payments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter in the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to a State plan approved under such title prior to or during such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which such plan was submitted for approval.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries, Office of the Administrator: Salaries, Office of the Administrator, including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$2,383,100, together with not to exceed \$334,900 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That the Administrator may advance to this appropriation from appropriations of constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency such sums as may be necessary to finance the regional office activities of such constituent organizations.

Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Administrator, including personal services in the District of Columbia for the Division of Service Operations, \$1,090,000, together with not to exceed \$165,600 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That the Administrator may advance to this appropriation from appropriations of constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency such sums as may be necessary to cover the charges for services, supplies, equipment and materials furnished.

Salaries, Office of the General Counsel: Salaries, Office of the General Counsel, including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$523,100, together with not to exceed \$22,950 to be transferred from

the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services", and not to exceed \$321,100 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, relating to disposal of real and personal excess property for educational purposes and protection of public health, including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$333,300.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field, for exchange of books.

SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), and such amounts as may be necessary may be transferred to the appropriations of the organizational units operating such programs.

SEC. 205. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for printing and binding, including the purchase of reprints.

SEC. 206. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

SEC. 207. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

SEC. 208. None of the funds appropriated by this title to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

This title may be cited as the "Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1951".

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including personal services in the District of Columbia; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the General

Counsel; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); and a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); \$8,582,500: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1060).

This title may be cited as the "National Labor Relations Board Appropriation Act, 1951".

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Mediation Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, and stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$412,200.

Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses necessary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157), and emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant to section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including printing and binding, and stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$150,000.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Railroad Adjustment Board, including printing and binding, and stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$797,300, of which not less than \$296,700, shall be available for compensation (at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

This title may be cited as the "National Mediation Board Appropriation Act, 1951".

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust fund): For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by the Board; printing and binding; stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); \$5,446,000, to be derived from the railroad retirement account.

Railroad retirement account: For an amount sufficient as an annual premium for the payments required under the Railroad Retirement

Acts of August 29, 1935, and June 24, 1937, and authorized to be appropriated to the railroad retirement account established under section 15 (a) of the latter Act, \$457,832,724: *Provided*, That such total amount shall be available until expended for making payments required under said retirement Acts, and the amount not required for current payments shall be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of said Railroad Retirement Act of June 24, 1937.

This title may be cited as the "Railroad Retirement Board Appropriation Act, 1951".

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171–180, 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial relations; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); \$2,949,700.

Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay necessary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176–180, 182), including printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and rent in the District of Columbia, \$50,000.

This title may be cited as the "Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1951".

This chapter may be cited as the "Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

TITLE I

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

To enable the Secretary to improve and develop, independently or through cooperation among Federal and State agencies, and others, a sound and efficient system for the distribution and marketing of agricultural products under the provisions of title II of the Act of August 14, 1946, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1621–1629), including the objects for which funds are available for titles II and III of such Act of August 14, 1946, \$6,000,000: *Provided*, That not less than \$650,000 of this amount shall be available for contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 205 of said Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be

necessary to carry out the functions for which it is made (but amounts made available to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Solicitor, and Office of Information, shall not exceed those which the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine), and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to other appropriation items of the Department: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work relating to fish or shellfish or any product thereof, except for the support of equitable transportation rates before Federal agencies concerned with such rates and for development of foreign markets.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act establishing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (5 U. S. C. 673) and related Acts, as follows:

Economic investigations: For conducting investigations and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, costs, prices and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, \$2,600,000: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Economic investigations" shall be used for State and county land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices.

Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton, stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and value of livestock and livestock products on farms, production, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), and for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as provided by the Act approved June 24, 1936, as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951-957), \$2,904,000: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton, or for estimates of apple production for other than the commercial crop.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, travel and subsistence expenses of advisory committees authorized by title III of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1628-1629), and the maintenance, oper-

ation, and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Research Center, \$600,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation current at the time services are rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including handling and other related services, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies, equipment, and material furnished: *Provided further*, That of the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration, not to exceed \$15,000 shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration shall be available for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided, however*, That unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses) shall not exceed \$5,000, the total amount for construction of buildings costing more than \$2,500 each shall be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed \$2,500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Research Administrator, whichever is greater.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

For the establishment of a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for furnishing facilities and services by the Agricultural Research Center to Government agencies, \$300,000. Said fund shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations or other funds to cover the charges for such facilities and services, including handling and related charges, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs), for supplies, equipment and materials, stores of which may be maintained at the Center, and for building construction, alterations, and repair, and applicable appropriations or other funds may also be charged their proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the Center not covered by the annual appropriation.

RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out his responsibilities under section 7 (b) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946 (50 U. S. C. 98f), \$399,000, including not to exceed \$30,000 for alterations at the Eastern Regional Research Laboratory, Wyndmoor, Pennsylvania, to provide pilot plant facilities for tannin extraction, and such amount shall be in addition to amounts otherwise available for alterations.

RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS OF ALASKA

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct research into the basic agricultural needs and problems of the Territory of Alaska, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, independently or in cooperation with appropriate agencies of the Territory of Alaska, \$280,000.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico to be paid quarterly in advance where applicable, to carry into effect the provisions of the following Acts relating to agricultural experiment stations:

Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Hatch Act, the Act approved March 2, 1887 (7 U. S. C. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377-379), \$720,000; Adams Act, the Act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), \$720,000; Purnell Act, the Act approved February 24, 1925 (7 U. S. C. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373-376, 380, 382), \$2,880,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427-427g), sections 3 and 5, \$2,863,708, and sections 9 and 11 of said Act as added by the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427h, 427j), including administration by the Office of Experiment Stations in the United States Department of Agriculture, \$5,000,000, no part of which latter amount shall be used for beginning construction of any building costing in excess of \$15,000, except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University at a cost to this appropriation of not to exceed \$29,000; Hawaii, the Act approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386-386b), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii, \$90,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Hatch Act to the Territory of Alaska, \$15,000, and the provisions of section 2 of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), extending the benefits of the Adams and Purnell Acts to the Territory of Alaska, \$37,500; Puerto Rico, the Act approved March 4, 1931, as amended (7 U. S. C. 386d-386f), extending the benefits of certain Acts of Congress to Puerto Rico, \$90,000; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, \$12,416,208.

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in connection with administration of grants and coordination of research with States, to carry out the provisions of the Acts approved March 2, 1887, March 16, 1906, February 24, 1925, May 16, 1928, February 23, 1929, March 4, 1931, and June 20, 1936, and Acts amendatory thereto (7 U. S. C. 361-363, 365-383, 386-386f), and title I of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 427-427g), relative to their administration and for the administration of an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, \$237,500; and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above Acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said Acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress.

Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico

For expenses necessary to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and not to exceed

\$24,950 to replace water supply line and increase capacity of reservoir, \$175,000.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in connection with conducting investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, and such economic investigations, including housing and household buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home, for coordinating nutrition services made available by Federal, State, and other agencies, and for disseminating useful information on these subjects, \$1,500,000.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act, as amended, establishing a Bureau of Animal Industry, and related Acts, and for investigation concerned with the livestock and meat industries and the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals, as follows:

Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101 (b) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authorizing cooperation with State authorities in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries, \$2,294,000.

Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of diseases of animals, and for investigations of tuberculin, serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, \$1,325,000, including not to exceed \$8,000 for the purchase of land and appurtenances near Ames, Iowa, for continuation of a hog cholera experiment station.

Animal disease control and eradication: For the control and eradication, including inspections and quarantines, of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, Bang's disease of cattle, scabies in sheep and cattle, southern cattle ticks, hog cholera and related swine diseases, and dourine in horses, and inspection and quarantine work; for supervision of the transportation of livestock, including administration of the twenty-eight-hour law; for inspection of vessels; and for carrying out the provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913 (21 U. S. C. 151-158), relating to veterinary biological products, \$7,950,000, including \$30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry: *Provided*, That no payment hereunder as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter for tuberculosis, paratuberculosis, or Bang's disease shall exceed (1) \$25 for any grade animal or \$50 for any purebred animal, (2) one-third of the difference between the appraised value and the value of salvage thereof, or (3) the amount paid or to be paid by the State or other cooperating agency, and no payment hereunder shall be made for any animal if at the time of test or condemnation it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for slaughter: *Provided further*, That inspec-

tion service shall be maintained at all stockyards having such service during the current fiscal year.

Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products, \$12,800,000.

Marketing Agreements, Hog Cholera Virus and Serum

The sum of \$49,300 of the appropriation made by section 12 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933 (7 U. S. C. 612), is hereby made available during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made to carry into effect sections 56 to 60, inclusive, of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 851-855).

Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth and Other Contagious Diseases of Animals

For expenses necessary in the arrest and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction of animals (including poultry) affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations; and for foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest programs undertaken pursuant to the provisions of the Act of February 28, 1947 (21 U. S. C. Supp. II, 114b-114d), and the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C., 391; 21 U. S. C., 111-122), including expenses in accordance with section 2 of said Act of February 28, 1947, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the bureaus, corporations, or agencies of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency which threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the country, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred under this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided*, That, except for payments made pursuant to said Act of February 28, 1947, the payment for such animals hereafter purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat, egg-production, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any such animal shall exceed three times its meat, egg-production, or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the United States Government for any such animals shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further*, That poultry may be appraised in groups when the basis for appraisal is the same for each bird.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401-404), including investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, for carrying out the applicable provisions of the Act of May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c)), relating to process or renovated butter, as amended, and the Act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)), insofar as it relates to the exportation of process or renovated butter, \$1,617,500.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations established under the provisions of section 202 (a) to 202 (e), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1292); for the development of new and extended food, feed, and industrial uses for agricultural commodities, both plant and animal, and potential replacement crops, and processing, biological, chemical, physical, pharmacological, toxicological, and technological investigation thereof, \$7,960,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$20,000 shall be available for the alteration to buildings of the Naval Stores Station at Olustee, Florida.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in connection with the production and improvement of farm crops and other plants and plant industries; soils and soil-plant relationships, and the application of engineering principles to agriculture; plant diseases, including nematodes, and methods for their prevention and control; plant and plant-disease collections, and surveys; the distribution of weeds and means for their control; methods of handling, processing, transportation, and storage of agricultural products; and plants in foreign countries and our possessions for introduction into the United States, including explorations and surveys, and propagation and testing in this country; and for the operation and maintenance of airplanes, as follows:

Field crops: For investigations on the production, improvement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn, cotton, flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums, soybeans, sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other field crops, \$3,437,500.

Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: For investigations on the production, improvement, and diseases of fruit, vegetable, nut, ornamental, and related crops and plants, \$3,012,500.

Forest diseases: For investigations of diseases of forest and shade trees and forest products, and methods for their control, \$452,500.

Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: For investigations of soil management methods to increase and maintain productivity, including fertilization, liming, crop rotations, tillage practices, and other means of improving soils; fertilizers, fertilizer ingredients, and their improvement for agricultural use; soil management and crop production on dry and irrigated lands, and the quality of irrigation water and its use by crops; and for the classification of soils in a national system and indication of their extent and distribution on maps, and determination of their potential productivity under adapted cropping and improved soil management, \$2,723,750, including not to exceed \$100,000 for construction or acquisition of buildings, facilities, and equipment for the station at Brawley, California.

Agricultural engineering: For investigations involving the application of engineering principles to agriculture, including farm power and equipment, rural water supply and sanitation, and rural electrification; farm buildings and their appurtenances and buildings for processing and storing farm products, and the preparation and distribution of building plans and specifications; cotton ginning, and other

engineering problems relating to the production, processing, transportation, and storage of agricultural products; \$1,130,000.

National Arboretum: For the maintenance and development of the National Arboretum established under the provisions of the Act approved March 4, 1927 (20 U. S. C. 191-194), \$152,700.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and surveys for the promotion of economic entomology, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects and related pests injurious to agriculture, for importing useful and beneficial insects and bacterial, fungal, and other diseases of insects and related pests, for investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying insects affecting man and animals, and the best ways of utilizing beneficial insects, for carrying into effect the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151-167), the Honey Bee Act (7 U. S. C. 281-283), the Insect Pest Act (7 U. S. C. 141-144), the Mexican Border Act (7 U. S. C. 149), and the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), as amended, authorizing the eradication, control, and prevention of spread of injurious insects and plant pests; including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed two, as follows:

Insect investigations: For the investigation of insects affecting fruits, grapes, nuts, trees, shrubs, forests and forest products, truck and garden crops, cereal, forage and range crops, cotton, tobacco, sugar plants, ornamental and other plants and agricultural products, household possessions, and man and animals; for bee culture and apiary management; for classifying, identifying, and collecting information to determine the distribution and abundance of insects; for investigations in connection with introduction of natural enemies of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other arthropods; for developing methods, equipment, and apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines and in the eradication and control of insect pests and plant diseases; and for investigations of insecticides and fungicides, including methods of their manufacture and use and the effects of their application, \$4,157,500: *Provided*, That of the amount allotted for oriental fruitfly, not to exceed \$250,000 may be used for contracts with public or private agencies for research without regard to provisions of existing law, and the amounts obligated for contract research shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That \$50,000 shall be transferred to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for investigations and studies of effects of insecticidal and fungicidal residue on human health.

Insect and plant-disease control: For carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweetpotato weevil, Mexican fruitflies, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal rusts, pink bollworm and *Thurberia* weevil, golden nematode, citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, and the Hall scale, including the enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with States to enforce plant quarantines

as authorized by the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151-167), and including the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation of the pink bollworm as authorized by the Act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67), and for cooperation with States in the compensation of growers for losses resulting from the destruction of or for not planting potatoes and tomatoes on lands infested or exposed to infestations of the golden nematode for the purpose authorized by the Golden Nematode Act (Public Law 645, approved June 15, 1948), and for the enforcement of domestic plant quarantines through inspection in transit, including the interception and disposition of materials found to have been transported interstate in violation of Federal plant quarantine laws or regulations, and operations under the Terminal Inspection Act (7 U. S. C. 166), \$4,450,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed, except potatoes and tomatoes as authorized under the Golden Nematode Act: *Provided further*, That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose, or for barberry eradication until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of this purpose, or with respect to the golden nematode except as prescribed in section 4 of the Golden Nematode Act.

Foreign plant quarantines: For operations against the introduction of insect pests or plant diseases into the United States, including the enforcement of foreign-plant quarantines and regulations promulgated under sections 5 and 7 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151-167), the Insect Pest Act of 1905 (7 U. S. C. 141-144), and the Mexican Border Act of 1942 (7 U. S. C. 149), for enforcement of domestic-plant quarantines as they pertain to Territories of the United States and enforcement of regulations governing the movement of plants into and from the District of Columbia promulgated under section 15 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended, and for inspection and certification of plants and plant products to meet the sanitary requirements of foreign countries, as authorized in section 102 of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), \$2,354,700.

Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insects and Plant Diseases

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148-148e), including the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed two, and surveys and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities, and the employment of Canadian citizens, \$2,100,000, of which \$1,250,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said joint resolution only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS

For expenses necessary for carrying out operations, measures, or surveys necessary to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of insects or diseases which endanger forest trees on any lands in the United States, and for such quarantine measures relating thereto as may be necessary pursuant to the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151-167), including the purchase (not to exceed three) and operation and maintenance of airplanes, construction and alteration of necessary buildings, not to exceed \$23,500 for the purchase of one building at Greenfield, Massachusetts: *Provided*, That the cost of constructing or altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed \$2,500, as follows:

Gypsy and brown-tail moths: Gypsy and brown-tail moths, pursuant to section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944 (7 U. S. C. 147a), \$560,000.

Forest Pest Control Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Act approved June 25, 1947 (16 U. S. C., Supp. I, 594-1-594-5), \$1,650,000, of which \$750,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes for the purposes of said Act only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pursuant to the Act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), \$3,490,000, of which amount \$537,050 shall be available to the Department of the Interior for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United States; \$1,837,475 of said amount to the Forest Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and \$1,115,475 of said amount to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordination of the entire program, method development, and for operations conducted under its direction for such control, including, but not confined to, the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately owned lands.

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary including not to exceed \$10,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); to experiment and make investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved,

exclusive of the cost (not to exceed \$1,000) of constructing a water-supply or sanitary system and of connecting the same with any such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed \$15,000, with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was \$15,000 or more, may be improved out of the appropriations made under this chapter for the Forest Service by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such building as certified by the Chief of the Forest Service, and that not to exceed \$8,000 may be expended for the installation of an elevator in the Yeon Avenue warehouse in Portland, Oregon; to protect, administer, and improve the national forests, including tree planting and other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service, as follows:

General administrative expenses: For general administration, including expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514), \$665,000.

National forest protection and management: For the administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of the national forests, including the establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the care of plantations and young growth; the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed three; and the maintenance of roads and trails and the construction and maintenance of all other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, development, and use of the national forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service administration, except that where direct purchases will be more economical than construction, improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to exceed \$15,000 for any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; timber cultural operations; development and application of fish and game management plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber and other resources and development and application of plans for their effective management, sale, and use; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the Act of June 11, 1906, and the Act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506-509), as provided by the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the administration and public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the national forests,

\$27,100,000, of which not to exceed \$75,000 shall be available for the purchase of three nursery sites, and not to exceed \$5,000 shall be available for the purchase of administrative sites.

Cooperative range improvements: For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forest lands, pursuant to section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law Numbered 478), \$700,000, to remain available until expended.

Fighting forest fires: For fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening lands under Forest Service administration, including lands under contract for purchase or in process of condemnation for Forest Service purposes, and for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal year for such purpose, \$6,000,000, of which \$2,500,000 shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only to the extent that the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, finds necessary to meet emergency conditions.

Forest research: For forest research in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581, 581a, 581f-581i), including the construction and maintenance of improvements, as follows:

Forest and range management investigations: Fire, silvicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and experiments under said section 2, as amended, and investigations and experiments to develop improved methods of management of forest and other ranges under section 7, at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere, \$3,030,000, of which \$41,000 shall be available for such investigations and experiments at Bartlett Experimental Forest only.

Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, \$1,300,000, of which \$30,000 shall be made available for the establishment of a forest utilization service unit in the Southwest.

Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics under section 10, \$880,000.

FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), relating to forest development roads and trails, including the construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest Service administration, \$10,348,000, which sum is authorized to be appropriated by the Act of June 29, 1948 (Public Law 834), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed \$15,000 with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was \$15,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year by an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the cost of such buildings certified by the Chief of the Forest Service.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

Weeks Act: For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513-519, 521), \$300,000, to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated.

Superior National Forest: For the acquisition of forest land within the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the Act approved June 22, 1948 (Public Law 733), \$150,000, to remain available until expended.

Special Acts: For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the following Acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, \$40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, \$10,000; San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, California, Act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended, \$22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended, \$10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, Act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), \$20,000; Cleveland National Forest, San Diego County, California, Act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), \$5,000; Sequoia National Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637), \$35,000; in all \$142,000.

FOREST-FIRE COOPERATION

For cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act approved June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U. S. C. 564-566), \$9,500,000.

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

To enable the Secretary through the Forest Service to advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resources, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, and to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed \$785,034) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed \$449,200) and 5 (not to exceed \$65,766) of the Act approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567-568), and Acts supplementary thereto; \$1,300,000.

FLOOD CONTROL

For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738), as amended and supplemented, to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of the Columbia Basin area in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, to remain available until expended, \$10,315,000, with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for flood-control purposes: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in which such lands are situated, nor shall any part of such funds be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the Board of County Commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated: *Provided further*, That of the funds available herein, not in excess of \$8,315,000 may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, for necessary gulley control, floodwater detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a-590f), which provides for a national program of erosion control and soil and water conservation, furnishing of subsistence to employees, operation and maintenance of aircraft, and the purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same with any such building, shall not exceed \$2,500 except where buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to be constructed at a cost not to exceed \$15,000 per building: *Provided further*, That no money appropriated in this chapter shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*, That in the State of Missouri where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district, as follows:

Soil conservation research: For research and investigations into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and moisture depletion and methods of soil and water conservation (including the construction and hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and water regulation to conserve the soil and reduce

fire hazards in the Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not in excess of funds made available for such work by the State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); and for construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations, \$1,500,000.

Soil conservation operations: For carrying out preventive measures to conserve soil and water, including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information, \$52,400,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010-1012), and the provisions of the Act approved August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011 note), \$1,565,175.

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

For expenses necessary to carry into effect the functions of the Department under the Acts of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685, 719), October 14, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 590y-z-10), as amended and supplemented, and June 28, 1949 (Public Law 132), relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of water conservation and utilization projects, to remain available until expended, \$500,000, which sum shall be merged with the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to said Department for the purposes of said Act.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g-590q), including not to exceed \$6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; \$282,500,000, to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1950, carried out during the period July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1950, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$25,500,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year for salaries and

other administrative expenses for carrying out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than \$5,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order Numbered 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1951 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to \$285,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary, except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 per centum from the distribution for the next preceding program year, and no participant shall receive more than \$2,500); but the payments or grants under such programs shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committees appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h (b)), for the respective States: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allotted with the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department,

shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acreage allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301-1393), \$32,300,000, of which not more than \$5,500,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided*, That \$4,000,000 of this appropriation shall be placed in reserve pending determination by the Secretary as to necessity of marketing quotas on the 1951 crops of wheat, corn, and rice, to be released in such amounts and at such times as determined by the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary in connection with such marketing quotas.

SUGAR ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1101-1160), \$63,750,000, to remain available until June 30 of the next succeeding fiscal year: *Provided*, That expenditures (including transfers) from this appropriation for other than payments to sugar producers shall not exceed \$1,500,000.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751-1760), \$83,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said Act.

MARKETING SERVICES

For expenses necessary in conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations, as follows:

Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products (including broilers), fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and other agricultural products, \$2,118,500.

Market inspection of farm products: For the investigation and certification, in one or more jurisdictions, to shippers and other interested parties of the class, quality, and condition of any agricultural commodity or food product, whether raw, dried, canned, or otherwise

processed, and any product containing an agricultural commodity or derivative thereof when offered for interstate shipment or when received at such important central markets as the Secretary may from time to time designate, or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered, \$780,000.

Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information relative to the needed supplies, standardization, classification, grading, preparation for market, handling, transportation, storage, and marketing of farm and food products, including the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform standards of classification of American farm and food products throughout the world, for making analyses of cotton fiber as provided by the Act of April 7, 1941 (7 U. S. C. 473d), for carrying out the provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), including not to exceed \$25,000 for employment at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem, pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a), of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and not to exceed \$20,000 for transportation and other necessary expenses including not to exceed \$10 per diem of persons serving without compensation while away from their homes or regular places of business, \$1,260,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary may make available to any bureau, office, or agency of the Department such amounts from this appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the functions for which this appropriation is made, and any such amounts shall be in addition to amounts transferred or otherwise made available to appropriation items in this Act.

Tobacco Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act to establish and promote the use of standards of classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official tobacco-inspection service, approved August 23, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 511-511q), the Act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department, approved January 14, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 501-508), as amended, and the Act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, approved June 5, 1940 (7 U. S. C. 516), \$1,660,500.

Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards and Futures Acts: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act authorizing the Secretary to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as amended by the Act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471-476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures (26 U. S. C. 1920-1935), and to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51-65), \$1,675,000.

Marketing regulatory Acts: For expenses necessary to carry into effect the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a-499r), the Act to prevent the destruction or dumping of farm produce (7 U. S. C. 491-497), the Act to provide standards for baskets and containers for fruits and vegetables, as amended (15 U. S. C. 251-256), the Act to fix standards

for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables (15 U. S. C. 257-257i), the Act to provide export standards for apples and pears (7 U. S. C. 581-589), the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 71-87), the United States Warehouse Act (7 U. S. C. 241-273), the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1551-1610), the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181-229), the Naval Stores Act (7 U. S. C. 91-99), and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U. S. C. 135-135k), \$3,495,000.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1-17a), \$650,000.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

For operating and administrative expenses, \$7,204,000.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901-915), as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For administrative expenses, including not to exceed \$500 for financial and credit reports, \$8,550,000.

LOAN AUTHORIZATION

For loans in accordance with said Act, and for carrying out the provisions of section 7 thereof, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said Act as follows: Rural electrification program, \$350,000,000; and rural telephone program, \$32,500,000; and additional amounts, not to exceed a total of \$150,000,000 (including the uncommitted balance available as a carry-over from the fiscal year 1950), may be borrowed for the rural electrification program under the same terms and conditions if and to the extent that the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify, from time to time, to the Secretary of the Treasury that such additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1951, under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly development of the program.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of titles I, II, and the related provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1000-1031), the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1001, note; 31 U. S. C. 82h; 12 U. S. C. 371; 35 D. C. Code 535; 60 Stat. 1062-1080); the Act of July 30, 1946 (40 U. S. C. 436-439); the Act of October 19, 1949 (Public Law 361); the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r-590x, 590z-5), for the development of facilities for water storage and utilization in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States; and the provisions of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating to financial assistance for farm housing (Public Law 171, approved July 15, 1949), as follows:

LOAN AUTHORIZATION

For loans (including payments in lieu of taxes and taxes under section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and advances incident to the acquisition and preservation of security of obligations under the foregoing several authorities): Title I and section 43 of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended and title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (except grants under 504 (a)) \$65,000,000, of which not to exceed \$3,500,000 of the amount available for the purposes of title I and section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, may be distributed to States and Territories without regard to farm population and prevalence of tenancy, in addition to the amount otherwise distributed thereto, for loans in reclamation projects and to entrymen on unpatented public land (sums available for loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to remain available until expended); title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, \$85,000,000; the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, \$4,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed the foregoing several amounts shall be borrowed in one account from the Secretary of the Treasury on the request of the Secretary of Agriculture at such rate of interest as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, but not in excess of 3 per centum per annum; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sums to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of said Acts: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest under such Acts to repay the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts borrowed therefrom for the purposes of such Acts: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such loans to the Secretary: *Provided further*, That repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-debt transaction.

GRANTS

For grants and for the grant portion of combination loans and grants for the purpose of section 504 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949, \$650,000, to remain available until expended.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the making, servicing, and collecting of loans and insured mortgages, the servicing and collecting of loans made under prior authority, the liquidation of assets transferred to Farmers Home Administration pursuant to the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, and the extension of financial assistance under the Housing Act of 1949, \$28,500,000, together with a transfer to this appropriation item of not to exceed \$80,000 of the fees and administrative expense charges made available by subsections (d) and (e) of section 12 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses, including not to exceed \$5,000 for attendance at meetings or conventions of members of organizations at which matters of importance to the work of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or transacted; library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed \$20,000 for expenditures authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 833); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (for replacement only) for use in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit Administration, except that such expenditures shall not exceed \$10,000; examination of corporations, banks, associations, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by the Farm Credit Administration \$585,000, together with not to exceed \$2,325,000 of collections from Federal Farm Credit agencies of assessments and charges, to be advanced by transfer and counter warrant to this appropriation, to cover the cost of Farm Credit Administration facilities, examinations, and other services rendered to such agencies; \$2,910,000.

EXTENSION SERVICE

PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:

Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related Acts: Capper-Ketcham Act, the Act approved May 22, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), \$1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 21, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, (7 U. S. C. 343c), \$12,000,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 23, title II, of the Act approved June 29, 1935, as amended by the Act of June 6, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 343d-1), \$12,500,000; additional extension work, the Act approved April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c-1), \$555,000; Alaska, the Act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, \$13,950, and the Act approved October 27, 1949 (Public Law 417), extending to the Territory of Alaska the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act and sections 21 and 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act, \$42,150; Puerto Rico, section 3 of the Act of March 4, 1931 (7 U. S. C. 386f), authorizing extension of the Capper-Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico, \$31,348; the Act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f-343g), extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, \$408,000, and the Act approved October 26, 1949 (Public Law 406), extending the benefits of section 23 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, \$40,000; and section 506a of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171), \$33,050; in all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, \$27,103,498.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to administer the provisions of the Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914 (7 U. S. C. 341-348), and Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, and to coordinate the extension work of the Department and the several States, Territories, and insular possessions, \$900,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, \$2,161,300, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary not exceeding a total of \$109,280, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

For necessary expenses, including payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, \$2,562,500, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses which several amounts not exceeding a total of \$207,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work. \$600,000.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work and programs authorized by Congress in the Department,

\$1,265,800, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of \$16,200, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For preparation and display of exhibits, \$109,959; for preparation, distribution, and display of motion and sound pictures, \$58,700; for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7 U. S. C. 417) and not less than two hundred thirty thousand eight hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture), as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), \$611,128: *Provided*, That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the programs of the various agencies of the Department authorized by Congress can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office of Information, as the central agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not exceeding \$300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein: *Provided further*, That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of \$10,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices, or for the compensation of employees in such offices except that not to exceed \$10,000 may be used to maintain the San Francisco radio office.

LIBRARY

For necessary expenses, including dues, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; \$713,293.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this chapter shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$16,350,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge \$66,698,457 of the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes in such amount issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 4 of the Act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-4).

Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: Not to exceed \$1,280,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the Corporation shall be available for administrative expenses, including employment on a contract or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the performance of special services, including legal services, and the use of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, national farm loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies of the Government as authorized by the Act of January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020-1020h); and said total sum shall be exclusive of services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office, interest expense, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest: *Provided*, That promptly after June 30 of each fiscal year all cash funds in excess of the estimated operating requirements for the current fiscal year shall be declared as dividends and paid into the general fund of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That the aggregate amount of bonds the Corporation may issue and have outstanding at any one time shall not exceed \$500,000,000.

Federal intermediate credit banks: Not to exceed \$1,496,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the banks shall be available for administrative expenses and services performed for the banks by other Government agencies (except services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office, and services performed by any Federal Reserve bank and by the United States Treasury in connection with the financial transactions of the banks); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the banks or in which they have an interest.

Production credit corporations: Not to exceed \$1,358,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the corporations shall

be available for administrative expenses and services performed for the corporations by other Government agencies (except services and facilities furnished and examinations made by the Farm Credit Administration central office); and said total sum shall be exclusive of interest expense, legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, and expenses in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the corporations or in which they have an interest.

TITLE III—REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

Amounts available from appropriations are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this chapter:

An amount of \$199,990,000 in the revolving fund held in the Treasury available to the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, as authorized by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1020b), for resubscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

The total amount of \$125,000,000 in the revolving fund appropriated to the Office of the Secretary, Treasury Department, as authorized by the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 698), for subscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal land banks.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, the lump-sum appropriations and authorizations made for the Department under this chapter shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 497 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles, necessary in the conduct of the work of the Department outside the District of Columbia.

SEC. 402. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary employment of translators when competent citizen translators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emergency of persons in the field service of the Department for periods of not more than sixty days; and (3) employment under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

SEC. 403. Appropriations and authorizations made in this chapter shall be available for health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150).

SEC. 404. Funds available to the Department during the current fiscal year shall be available for the payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 405. Funds available to the Department of Agriculture during the current fiscal year may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 406. Funds available to the Department of Agriculture may be used for printing and binding, including the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles.

SEC. 407. Of appropriations herein made which are available for

the purchase of lands, not to exceed \$1 may be expended for each option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land.

SEC. 408. No part of the funds appropriated by this chapter shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

SEC. 409. Except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this chapter shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

SEC. 410. Not less than \$575,000 shall be available for contracts in accordance with section 10 (a) of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 427i) from appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; Bureau of Animal Industry; Bureau of Dairy Industry; Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering; Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine; Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry; Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics; and the Forest Service.

SEC. 411. Of the funds appropriated in this chapter for travel expenses, \$791,888 shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury within thirty days after enactment of this Act; but such amount shall be credited toward any other reduction in amounts available for such travel expenses resulting from decreases in appropriations made by this Act below the budget estimates.

This chapter may be cited as the "Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

TITLE I

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this chapter referred to as the Secretary), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; for purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only at not to exceed \$4,500; printing and binding; employment of a Director of the Oil and Gas Division without regard to the civil service laws; and teletype rentals and service; \$2,315,000.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

For expenses necessary for controlling the interstate shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U. S. C. 715), including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and printing and binding; \$180,000.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For establishment of a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) communication services; (3) a central supply service for stationery, supplies, equipment, blank forms, and miscellaneous materials, for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet in whole or in part requirements of the bureaus and offices of the Department in the city of Washington and elsewhere; (4) a central library service; (5) health services; and (6) such other similar service functions as the Secretary determines may be performed more advantageously on a reimbursable basis; \$300,000. Said fund shall be reimbursed from available funds of bureaus, offices, and agencies for which services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including reserves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER MARKETING AREA

For necessary expenses of marketing electric power and energy produced or to be produced at multiple-purpose projects of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the area east of the Mississippi River, including purchase (not to exceed two) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and printing and binding; \$150,000.

CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, to remain available until expended, \$8,620,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted; and, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed \$1,730,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of funds appropriated under the head "Construction, operation, and maintenance, power transmission facilities" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, \$760,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Southwestern Power Administration shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed eight, of which six shall be for replacement only) and

hire of passenger motor vehicles; and printing and binding. Appropriations made herein to the Southwestern Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U. S. C. 104), including personal services in the District of Columbia, hire of passenger motor vehicles, printing and binding and payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and committee meetings of the Commission either within or outside of the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the Commission, \$12,530.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$39,500,000, of which not to exceed \$17,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted; and, in addition, the Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed \$20,000,000: *Provided*, That unexpended balances of prior year appropriations, including unused balances of related contract authorizations, for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, \$5,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed seventeen of which twelve shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not to exceed two) of aircraft; and printing and binding. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired-labor basis, except in case of emergencies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville Power Administrator.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, \$7,127,810: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended on a reimbursable basis for surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of access roads on the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands; acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads adjacent to such lands; and for acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of buildings and appurtenant facilities in Alaska; to remain available until expended, \$700,000, of which not to exceed \$200,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under the head "Revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950: *Provided*, That the amounts of appropriation made herein for road construction shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed twenty-eight for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of two aircraft; printing and binding; and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title: *Provided*, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands shall be reimbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in section c, title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937, of the special fund designated the "Oregon and California Land Grant Fund" and section 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939, of the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund".

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received as range improvement fees under section 3 of said Act and of 25 per centum of all moneys received under section 15 of said Act during the current and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated, to remain available until expended.

PAYMENTS TO STATES (PROCEEDS OF SALES)

For payment to the several States of 5 per centum of the net proceeds of sales of public lands and materials lying within their limits,

for the purpose of education or of making public roads and improvements, sums equal to the aggregate of receipts (not to exceed \$20,000) covered into the Treasury in accordance with section 4 of the Act of June 26, 1934 (31 U. S. C. 725c), during the current and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated.

PAYMENT TO OKLAHOMA

For payment to the State of Oklahoma in lieu of all State and local taxes upon tribal funds accruing under the provisions of the joint resolution of June 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 740), to be expended by the State in the same manner as if received under section 35 of the Act approved February 25, 1920 (30 U. S. C. 191), sums equal to 37½ per centum of the royalties received during the current and prior fiscal years (but not yet appropriated) from the south half of Red River in Oklahoma under the provisions of said joint resolution of June 12, 1926.

LEASING OF GRAZING LANDS

For leasing State, county, or privately owned lands in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-1), sums equal to the aggregate of receipts covered into the Treasury in accordance with the Act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-4), during the current and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated.

PAYMENTS TO STATES (GRAZING FEES)

Sums not in excess of 33⅓ per centum of all grazing fees received during the current and prior fiscal years (but not yet appropriated) from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-land laws, to be paid to the State in which said lands are situated, in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315j).

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES

For expenses necessary to provide health, education, and welfare services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations, including payment (in advance or from date of admission) of care, tuition, assistance, and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law on Indian reservations or lands; operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of Indians participating in folk festivals; \$40,252,328.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for management, development, improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; conducting agricultural experiments and demonstrations; furnishing plants or seed to Indians; advances for Indian industrial and business

enterprises; payment of expenses of Indian fairs, including premiums for exhibits; and development of Indian arts and crafts as authorized by law (25 U. S. C. 305), including expenses of exhibits; \$10,814,576.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, roads and trails, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; to remain available until expended, \$23,272,651, of which not to exceed \$3,737,500 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted; and, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed \$3,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

The unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made, including unused balances of related contract authorizations, under the heads "Construction, and so forth, buildings and utilities, Indian Service," "Construction, and so forth, irrigation systems, Indian Service," "Roads, Indian Service," "Navajo and Hopi construction and maintenance services," and "Acquisition of lands for Indian tribes", shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the general administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses in field offices, \$3,600,000.

REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

For an additional amount for loans as authorized by sections 10 and 11 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U. S. C. 470, 471), as amended and supplemented, \$2,400,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed two hundred and twenty-seven, of which two hundred and twenty shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, which may be used for the transportation of Indians; printing and binding, including illustrations and purchase of reprints; purchase of ice for official use of employees; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including not to exceed \$5,000 for expenditure at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem on irrigation and power matters, when authorized by the Secretary; and expenses required by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and payment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary during the current fiscal year.

PROCEEDS FROM POWER

Sums not in excess of the amount of power revenues covered into the Treasury to the credit of each of the power projects, including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, to be available for the purposes authorized by section 3 of the Act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 647), as amended, including printing and binding, in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived.

TRIBAL FUNDS

In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended by existing law, there is hereby appropriated \$2,437,965 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition and other assistance to Indian children attending public and private schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of admission); purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and water rights; printing and binding; compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts; pay, travel and other expenses of tribal officers, councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, including mileage for use of privately owned automobiles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391), including cash grants; and employment of a recreational director for the Menominee Reservation and a curator for the Osage Museum, each of whom shall be appointed with the approval of the respective tribal councils and without regard to the classification laws: *Provided*, That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary. Any tribal funds advanced under this authority shall be reported to the Congress in the annual Budget for the fiscal year 1952: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans; engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects; to remain available until expended, \$5,875,000; of which \$5,116,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any sums from this appropriation for investigations of any nature requested by States, municipalities, or other interests shall be upon the basis of the State, municipality, or other interest advancing at least 50 per centum of the estimated cost of such investigations: *Provided further*, That the limitation on the amount available for surveys and preconstruction work in connection with the North Side pumping division, Minidoka project, Idaho, stated in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, is increased from \$725,000 to \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That, except as herein expressly provided with respect to investigations in Alaska, no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the conduct of activities which are not authorized by law.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$295,828,000, of which \$25,135,700 shall be derived from the reclamation fund, and in addition thereto the Commissioner of Reclamation is hereby authorized to incur obligations and enter into contracts for additional work, materials, and equipment in an amount not exceeding \$3,000,000 for power transmission lines and substations in the fiscal year 1951: *Provided*, That hereafter when funds appropriated under this head are transferred to the credit of the appropriate regional disbursing officer of the Treasury Department for expenditure in connection with Hoover Dam and related works, such funds, solely for the purpose of computing interest on advances under the provisions of section 2 of the Act of December 21, 1928, as amended (43 U. S. C. 617a (b), 617a (d), 618e), shall be considered as if advanced to the Colorado River Dam fund: *Provided further*, That \$3,000,000 of the funds provided in this paragraph plus \$3,000,000 contract authority shall be available for construction of transmission lines and substations in South Dakota, to include a transmission loop from Fort Randall through the load centers of Armour, Huron, Aberdeen, Andover, Watertown, Brookings, Sioux Falls, and Gavins Point to Fort Randall, and lines from Fort Randall to Winner and from Rapid City to Midland: *Provided further*, That in order to promote agreement among the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado and to avoid any possible altera-

tion of existing vested water rights, no part of this or of any prior appropriation shall be used for construction or for further commitment for construction of the Glendo unit or any feature thereof, until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and approved by Congress: *Provided further*, That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction, nor for further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Montana, or any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress.

Of the amount appropriated under the preceding paragraph, \$1,600,000 is for liquidation of the contract authority granted under the appropriation "Reclamation fund, special fund, construction, Santa Barbara County project, California, Cachuma unit", in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949; \$225,700 is for partial liquidation of the contract authority granted under the appropriation "General fund, construction, advances to Colorado River dam fund, Boulder Canyon project (All-American Canal)" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950; \$1,000,000 is for liquidation of the contract authority provided under the appropriation "General fund, construction, Fort Sumner project, New Mexico", in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950; and \$1,770,000 is for partial liquidation of the contract authority granted under the appropriation "General fund, construction, Missouri River Basin", in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, \$15,491,000, of which \$12,001,400 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$1,808,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River dam fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation, \$7,200,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377): *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That not exceeding \$150,000 of funds available for expenditure under this appropriation shall be used for salaries and expenses in connection with information work.

SPECIAL FUNDS

Sums herein referred to as being derived from the reclamation fund, the Colorado River dam fund, or the Colorado River development fund, are appropriated from the special funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U. S. C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43 U. S. C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U. S. C. 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended balances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads "Operation and maintenance" and "General administrative expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special fund from which derived.

PRIOR YEAR APPROPRIATIONS

Except for the emergency fund established in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, the unexpended balances on June 30, 1950, of sums heretofore appropriated for the Bureau of Reclamation which were made available until expended shall be classified under the corresponding heads herein established, shall be transferred to and merged with the amounts appropriated under those headings, and shall be available for the purposes therein specified.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed two hundred for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of not to exceed three aircraft for replacement only; printing and binding; not to exceed \$100,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary; payment of claims for damage to or loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law involving property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; payments to school districts as authorized by law (43 U. S. C. 385a and 618 (a) (e)), including payments on account of dependents of employees in field offices in project areas engaged in construction and related activities; performance of the functions specified under the head "Operation and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful information including recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, as authorized by law: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except \$7,200,000 under the head "General

Administrative Expenses" and \$1,193,205 (\$197,925 for reconnaissance, \$769,080 for basin surveys, and \$226,200 for general engineering and research) under the head "General Investigations."

Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the appropriation under the head "Construction and rehabilitation" shall be available additionally for said project for those functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under the head "General investigations" (but this authorization shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head within that area), and for the continuation of investigations by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments may be expended through or in cooperation with State and other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are hereby authorized.

Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the performance of functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be reimbursable or returnable to the extent and in the manner provided by law.

Any agency of the United States Government having title thereto is authorized to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation, without reimbursement, parts, equipment and supplies for aircraft excess to its needs.

No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation, contained in this chapter or in any prior Act, which represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose, regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*, That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section 665 of title 31 of the United States Code.

No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance, except those derived from advances by water users, shall be used for the particular benefit of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization, or (c) of any individual, when such district, organization, or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months in the payment of charges due under a contract entered into with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Not to exceed 12 per centum of the construction allotment made by the Bureau of Reclamation for any project from the appropriation "Construction and Rehabilitation" contained in this chapter shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired-labor basis; except that not to exceed \$225,000 may on approval of the Commissioner be expended for construction work by force account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit when the work is unsuitable for contract or when excessive bids are received; and except in cases of emergencies local in character, so declared by the Commissioner.

APPROPRIATION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS

There are hereby appropriated from the reclamation fund such sums as may be necessary after June 30, 1950, to make payments, to the extent authorized by the Act of May 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 273), to the Farmers' Irrigation District on behalf of the Northport Irrigation District (North Platte project, Nebraska-Wyoming) for water carriage in accordance with contracts entered into pursuant to said Act.

REFUNDS AND RETURNS

There are hereby appropriated such amounts as may be necessary after June 30, 1950, for the Bureau of Reclamation to refund overcollections, and to return deposits in excess of amounts applied to the purposes for which the deposits were accepted, each such refund or return to be derived from the account into which such overcollection or deposit shall have been covered.

TRANSFER OF EPHRATA AIR FORCE BASE

For the purpose of assisting in the construction, operation, and maintenance, and settlement programs on the Columbia Basin project in the State of Washington, the Armed Services, General Services Administration, or other Federal agency having ownership or custody thereof or interest therein, is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, all of their right, title, and interest to certain buildings, facilities, and equipment at the Ephrata Air Force Base, Ephrata, Washington, including the following buildings in accordance with block and building numbers: Block 800, building numbered 68; block 1900, buildings numbered 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17; block 2000, four buildings numbered 75, two buildings numbered 56; block 3000, buildings numbered 56, 131, 58; block 2900, buildings numbered 59, 53, 55, 57, 66, 89, 90, 85, 84, 124, 141, two buildings numbered 60, two buildings numbered 64, two buildings numbered 65; block 3300, eleven buildings numbered 28; block 3400, seven buildings numbered 28; block 3500, buildings numbered 43, 46; block 3600, buildings numbered 34, 35, 36, 38, two buildings numbered 37; block 3700, buildings numbered 35, 38, four buildings numbered 31, two buildings numbered 32, two buildings numbered 34, two buildings numbered 37; block 3800, buildings numbered 35, 38, 39, 42, two buildings numbered 37; block 4300, buildings numbered 19, 20, 21, 22; block 4400, buildings numbered 113, 114, two buildings numbered 112; block 4600, buildings numbered 134; block 4700, buildings numbered 94, 95, 96, 99, 109, 100, 35, 108, 104, 110, six buildings numbered 97; block 4800, buildings numbered 53, 40, 102, 101, 103, 105, 107, 111, two buildings numbered 32, five buildings numbered 106, three buildings numbered 98, together with one sewage-disposal plant numbered 116, one water tank numbered 115, one well, one flag pole numbered 118, two garbage racks numbered 155, two garbage racks numbered 158, one wash rack numbered 63, two grease racks numbered 62, and sewer system, water lines, electric-power lines, railroad spur and siding, road improvements, and all other facilities and equipment incident to the foregoing property, and including land and rights-of-way formerly under Reclamation withdrawal to other federally owned land on which said buildings are situate, which have heretofore or which may hereafter be declared surplus to the needs of the Armed Forces: *Provided*, That amounts equal to the value of all property transferred hereunder and used shall be charged, in the same manner as appropriations are charged, as part of the construction or appropriate other costs of the Columbia Basin project, such value to be determined by appraisal approved by the Administrator of General Services of the market value of such property current at the time of transfer hereunder less expenditures on such property by the Bureau of Reclamation prior to such transfer.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its territories and possessions; classify lands as to mineral character and water and power resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses, and operating contracts; and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; \$19,382,000, of which \$3,100,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations: *Provided*, That the share of the Geological Survey in any topographic mapping or water resources investigations carried on in cooperation with any State or municipality shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost thereof.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed one hundred and twenty-nine, of which eighty-five shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including purchase of reprints; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service for protection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging stations; and payment of compensation and expenses (not to exceed \$10,000) of the person appointed by the President to participate as the representative of the United States in the administration of the compact consented to by the Act of May 31, 1949 (Public Law 82): *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President is authorized to appoint a retired officer as such representative, without prejudice to his status as a retired Army officer, and he shall receive such compensation and expenses in addition to his retired pay.

BUREAU OF MINES

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; developing synthetics and substitutes; producing and distributing helium; and controlling fires in inactive coal deposits on public lands, and on private lands, with the consent of the owner; \$17,758,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to make suitable arrangements with owners of private property or with a State or its subdivisions for payment in the current fiscal year of a sum equal to not less than one-half the amount of expenditure to be

made for control or extinguishment of fires in inactive coal deposits from funds provided under the authorization of this Act except that expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose in any privately owned operating coal mine shall be limited to investigation and supervision.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

For expenses necessary for promotion of health and safety in mines and in the minerals industries as authorized by law, \$3,805,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, to remain available until expended, \$1,268,100, of which not to exceed \$550,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under the heads "Anthracite research laboratory" and "Drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colorado", in The Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950: *Provided*, That unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made, including unused balances of related contract authorizations, under the heads, "Synthetic liquid fuels", "Drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colorado", "Lignite research laboratory", and "Anthracite research laboratory" shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Mines, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$1,300,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Mines may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed one hundred and fifty, of which one hundred and forty-five shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including purchase of reprints; providing transportation services in isolated areas for employees, student dependents of employees, and other pupils, and such activities may be financed under cooperative arrangements; temporary and emergency contracts for personal services and employment of persons without regard to civil-service regulations as required in the conduct of programs for the control of fires in inactive coal deposits and flood prevention in anthracite mines; purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Provided further*, That power produced in the operation of the power plant of the Bureau of Mines at Louisiana, Missouri, in excess of the Bureau's needs may be sold to non-Federal purchasers, but the expenses of the Bureau in the production and sale of such excess power shall not exceed the total amount of such sales, and expenditures for the production of excess power shall not be deemed a charge against the total appropriations authorized by the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That the sums made available for the current fiscal year in the Act making appropriations

for the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the acquisition of helium from the Bureau of Mines shall be transferred to the Bureau of Mines on July 1 of said fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The Veterans' Administration is authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior, for the use of the Bureau of Mines, without compensation therefor, full jurisdiction, possession, and control of a parcel of forty-three acres, more or less, within the boundaries of the Fort Snelling Government Reservation in Hennepin County, Minnesota.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For expenses necessary for the management and protection of the areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service, including protection of lands in process of condemnation; and for plans, investigations, and studies of the recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of detailed plans and working drawings) and archaeological values in river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River Basin); \$7,688,700: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation under the head "Mississippi River Parkway" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service, \$7,400,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement, without regard to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U. S. C. 451), of roads, trails, parkways, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities; and the acquisition of lands, interests therein, improvements, and water rights; to remain available until expended, \$19,667,000, of which not to exceed \$7,935,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under the heads "Independence National Historical Park, Pennsylvania", "Parkways, National Park Service", and "Roads and Trails, National Park Service", in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of prior year appropriations, including unused balances of related contract authorizations, for the foregoing purposes, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$150,000 of the funds available for the Independence National Historical Park, Pennsylvania, shall be available after January 1, 1951, for the management, protection, maintenance, and rehabilitation of Independence Hall, grounds, and structures in that Park.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the National Park Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$1,314,500.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed nineteen, of which sixteen shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding; cleaning and repair of uniforms for National Capital Parks police and guards; and the objects and purposes specified in the Act of August 7, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 17j-2).

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; purchase or rent of land, and functions related to wildlife management in California (16 U. S. C. 695-695c); and not to exceed \$30,000 for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service; \$7,082,000.

INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies and investigations respecting conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, including related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such studies and investigations; and the performance of other functions related thereto; as authorized by law; \$4,125,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, including continuing the construction of fish cultural facilities on lands owned by the State of South Dakota; to remain available until expended. \$2,423,450, of which not to exceed \$50,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under the head "Investigations respecting food fishes" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$917,500.

FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of September 2, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 669-669j), amounts equal to the sums credited during the next preceding fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter to the special fund created by said Act.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION FUND

For carrying into effect section 4 of the Act of March 16, 1934, as amended (16 U. S. C. 718-718h), amounts equal to the sums received during the current year and each fiscal year thereafter from the proceeds from the sale of stamps, to be warranted monthly and to remain available until expended.

MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES

For management of national wildlife refuges, including the construction, improvement, repair, and alteration of buildings, roads, and other facilities, and enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918, as amended (16 U. S. C. 703-711), amounts equal to 75 per centum of the net proceeds received during the next preceding fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter under the provisions of section 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 715s), to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed ninety, of which sixty shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not to exceed ten, of which six shall be for replacement only) of aircraft; printing and binding, including purchase of reprints; publication and distribution of bulletins as authorized by law (7 U. S. C. 417); rations or commutation of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates not to exceed \$2 per man per day; repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are not inconsistent with their primary purposes; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service and to which the United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant to law in connection with management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources.

TERRITORIES AND ISLAND POSSESSIONS

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and possessions under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the Offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam, and the Government of the Virgin Islands, including the agricultural station; compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska and Hawaii; compensation of members of the

Supreme Court and the legislature in Guam; care of insane as authorized by law for Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46-50); grants to the Virgin Islands and Guam, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the several Governors' houses; and personal services in the District of Columbia; \$3,392,180: *Provided*, That the territorial and local governments of the Virgin Islands and Guam are authorized to make purchases for their public institutions through the General Services Administration.

CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS, ALASKA

For construction of roads, tramways, buildings, ferries, bridges, and trails, including surveys and plans for new road construction; acquisition of lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise; to remain available until expended, \$20,400,000, of which not to exceed \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted; and, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed \$8,000,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of prior year appropriations, including unused balances of related contract authorizations, for the foregoing purposes, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS, ALASKA

For operation and maintenance of roads, tramways, buildings, ferries, bridges, and trails, \$2,600,000.

The total of the amounts appropriated for construction, operation and maintenance of roads in Alaska shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA RAILROAD

For the authorized work of the Alaska Railroad, including improvements and new construction, to remain available until expended, \$30,000,000, of which not to exceed \$17,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this head may be transferred to the Alaska Railroad Special Fund for purposes of accounting and administration.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA RAILROAD

The Alaska Railroad Special Fund shall continue available until expended for the work authorized by law, including personal services in the District of Columbia; operation of facilities under the jurisdiction of the railroad in Mount McKinley National Park; operation and maintenance of oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or arrangement with other branches of the Government service, for the purpose of providing additional facilities for transportation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed necessary for the benefit and development of industries or travel in the area served; and payment of compensation and expenses as authorized by section 42 of the Act of September 7, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 793), to be reimbursed

as therein provided: *Provided*, That no one other than the general manager of said railroad, and one assistant general manager at not to exceed \$13,000 per annum, shall be paid an annual salary out of said fund of more than \$11,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for Territories and island possessions shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles and printing and binding.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 102. Appropriations made in this chapter shall be available for the purchase of station wagons without such vehicles being considered as passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, aliens may be employed during the current fiscal year in the field service of the Department for periods of not more than thirty days in cases of emergency caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage.

SEC. 104. Appropriations in this chapter available for travel expenses shall be available, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, for expenses of attendance of officers and employees at meetings or conventions of members of societies or associations concerned with the work of the bureau or office for which the appropriation concerned is made.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made in this chapter shall be available, with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement or repair of buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

SEC. 106. The Secretary may authorize the use of any appropriation in this chapter, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this chapter for fire suppression purposes shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 107. Appropriations made in this chapter shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U. S. C. 686): *Provided*, That reimbursements for cost of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made in this chapter shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) when authorized by the Secretary; maintenance and operation of aircraft; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secre-

tary; health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); and the payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

SEC. 109. During the current fiscal year the head of any Department or establishment of the Government having funds available for scientific and technical investigations within the scope of the functions of the Department of the Interior may, with the approval of the Secretary, transfer to the Department such sums as may be necessary therefor, which sums so transferred may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein but without their limitations.

SEC. 110. Transfers to the Department of the Interior, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, of equipment, material and supplies, excess to the needs of Federal agencies may be made at the request of the Secretary without reimbursement or transfer of funds when required by the Department for operations conducted in Territories and island possessions.

TITLE II—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

GRANTS

For payment to the Virgin Islands Corporation in the form of grants, \$474,000, for estimated losses to be sustained during the fiscal years 1950 and 1951, as authorized by section 8 (a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act, in the conduct of activities budgeted as predominantly revenue producing.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

During the current fiscal year the Virgin Islands Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available to it and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal-year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out its programs as set forth in the budget for the fiscal year 1951: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$121,480 shall be available for administrative expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the Corporation, covering the categories set forth in the 1951 Budget estimates for such expenses.

This chapter may be cited as the "Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER VIII—EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

For compensation of the President, including an expense allowance at the rate of \$50,000 per annum, as authorized by the Act of January 19, 1949 (Public Law 2), \$150,000.

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for The White House Office, including personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; not to exceed \$100,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at such per diem rates for individuals as the President may specify, and other personal services without regard to the provisions of law regulating the employment and compensation of persons in the Government service; and travel and official entertainment expenses of the President, to be accounted for solely on his certificate; \$1,585,553.

EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT

To provide for emergencies affecting the national interest or security, without regard to such provisions of law regulating the expenditure of Government funds as the President may specify, and for supplementing the efforts and available resources of State and local governments or other agencies in alleviating hardship or suffering caused by flood, fire, hurricane, earthquake, or other catastrophe in any part of the United States, \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That assistance in alleviating hardship or suffering caused by such a catastrophe may be rendered through such agency or agencies as the President may designate and in such manner as he shall determine, without regard to such provisions of law regulating the expenditure of Government funds or the employment of persons in the Government service as he shall specify, whenever he finds that such a catastrophe is of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant emergency assistance by the Federal Government in alleviating hardship or suffering caused thereby, and if the Governor of any State in which such a catastrophe shall occur shall certify that such assistance is required, and shall have entered into an agreement with such agency of the Government as the President may designate, giving assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, local governments therein, or other agencies, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe: *Provided further*, That within any affected area Federal agencies are authorized to participate in any such emergency assistance: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation which may be allocated for alleviating hardship or suffering caused by a catastrophe shall be expended for departmental personal services or for permanent construction: *And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Eighty-first Congress or the first session of the Eighty-second Congress and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate or House of Representatives or by the Committee on Appropriations of either body.

EXECUTIVE MANSION AND GROUNDS

For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refurnishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion and the Executive Mansion grounds, and traveling expenses, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act, \$266,000.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Bureau of the Budget, personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; exchange of books; newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding \$200); teletype news service (not exceeding \$900); printing and binding; not to exceed \$20,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals; a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and the payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); \$3,412,000.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Council in carrying out its functions under the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U. S. C. 1021), including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel expenses; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; printing and binding; newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding \$200); press clippings (not exceeding \$300); a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); \$300,000.

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

PHILIPPINE ALIEN PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION

Administrative expenses, Philippine Alien Property Administration: The Philippine Alien Property Administrator is hereby authorized to pay out of any funds or other property or interest vested in him or transferred to him, necessary expenses incurred in carrying out the powers and duties conferred on him pursuant to the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.), and the Philippine Property Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 418): *Provided*, That not to exceed \$187,750 shall be available for the current fiscal year for the general administrative expenses of the Philippine Alien Property Administration; printing and binding; rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia; employment outside the United States of persons without regard to the civil service and classification laws including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); personal services in the District of Columbia and expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the agency: *Provided further*, That on or before November 1 of the current fiscal year the Philippine Alien Property Administrator shall make a report to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives giving detailed information on all administrative and nonadministrative expenses incurred during the next preceding fiscal year, in connection with the activities of the Philippine Alien Property Administration: *Provided further*, That the Philippine Alien Property Administration shall cease to exist after June 30, 1951, and all duties being performed by such Administration as of that date shall be transferred to the Office of Alien Property Custodian, including all records, files, and other property.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, as authorized by the Act of June 26, 1946 (36 U. S. C. 121, 123-132, 138), including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its Territories and possessions at a cost not exceeding \$4,845; travel expenses; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; and printing, binding, engraving, lithographing, photographing, and typewriting; \$670,000: *Provided*, That where station allowance has been authorized by the Department of the Army for officers of the Army serving the Army at certain foreign stations, the same allowance shall be authorized for officers of the armed forces assigned to the Commission while serving at the same foreign stations, and this appropriation is hereby made available for the payment of such allowance: *Provided further*, That when traveling on business of the Commission, officers of the armed forces serving as members or as secretary of the Commission may be reimbursed for expenses as provided for civilian members of the Commission.

Construction of memorials and cemeteries: For the permanent design and construction of memorials and cemeteries in foreign countries as authorized by the Act of June 26, 1946 (36 U. S. C. 121, 123-132, 138), and the Act of August 5, 1947 (50 U. S. C. 1819), and personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$8,500,000, of which \$5,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority provided under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, to remain available until expended; and in addition the Commission is authorized to enter into contracts in the amount of \$1,500,000 for the purposes of this appropriation.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, including personal services in the District of Columbia and employment of aliens; purchase of land and interests in land; services authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of not to exceed one hundred and fifty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; printing and binding; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); publication and dissemination of atomic information; payment of tort claims pursuant to law; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; purchase of newspapers and periodicals (not to exceed \$8,000) and travel expenses; official entertainment expenses (not to exceed \$5,000); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; and payment of obligations incurred under prior year contract authorizations; \$647,820,000, together with the unexpended balances, as of June 30, 1950, of prior year appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission, of which amounts \$100,000 may be expended for objects

of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended; from which appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred; and in addition to the amount herein provided, the Commission is authorized to contract for the purposes of this appropriation during the current fiscal year in an amount not exceeding \$300,150,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee (except such officers and employees whose compensation is fixed by law, and scientific and technical personnel) whose position would be subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, if such Act were applicable to such position, at a rate in excess of the rate payable under such Act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used—

(A) to start any new construction project for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year;

(B) to start any new construction project the currently estimated cost of which exceeds the estimated cost included therefor in such budget; or

(C) to continue any community facility construction project whenever the currently estimated cost thereof exceeds the estimated cost included therefor in such budget;

unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such construction project or its continuation and a detailed explanation thereof is submitted forthwith by the Director to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; the limitations contained in this proviso shall not apply to any construction project the total estimated cost of which does not exceed \$500,000; and, as used herein, the term "construction project" includes the purchase, alteration, or improvement of buildings, and the term "budget" includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates: *Provided further*, That whenever the current estimate to complete any construction project (except community facilities) exceeds by 15 per centum the estimated cost included therefor in such budget or the estimated cost of a construction project covered by clause (A) of the foregoing proviso which has been approved by the Director, the Commission shall forthwith submit a detailed explanation thereof to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: *Provided further*, That the two foregoing provisos shall have no application with respect to technical and production facilities (1) if the Commission certifies to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that immediate construction or immediate continuation of construction is necessary to the national defense and security, and (2) if the Director agrees that such certification is justified: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authorization

shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of \$90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of \$45,000 per annum.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed \$28,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not to exceed \$10,000 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; travel expenses of examiners acting under the direction of the Commission, and expenses of examinations and investigations held in Washington and elsewhere; payment in advance for library membership in societies whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; printing and binding; not to exceed \$50,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); and not to exceed \$5,000 for actuarial services by contract, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended; \$15,511,913: *Provided*, That no details from any executive department or independent establishment in the District of Columbia or elsewhere to the Commission's central office in Washington or to any of its regional offices shall be made during the current fiscal year, but this shall not affect the making of details for service as members of the boards of examiners outside the immediate offices of the Commission in Washington or of the regional directors, nor shall it affect the making of details of persons qualified to serve as expert examiners on special subjects: *Provided further*, That the Civil Service Commission shall have power in case of emergency to transfer or detail any of its employees to or from its office or field force: *Provided further*, That members of the Loyalty Review Board in Washington and of the regional loyalty boards in the field may be paid actual transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949 while traveling on official business away from their homes or regular places of business, and while en route to and from and at the place where their services are to be performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in section 281 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment for part-time or intermittent service as a member of the Loyalty Review Board or a regional loyalty board in the Civil Service Commission.

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 9358 of July 1, 1943, or for the compensation or expenses

of any member of a board of examiners (1) who has not made affidavit that he has not appeared in any agency proceeding within the preceding two years, and will not thereafter while a board member appear in any agency proceeding, as a party, or in behalf of a party to the proceeding, before an agency in which an applicant is employed who has been rated or will be rated by such member; or (2) who, after making such affidavit, has rated an applicant who at the time of the rating is employed by an agency before which the board member has appeared as a party, or in behalf of a party, within the preceding two years: *Provided*, That the definitions of "agency", "agency proceeding" and "party" in section 2 of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to these terms as used herein.

No part of appropriations herein shall be used to pay the compensation of officers and employees of the Civil Service Commission who allocate or reallocate supervisory positions in the classified civil service solely on the size of the group, section, bureau, or other organization unit, or on the number of subordinates supervised. References to size of the group, section, bureau, or other organization unit or the number of subordinates supervised may be given effect only to the extent warranted by the work load of such organization unit and then only in combination with other factors, such as the kind, difficulty, and complexity of work supervised, the degree and scope of responsibility delegated to the supervisor, and the kind, degree, and value of the supervision actually exercised.

Panama Canal construction annuity fund: For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May 29, 1944, as amended (48 U. S. C. 1373a), \$2,803,177.

Civil-service retirement and disability fund: For financing the liability of the United States, created by the Act approved May 22, 1920, and Acts amendatory thereof (5 U. S. C. chap. 14), \$305,000,000, which amount shall be placed to the credit of the "civil-service retirement and disability fund".

COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

For all expenses of the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion as authorized by Public Law 40, Eighty-first Congress, \$35,000, together with not exceeding \$30,000 of the unobligated balances of funds appropriated for such purpose in the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, and the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950.

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended by the Act of June 16, 1950 (Public Law 555), including personal services and rents in the District of Columbia; travel expenses, including travel expenses outside continental United States without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; purchase (not to exceed three), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and

binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); expenses incident to the primary and secondary education of American children who are dependents of Government personnel paid from this appropriation and stationed overseas; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; and payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; \$8,000,000: *Provided*, That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further*, That the Commission may enter into agreements with United States governmental agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in performing the duties imposed by the Communications Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1064), the Ship Act of 1910, approved June 24, 1910, as amended (46 U. S. C. 484-487), the International Radiotelegraphic Convention (45 Stat. pt. 2, p. 2760), Executive Order 3513, dated July 9, 1921, as amended under date of June 30, 1934, relating to applications for submarine cable licenses, and the radiotelegraphy provisions of the Convention for Promoting Safety of Life at Sea, ratified by the President July 7, 1936, including personal services in the District of Columbia, contract stenographic reporting services, special counsel fees, health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672), improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to exceed \$17,500), purchase of not to exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, travel expenses (not to exceed \$93,000), and printing and binding, \$6,625,000, of which \$25,000 shall be available only for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), for a survey as to ways and means of expediting business: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this paragraph may be used for application processing and hearings in connection with broadcast activities and for application processing in connection with safety and special services without regard to the apportionment of funds required by the Act of February 27, 1906 (31 U. S. C. 665).

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by law, including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed

\$256,500 for travel; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); printing and binding; and purchase (not to exceed two, for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$500 for newspapers; \$4,013,300, of which amount not to exceed \$10,000 shall be available for special counsel and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates not exceeding \$50 per diem for individuals.

Flood-control surveys: For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission as authorized by section 4 of the Act of June 28, 1938 (33 U. S. C. 701j), and similar provisions in subsequent Acts, including personal services in the District of Columbia; contract stenographic reporting services, and printing and binding, \$351,700.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); contract stenographic reporting services; and printing and binding; and not to exceed \$700 for newspapers; \$3,891,695, of which not less than \$223,473 shall be available for trade practice agreement work: *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated herein for the Federal Trade Commission shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Salaries: For personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$32,689,500.

Miscellaneous expenses: For necessary expenses, including printing and binding and the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, \$1,750,000.

Appropriations for the General Accounting Office shall be available for a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), for payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672), for newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding \$300), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Sites and planning, public buildings outside the District of Columbia: For expenses necessary for continuing the program for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of drawings and specifications for Federal public building projects outside the District of Columbia, as authorized and provided for by title I of the Act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105), and by the Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$22,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Renovation and improvement of federally owned buildings outside of the District of Columbia: For expenses necessary for continuing the program for the renovation and improvement of federally owned

buildings outside the District of Columbia, for which funds are not otherwise available, including appurtenances and approaches thereto, that are under the control of the General Services Administration for repair and preservation, as authorized by title III of the Act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105), including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Repair, preservation, and equipment, outside the District of Columbia: For the repair, alteration, improvement, preservation, and equipment, not otherwise provided for, including personal services in the District of Columbia, of completed Federal buildings, the grounds and approaches thereof, wharves, and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto, and care and safeguarding of sites acquired for Federal buildings and of surplus real property, the custody of which is the responsibility of the General Services Administration under the Act of August 27, 1935 (40 U. S. C. 304), and Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, pending sale or disposition; the demolition of buildings thereon; the purchase and repair of equipment and fixtures in buildings under the administration of the General Services Administration; and for changes in, maintenance of, and repairs to the pneumatic-tube system in New York City installed under franchise of the city of New York, approved June 29, 1909, and June 11, 1928, and the payment of any obligations arising thereunder in accordance with the provisions of the Acts approved August 5, 1909 (36 Stat. 120), and May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 533); \$10,000,000.

Federal office building, Nashville, Tennessee: For completion of construction of a Federal office building in Nashville, Tennessee, to remain available until expended, \$1,200,000, which shall be for payment of obligations incurred under authority granted under this head in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949.

Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio: For completion of construction of buildings and facilities at Cincinnati, Ohio, for the use of the Public Health Service, as authorized by section 8 (b) of the Act of June 30, 1948 (Public Law 845), \$1,400,000, to remain available until expended, and in addition thereto the General Services Administration is authorized to enter into contracts for such purposes in an amount not exceeding \$2,400,000.

Federal Courts Building, District of Columbia: For completion of construction of a building for the use of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, as authorized by the Act of May 14, 1948 (Public Law 527), to remain available until expended, \$6,000,000, which shall be for payment of obligations incurred under authority granted under this head in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948.

General Accounting Office Building, District of Columbia: For completion of construction of a building for the use of the General Accounting Office on square 518, in the District of Columbia, under the provisions of the Act of May 18, 1948 (Public Law 533), to remain available until expended, \$15,358,194, which shall be for payment of obligations incurred under authority granted under this head in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948.

Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion: For completing the renovation, repair, and modernization of the Executive Man-

sion, to remain available until expended, \$3,400,000, which shall be for payment of obligations incurred under authority granted under this head in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949.

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946, including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of five passenger motor vehicles; and printing and binding; \$605,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$240,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head; and in addition to the amount herein appropriated, contracts may be entered into for the purposes of the said Act of July 23, 1946, in an amount not in excess of \$125,000,000: *Provided*, That any funds received as proceeds from sale or other disposition of materials on account of the rotation of stocks under said Act shall be deposited to the credit, and be available for expenditure for the purposes, of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with subsection 6 (a) of the Act of July 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 598), may be transferred to stock piles established in accordance with said Act.

For refunds under section 403 (a) (4) (D) (relating to the recomputation of the amortization deduction) and by the last sentence of section 403 (i) (3) (relating to excess inventories) of the Renegotiation Act; and to refund any amount finally adjudged or determined to have been erroneously collected by the United States pursuant to a unilateral determination of excessive profits, with interest thereon (at a rate not to exceed 4 per centum per annum) as may be determined by the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, computed to the date of certification to the Treasury Department for payment; \$7,400,000: *Provided*, That to the extent refunds are made from this appropriation of excessive profits collected under the Renegotiation Act and retained by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any of its subsidiaries, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the appropriate subsidiary shall reimburse this appropriation: *Provided further*, That refunds made hereunder shall be based solely on the certificate of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board or its duly authorized representatives.

To increase the General Supply Fund established by section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, approved June 30, 1949), \$4,000,000.

Alaska public works: For an additional amount for expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 264), relating to the development of the Territory of Alaska, to remain available until June 30, 1955, \$9,000,000, of which \$4,000,000 shall be for the liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head and of which not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including the purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure on any project until a certificate has been received from the Secretary of Defense that the installation of such facility will be of value in connection with national defense.

Advance planning of non-Federal public works: For an additional amount for expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the Act of October 13, 1949 (Public Law 352), relating to the advance planning of public works, to remain available until expended, \$20,000,000, of which \$14,100,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head and of which not to exceed \$1,704,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; and in addition, the General Services Administration is authorized to enter into contracts, in an amount not to exceed \$27,000,000, for the purposes of this appropriation.

Grants for plan preparation, water pollution control: For an additional amount for grants to States, municipalities, or interstate agencies to aid in financing the cost of action preliminary to the construction of projects for water pollution control as authorized by section 8 (c) of the Water Pollution Control Act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1155), \$750,000.

Administrative expenses, water pollution control: For expenses necessary to carry out the administrative functions of the General Services Administration under the provisions of the Water Pollution Control Act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1155), as authorized by section 8 (e) of said Act, including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel, hire of passenger motor vehicles; health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and exchange of books; \$52,285.

Virgin Islands public works: For an additional amount to carry out the provisions of the Act of December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 827), \$1,000,000, and, in addition, the General Services Administration is authorized to enter into contracts, for an amount not to exceed \$1,467,000, for the purposes of this appropriation.

Public works advance planning: Not to exceed \$4,350,000 of the unexpended balances on June 30, 1950, of funds made available for public works advance planning under title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 791), are hereby continued available for expenditure until June 30, 1951. The sum of \$1,324,000 carried in the said unexpended balances shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Act.

Liquidation of public works advance planning: Not to exceed \$125,000 of the unobligated balance on June 30, 1950, of the funds made available for public works advance planning under title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 791) shall be available during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the liquidation of the activity for which said funds were appropriated, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946.

War public works (community facilities) liquidation: For administrative expenses necessary during the current fiscal year for the liquidation of all activities under titles II, III, and IV of the Act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1531-1534, 1541, and 1562), except expenses related to the maintenance, operation and disposal of Federal project properties, and those in connection with the management and disposal of project securities, including personal services and rents in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; and a health

service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); not to exceed \$40,000 of the unobligated balances of the funds heretofore appropriated for carrying out the provisions of titles II, III, and IV of the Act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1531-1534, 1541, and 1562).

Operating expenses: For necessary expenses of the General Services Administration not otherwise provided for, including: Operation, maintenance, protection, repair, and improvement of public buildings and grounds to the extent that such buildings and grounds are under the control of the General Services Administration for any of such purposes (including the operation, maintenance, and protection of the District Court Building in the District of Columbia); rental of buildings or parts thereof in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; ground rent, which may be paid in advance where required; demolition of buildings; furnishings and equipment; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; payment of sums in lieu of taxes accruing against real property declared surplus by Government corporations under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, where legal title to such property remains in the Government corporation; compliance with the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 451ff); payment of per diem employees employed in connection with any of the foregoing functions at rates approved by the Administrator of General Services or his designee not exceeding current rates for similar services in the place where such services are employed; arms and ammunition for the guard force; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators; purchase of not to exceed twenty-three passenger motor vehicles; processing and determining net renegotiation rebates; liquidation of activities under the Act to promote the defense of the United States (55 Stat. 31); scientific, technical and other apparatus and materials for the arrangement, titling, scoring, repair, editing, processing, duplication, and reproduction of photographic and other records (including motion-picture and other films and sound recordings) in the custody of the Archivist of the United States and preparation of guides and other finding aids to records of the Second World War; \$78,500,000.

Section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a) shall not apply to any lease entered into by, or transferred to, the General Services Administration, for the housing of agencies specifically exempted from the requirements of said section.

The foregoing appropriation shall be credited with (1) advances or reimbursements for salaries and administrative expenses chargeable against other appropriations of the General Services Administration, and such salaries and expenses may be paid from this appropriation; (2) advances or reimbursements for services, quarters, maintenance, or other facilities furnished other agencies on a reimbursable basis; (3) cost of maintenance, upkeep, and repair included as part of rentals received from Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U. S. C. 129); (4) reimbursements for services performed in respect to bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, issued by public authorities, States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to such bonds or

obligations as the Administrator deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from this appropriation; and (5) as respects property transferred to the General Services Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U. S. C. 451ff), (a) advances or reimbursements for necessary utilities and services furnished private occupants of industrial plants, and such utilities and services may be provided at cost from this appropriation; (b) proceeds received from insurance against damage to such property, and such proceeds may, at the direction of the Secretary of Defense, be used to repair or restore the damaged property; and (c) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the General Services Administration, in connection with such property, and such appropriations or funds may, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, be so transferred.

Appropriations or other funds available to the General Services Administration shall be available during the current fiscal year for personal services in the District of Columbia; health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); printing and binding; purchase of newspapers and periodicals (not to exceed \$400); preparation, shipment, and installation of photographic displays, exhibits, and other descriptive materials; and payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

During the current fiscal year, no part of any money appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used during any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase typewriting machines (except bookkeeping and billing machines) at a price which exceeds 90 per centum of the lowest net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the most-favored customer (other than the Government, the American National Red Cross, and the purchasers of typewriting machines for educational purposes only) of the manufacturer of such machines during the six-month period immediately preceding such quarter.

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Government (which shall include all departments, independent establishments, and wholly owned Government corporations) shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines (except typewriting machines for veterans under public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration) unless the Administrator of General Services certifies that he is unable to furnish such agency with suitable typewriting machines out of stock on hand. The Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed at such times as he may determine to be necessary to survey and determine the numbers and kinds of typewriting machines located in the continental limits of the United States which are at any time surplus to the requirements of any agency in the executive branch of the Government (which shall include all departments, independent establishments, and wholly owned Government corporations). Upon such determination, the Administrator of General Services is authorized to direct, upon such notice and in such manner as he may prescribe, the head of any such agency to surrender to the General Services Administration any and all typewriting machines surplus to its requirements, the costs of packing, shipping, and handling thereof to be charged to the general supply

fund. Each such agency shall furnish the Administrator of General Services such information regarding typewriting machines, wherever located, as he may from time to time request. The General Services Administration is authorized and directed to receive, hold, sell, exchange, or supply to any branch of the Government, including the District of Columbia, typewriting machines surrendered to it hereunder. The Administrator of General Services is authorized to charge each agency to which typewriting machines are supplied hereunder amounts equal to the fair value thereof, as determined by him, and such amounts shall be credited to the general supply fund.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, for replacement only; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the agency; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and transportation expenses and not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b-2), for persons serving without compensation as members of any advisory committee established pursuant to Title VI of the Housing Act of 1949; \$4,200,000: *Provided*, That the Administrator may, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transfer to this account from funds of the constituent agencies such sums as relate primarily to functions which are consolidated in the Office of the Administrator as authorized by Title III of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended: *Provided further*, That necessary expenses of inspections of projects financed through loans to educational institutions authorized by Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be compensated by such institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative, and for the purpose of providing such inspections, the Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such institutions or the administrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such charges have been made.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Annual contributions: For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1410), \$7,500,000: *Provided*, That except for payments required on contracts entered into prior to April 18, 1940, no part of this appropriation shall be available for payment to any public housing agency for expenditure in connection with any low-rent housing project, unless the public housing agency shall have adopted regulations prohibiting as a tenant

of any such project by rental or occupancy any person other than a citizen of the United States, but such prohibition shall not be applicable in the case of a family of any serviceman or the family of any veteran who has been discharged (other than dishonorably) from, or the family and any serviceman who died in, the armed forces of the United States within four years prior to the date of application for admission to such housing: *Provided further*, That all expenditures of this appropriation shall be subject to audit and final settlement by the Comptroller General of the United States under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended.

Administrative expenses: For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, \$9,000,000, to be merged with and expended under the authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this chapter.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 13, 1946 (25 U. S. C. 70), creating an Indian Claims Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia and printing and binding, \$91,700, together with not exceeding \$7,300 of the unobligated balance available for such purpose contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

General expenses: For expenses necessary in performing the functions vested by law in the Commission (49 U. S. C. 1-24, 301-327, 901-923, 1001-1022), except those otherwise specifically provided for in this Act, and for general administration, including not to exceed \$5,000 for the employment of special counsel; contract stenographic reporting services; personal services in the District of Columbia; newspapers (not to exceed \$200); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); purchase of twenty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and printing and binding; \$9,889,600 (and any part of the amounts of \$100,000 for valuations of pipe lines, and \$3,831,920 for the work of the Bureau of Motor Carriers, contained in this paragraph, may be transferred as the Commission may determine for carrying out other functions of the Commission), of which \$100,000 shall be available for valuations of pipe lines, and \$3,831,920 shall be available for the work of the Bureau of Motor Carriers: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

Railroad safety: For expenses necessary in performing functions authorized by law (45 U. S. C. 1-15, 17-21, 35-46, 61-64; 49 U. S. C. 26) to insure a maximum of safety in the operation of railroads, including authority to investigate, test experimentally, and report on the use and need of any appliances or systems intended to promote the safety of railway operation, including those pertaining to block-signal and train-control systems, as authorized by the joint resolution approved June 30, 1906, and the Sundry Civil Act of May 27, 1908

(45 U. S. C. 35-37), and to require carriers by railroad subject to the Act to install automatic train-stop or train-control devices as prescribed by the Commission (49 U. S. C. 26), including the employment of inspectors, engineers, and personal services in the District of Columbia, and payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672), \$1,000,000.

Locomotive inspection: For expenses necessary in the enforcement of the Act of February 17, 1911, entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto", as amended (45 U. S. C. 22-34), including personal services in the District of Columbia, and payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672), \$718,600.

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay in advance to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin the Federal contribution toward the expenses of the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of its business in the conservancy district established pursuant to the Act of July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 748), \$5,000.

MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission established by the Act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 880), including personal services in the District of Columbia, travel, printing and binding, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$190,000.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Committee, including contracts for the making of special investigations and reports and for engineering, drafting and computing services; equipment, maintenance, and operation of the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, and the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory; purchase and maintenance of cafeteria equipment; maintenance and operation of aircraft; purchase of eight passenger motor vehicles of which seven shall be for replacement; printing and binding; personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); and a health service program for employees as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); in all, \$42,500,000: *Provided*, That statutory provisions prohibiting the payment of compensation to aliens shall not apply to any person whose employment by the Committee shall be determined by the Chairman thereof to be necessary: *Provided further*, That aircraft and parts, equipment, and supplies may be trans-

ferred to the Committee by the Air Force, Army, and Navy without reimbursement: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the operation of a field office outside the continental or territorial limits of the United States.

Construction and equipment: For construction and equipment at laboratories and research stations of the Committee, to be available until June 30 of the next succeeding year, \$15,500,000, of which \$10,000,000 and \$5,000,000 shall be available for payments under contracts entered into pursuant to the contract authority under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts, 1949 and 1950 respectively: *Provided*, That in addition, the Committee may enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not in excess of \$11,000,000.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Maintenance and operation of properties: For the maintenance and operation of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Authority Act \$38,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress) shall not be effective.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Land acquisition, National Capital and metropolitan area: For necessary expenses for the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in connection with the acquisition of land for the park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital, as authorized by the Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), and amendment of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 960), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and real estate appraisers, by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil service and classification laws, at rates of pay or fees not to exceed those usual for similar services; and purchase of options and other costs incident to the acquisition of land; \$724,500, to remain available until expended, \$480,500 of said sum to be used for carrying out the provisions of section 1 (b) of said Act and \$244,000 for carrying out the provisions of section 4 of said Act: *Provided*, That not exceeding \$29,000 of the funds available under the above appropriation during the current fiscal year may be used for regular and part-time personal services of the Commission, excepting services by contract.

OFFICE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE RECORDS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Office of Selective Service Records, as authorized by the Act of March 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 31), and by section 10 (a) (4) of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), including personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C.

2672) ; and a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ; \$4,954,000.

PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

Philippine War Damage Commission: For carrying out the provisions of title I of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, \$40,200,000, to remain available until April 30, 1951, of which not to exceed \$1,620,000 shall be for necessary expenses of the Philippine War Damage Commission for the current fiscal year, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of newspapers and periodicals not to exceed \$200; housing of American employees by rental or lease and necessary repairs and alterations to and maintenance of quarters, without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a) ; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111) ; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) : *Provided*, That the provisions of the Act of June 29, 1936 (46 U. S. C. 1241), shall not apply to any travel or transportation of effects payable from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That no payment shall be made under the provisions of such title of such Act to any person who, by a civil or military court having jurisdiction, has been found guilty of collaborating with the enemy or of any act involving disloyalty to the United States or the Republic of the Philippines or, in any case involving charges of such collaboration or disloyalty which have not been adjudicated by any such court, where the Commission, after hearing and evidence, certifies that it is satisfied that the person so charged is guilty of such collaboration or disloyalty: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for engaging in any phase of activity or for undertaking any phase of activity authorized by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 which would result in obligating the Government of the United States in any sense or respect to the future payment of amounts in excess of the amounts authorized to be appropriated in such Act.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) ; not to exceed \$1,150 for the purchase of newspapers; printing and binding; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$6,230,000.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Salaries and expenses, Smithsonian Institution: For all necessary expenses for the preservation, exhibition, and increase of collections from the surveying and exploring expeditions of the Government and from other sources; for the system of international exchanges between the United States and foreign countries; for anthropological researches among the American Indians and the natives of lands under the jurisdiction or protection of the United States, independently or in cooperation with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States, and the excavation and preservation of archeological remains;

for maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observations in high altitudes; for the administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts; for the administration, and for the construction and maintenance, of laboratory and other facilities on Barro Colorado Island, Canal Zone, under the provisions of the Act of July 2, 1940, as amended by the provisions of Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1946; for the maintenance and administration of a national air museum as authorized by the Act of August 12, 1946 (20 U. S. C. 77); including personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed \$35,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); traveling expenses; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); printing and binding, including printing the report of the American Historical Association; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator conductors; repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications; \$2,700,000.

Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art: For the upkeep and operation of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including personal services in the District of Columbia; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); traveling expenses; payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators; printing and binding; purchase or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and not to exceed \$15,000 for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper, \$1,179,000.

TARIFF COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Tariff Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, subscriptions to newspapers (not to exceed \$250), health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), and contract stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$1,290,700: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of any member of the Tariff Commission who shall hereafter participate in any proceedings under sections 336, 337, and 338 of the Tariff Act of 1930, wherein he or any member of his family has any special, direct, and pecuniary interest, or in which he has acted as attorney or special representative.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 12A), including purchase (not to exceed two) and hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft; the purchase (not to exceed two hundred and twenty-five for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$102,714,000 to remain available until expended, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against prior appropriations.

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including printing and binding and contract stenographic reporting services, \$826,900: *Provided*, That travel expenses of the judges shall be paid upon the written certificate of the judge.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Ship construction: For new ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, as authorized by title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (except for construction of one prototype vessel under title VII of said Act), \$35,000,000, of which \$30,000,000 is for payment of obligations for new ship construction incurred under authority granted in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948; and, in addition, the Commission is authorized to enter into contracts for new ship construction in an amount not to exceed \$63,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$64,875,000 of the funds and contract authority made available for new ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, shall continue to be available until December 31, 1950: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used (1) to start any new ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year; or (2) to start any new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 per centum the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construction and the Director shall submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, as used herein, the term "budget" includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates.

Operating-differential subsidies: For operating-differential subsidies, as authorized by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, \$26,450,000, together with funds appropriated under this head in the Supplemental Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, not to exceed \$16,770,000 from the special deposit account established with receipts from sales under Public Laws 44 and 305 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and not to exceed \$3,529,000 from the special deposit account established from the refund of unobligated amounts out of the working fund established with the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, for development of reserve fleet sites, all to be available until expended for

payment of operating-differential subsidies for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951, to grant operating-differential subsidies on a long-term basis and to obligate the United States to make future payments in accordance with the terms of such contracts: *Provided*, That to the extent that the operating-differential subsidy accrual (computed on the basis of parity) is represented on the operator's books by a contingent accounts receivable item against the Commission as a partial or complete offset to the recapture accrual, the operator (1) shall be excused from making deposits in the special reserve fund, and (2) as to the amount of such earnings the deposit of which is so excused shall be entitled to the same tax treatment as though it had been deposited in said special reserve fund. To the extent that any amount paid to the operator by the Commission reduces the balance in the operator's contingent receivable account against the Commission, such amount, unless it is forthwith deposited in the fund, shall be considered as withdrawn under section 607 (h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this Act, or in any prior appropriation Act, shall be construed to affect the authority of the Commission pursuant to the provisions of section 603 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, (1) to grant operating-differential subsidies on a long-term basis, and (2) to obligate the United States to make future payments in accordance with the terms of such operating-differential subsidy contracts: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for obligation, nor any obligation made, for the payment of an operating-differential subsidy for any number of ships in excess of the number of two hundred and sixty-three, unless a certificate has been received from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, that an operating-differential subsidy is required for a larger number of such ships in connection with national defense: *Provided further*, That the balance in excess of \$16,770,000 as of June 30, 1950, in the special deposit account established with receipts from sales under Public Laws 44 and 305 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, together with any receipts after that date from such sales, shall be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for carrying into effect the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and other laws administered by the United States Maritime Commission, \$19,903,300, within limitations as follows:

Administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; not to exceed \$2,000 for newspapers and periodicals; purchase of five passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; not to exceed \$17,700 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not to exceed \$1,125 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifically authorized by the Chairman; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); and \$50,000 to be available exclusively for ship structure research, testing and models; \$9,271,700: *Provided*, That the Maritime Commission is authorized to dispense with the administrative audit of agents' accounts covering voyages beginning prior to April 1, 1949;

Maintenance of shipyard facilities, \$452,000;

Operation of warehouses, \$436,000;
Reserve fleet expense, \$8,978,600;
Maintenance and operation of terminals, \$765,000.

Maritime training: For training personnel for the manning of the merchant marine (including operation of training stations at Kings Point, New York; Sheepshead Bay, New York; Alameda, California, and the United States Maritime Service Institute), including not to exceed \$2,477,000 for administrative personal services (exclusive of pay of cadet midshipmen and other trainees) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere which may be used to provide pay and allowances for personnel of the United States Maritime Service comparable to those of the Coast Guard as authorized by law (46 U. S. C. 1126, 14 F. R. 7707); purchase of three passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; printing and binding; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); not to exceed \$2,500 for contingencies for the Superintendent, United States Merchant Marine Academy, to be expended in his discretion; not to exceed \$77,000 for transfer to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for services rendered the Commission; \$4,348,520, including the pay of cadet midshipmen and other trainees.

State marine schools: To reimburse the State of California, \$50,000; the State of Maine, \$50,000; the State of Massachusetts, \$50,000; and the State of New York, \$50,000; for expenses incurred in the maintenance and support of marine schools in such States as provided in the Act authorizing the establishment of marine schools, and so forth, approved March 4, 1911, as amended (34 U. S. C. 1121-1123); \$153,000 for the maintenance and repair of vessels loaned by the United States to the said States for use in connection with such State marine schools, and \$749,050 for the pay of seven hundred and ten cadet midshipmen at \$65 per month and \$275 per annum for the subsistence of each cadet midshipman; \$1,102,050.

Vessel operating functions: For expenses (other than administrative expenses) necessary for liquidating the operating functions transferred to the United States Maritime Commission by section 202 of the Naval Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 501), \$764,760, together with not to exceed \$150,000 of the unobligated balance for this purpose contained in the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, which latter sum, together with not to exceed \$150,000 of the amount herein appropriated, shall be available for liquidation of liens or claims which may take precedence over the Government's preferred mortgage on vessels, and other expenses necessary to protect the Government's interest in vessels sold or chartered: *Provided*, That receipts from such functions during the current fiscal year shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

No additional vessels shall be allocated under charter, nor shall any vessel be continued under charter by reason of any extension of chartering authority beyond June 30, 1949, unless the charterer shall agree that the Commission shall have no obligation upon redelivery to accept or pay for consumable stores, bunkers, and slop-chest items, except with respect to such minimum amounts of bunkers as the Commission considers advisable to be retained on the vessel and that prior to such redelivery all consumable stores, slop-chest items, and

bunkers over and above such minimums shall be removed from the vessel by the charterer at his own expense.

War Shipping Administration liquidation: The unexpended balance of the appropriation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, for liquidation of obligations approved by the General Accounting Office as properly incurred against funds of the War Shipping Administration prior to January 1, 1947, is hereby continued available during the current fiscal year.

Construction fund: For an additional amount for payment of obligations (exclusive of obligations for ship construction, reconditioning, and betterments incurred pursuant to authority contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948) incurred prior to July 1, 1948, against the Construction fund established pursuant to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, \$10,000,000, to be available until June 30, 1951, for expenditure only.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the Commission is authorized to furnish utilities and services and make necessary repairs in connection with any lease, contract, or occupancy involving Government property under control of the Commission, and payments received by the Commission for utilities, services, and repairs so furnished or made shall be credited to the appropriation charged with the cost thereof: *Provided*, That rental payments under any such lease, contract, or occupancy on account of items other than such utilities, services, or repairs shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The United States Maritime Commission shall not incur any obligations during the current fiscal year from the construction fund established by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, or otherwise, in excess of the appropriations and limitations contained in this chapter, or in any prior appropriation Act, and all receipts which otherwise would be deposited to the credit of said fund shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: For necessary expenses of the Veterans' Administration, including maintenance and operation of medical, hospital, and domiciliary services, in carrying out the functions pursuant to all laws for which the Administration is charged with administering, including personal services in the District of Columbia; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); purchase of ninety-three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and one without reference to the provisions of this or any other Act; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); maintenance and operation of farms; recreational articles and facilities at institutions maintained by the Veterans' Administration; expenses incidental to securing employment for war veterans; funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration except burial awards authorized by Veterans' Administration Regulation Numbered 9 (a), as amended; aid to State or Territorial homes in conformity with the Act approved August 27, 1888, as amended (24 U. S. C. 134), for the support of veterans eligible for admission to Veterans' Administration facilities for hospital

or domiciliary care; not to exceed \$5,600 for newspapers and periodicals; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); not to exceed \$44,000 for the preparation, shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic displays, moving pictures, and other visual educational information and descriptive material, including the purchase or rental of equipment; and not to exceed \$800,000 for research work in connection with prosthetic appliances; \$881,750,000, together with not to exceed \$179,000 of the unobligated balance of funds appropriated for this purpose in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, from which allotments and transfers may be made to the Federal Security Agency (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Interior Departments, for disbursements by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of seventy persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home, or for the purchase of any hospital or home; and not more than \$4,708,000 of this appropriation may be used to repair, alter, improve, or provide facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and the purchase of materials: *Provided further*, That hereafter the Administrator shall assign as his representatives, as provided for in the last sentence of section 1100 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C. 696f), only such numbers of regional or sectional representatives as he finds necessary to provide for the processing of readjustment allowances in an efficient and economical manner.

Compensation and pensions: For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities, and allowances (including subsistence allowances authorized by part VII of Veterans Regulation 1a, as amended), authorized under any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities, the administration of which is now or may hereafter be placed in the Veterans' Administration, and for the payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended (38 U. S. C. 631 and 661), \$2,147,520,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended.

Readjustment benefits: For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by titles II, III, and V, of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, \$2,505,600,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended.

Military and naval insurance: For military and naval insurance, \$6,830,000 to remain available until expended.

Hospital and domiciliary facilities: For hospital and domiciliary facilities, \$160,000,000, to remain available until expended for the payment of obligations heretofore or herein authorized to be incurred under this head, for extending, with the approval of the President, any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 1 and 2 of the Act approved March 4, 1931 (38 U. S. C. 438 j-k) or in section 101

of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C. 693a): *Provided*, That the authority contained in the Third Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948, the Supplemental Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, and the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, to incur obligations for the purposes specified in those Acts, is hereby extended to July 1, 1952: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5.5 per centum of the foregoing appropriation and contract authorizations shall be available for the employment in the District of Columbia and in the field of all necessary technical and clerical personnel for the preparation of plans and specifications for the projects as approved hereunder and in the supervision of the execution thereof, and for all travel expenses, field office equipment, and supplies in connection therewith, except that whenever the Veterans' Administration finds it necessary in the construction of any project to employ other Government agencies or persons outside the Federal service to perform such services not to exceed 9 per centum of the cost of such projects may be expended for such services: *Provided further*, That the amount of the foregoing contract authorizations available for obligation for portable initial equipment, is increased from \$10,000,000 to \$25,000,000, including the purchase of one hundred and seventy-six passenger motor vehicles.

National service life insurance: For the payment of benefits and for transfer to the national service life insurance fund, in accordance with the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, \$31,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That certain premiums shall be credited to this appropriation as provided by the Act.

Veterans' miscellaneous benefits: For the payment of burial awards authorized by Veterans' Administration Regulation Numbered 9 (a), as amended, and for supplies, equipment, and tuition authorized by part VII and payments authorized by part IX of Veterans' Administration Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, \$71,100,000, to remain available until expended.

Grants to the Republic of the Philippines: For payments to the Republic of the Philippines of grants in accordance with the Act of July 1, 1948 (Public Law 865), for expenses incident to medical care and treatment of veterans, \$3,285,000.

No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

For payment of claims, as authorized by the War Claims Act of 1948, from funds deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the war claims fund created by section 13 (a) of said Act, such sums as may be necessary, to be available to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment of claims under sections 4 (a), 4 (b) (2), 5 (e), 6 (b), and 7 of said Act to the payees named and in the amounts stated in certifi-

cations by the War Claims Commission and the Federal Security Administrator or their duly authorized representatives, which certifications shall be in lieu of any vouchers which might otherwise be required: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That no claims shall be allowed or paid under the provisions of said War Claims Act of 1948 from any funds other than those covered into the Treasury pursuant to the provisions of section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, as provided by section 13 (a) of said War Claims Act of 1948.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the War Claims Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel; printing and binding; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; and advances or reimbursements to other Government agencies for use of their facilities and services in carrying out the functions of the Commission; \$600,000, to be derived from the war claims fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948).

INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. No part of any appropriation contained in this title for the Atomic Energy Commission shall be used to confer a fellowship on any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or with respect to whom the Commission finds, upon investigation and report by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the character, associations, and loyalty of whom, that reasonable grounds exist for belief that such person is disloyal to the Government of the United States: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment or a fellowship the salary, wages, stipend, grant, or expenses for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this title shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 103. Where appropriations in this title are expendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amount set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations.

SEC. 104. Where appropriations in this title are expendable for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures therefor under each such appropriation may not exceed the amount of \$50: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to the purchase of scientific, technical, trade, or traffic periodicals necessary in connection with the performance of the

authorized functions of the agencies for which funds are herein provided.

SEC. 105. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the armed forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service and has within ninety days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Civil Service Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 106. Appropriations contained in this title, available for expenses of travel shall be available, when specifically authorized by the head of the activity or establishment concerned, for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation concerned is made; and shall be available for the examination of estimates of appropriations and activities in the field.

SEC. 107. No part of any appropriation or fund contained in this title shall be available for installing or maintaining systems for administrative appropriation, fund, or inventory accounting except such systems as are prescribed or approved by the Comptroller General: *Provided*, That all agencies, for whose activities provision is made in this title, shall hereafter maintain fiscal-accounting control of all inventories of supplies, materials, or equipment which may be owned by or be in the custody of such agencies.

SEC. 108. No part of any appropriations made available by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have been approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

SEC. 109. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

SEC. 110. None of the sections under the head "Independent offices, General provisions" in this title shall apply to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Inland Waterways Corporation, or the Tennessee Valley Authority.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies, respectively, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for each such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Home Loan Bank Board: Not to exceed a total of \$455,000 to be derived from the special deposit account established under the provisions under the head "Federal Home Loan Bank Administration" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, and from receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home Loan Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, shall be available during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses of the Home Loan Bank Board, including health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), and the Board may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That all necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and all necessary expenses (including services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the handling, including the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1421-1449).

Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: Not to exceed \$635,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), which shall be on an accrual basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation of insured institutions, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the case of specific insured institutions, and legal fees and expenses, and said Corporation may utilize and may make pay-

ment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1724-1730).

Home Owners' Loan Corporation: Not to exceed \$1,400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), which shall be on an accrual basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses (including personal services) in connection with the termination or liquidation of accounts carried on the books of the Corporation not to exceed \$500,000, expenses (including services performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said Corporation or in which it has an interest, and legal fees and expenses, and said Corporation may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1461-1468).

Federal Housing Administration: In addition to the amounts available by or pursuant to law (which shall be transferred to this authorization) for the administrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed \$5,425,000 of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall be available for expenditure, in accordance with the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1701): *Provided*, That, except as herein otherwise provided, all expenses and obligations of said Administration shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of said Act: *Provided further*, That funds available for expenditure shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to exceed \$1,500); purchase of periodicals and newspapers (not to exceed \$1,500); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles, of which one shall be for replacement only.

Public Housing Administration: Of the amounts available by or pursuant to law for the administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law including funds appropriated by title I of this chapter, not to exceed \$15,024,000 shall be available for such expenses, including purchase of not to exceed nine passenger motor vehicles, of which eight shall be for replacement only; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Administration; and a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150): *Provided*,

That necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenditures by the Administration for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from such payments may be used only for the payment of necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects or for administrative expenses of the Administration not in excess of the amount authorized by the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency may relinquish and transfer, pursuant to the same general terms and conditions specified in subsections 505 (a) and (b) of the Act of October 14, 1940, as added by the Act of June 28, 1948 (Public Law 796), title to temporary housing provided for certain veterans and their families under title V of said Act of October 14, 1940, as amended, to any State, county, city, other public body, educational institution, or nonprofit organization: *Provided further*, That any application for such relinquishment and transfer shall be filed with the Administrator by December 31, 1950: *Provided further*, That funds made available by the Act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2035) shall be available for necessary expenses, including administrative expenses, of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Act of May 19, 1949 (Public Law 65).

INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

Inland Waterways Corporation (administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Commerce): Not to exceed \$542,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, to be determined in the manner set forth under the title "General expenses" in the Uniform System of Accounts for Carriers by Water of the Interstate Commerce Commission (effective January 1, 1947): *Provided*, That no funds shall be used to pay compensation of employees normally subject to the Classification Act of 1949 at rates in excess of rates fixed for similar services under the provisions of said Act, nor to pay the compensation of vessel employees and such terminal and other employees as are not covered by said Act, at rates in excess of rates prevailing in the river transportation industry in the area (including prevailing leave allowances for vessel employees, but the granting of such allowances shall not be construed as establishing a different leave system within the meaning of that term as used in section 3 of the Act of December 21, 1944 (5 U. S. C. 61d)).

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Not to exceed \$4,026,000 of the funds available to the Tennessee Valley Authority, shall be available during the current fiscal year for all administrative and general expenses of the Corporation, which expenses shall be inclusive of costs of all administrative offices and other activities representing management and other functions serving the programs and projects of the Corporation in general.

CORPORATIONS—GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. 202. No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by, any corporation or agency included in this title shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

This chapter may be cited as the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER IX—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

Cemeterial expenses: For maintaining and improving national cemeteries, including personal services and fuel for superintendents; purchase of grave sites; maintenance of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, chapel, and grounds in the Arlington National Cemetery, and that portion of Congressional Cemetery to which the United States has title and the graves of those buried therein, including Confederate graves, and the burial site of Pushmataha, a Choctaw Indian chief; repair to roadways but not to more than a single approach road to any national cemetery; for headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces under the Act of July 1, 1948 (24 U. S. C. 279a, b), and civilians interred in post cemeteries; for maintenance of monuments, tablets, roads, fences, and so forth, made and constructed by the United States in Cuba and China to mark the places where American soldiers fell; maintenance of the Confederate Mound in Oakwood Cemetery at Chicago, the Confederate Stockade Cemetery at Johnstons Island, the Confederate burial plats owned by the United States in Confederate Cemetery at North Alton, the Confederate Cemetery, Camp Chase, at Columbus, the Confederate Cemetery at Point Lookout, and the Confederate Cemetery at Rock Island; and for maintenance of graves used by the Army for burials in commercial cemeteries; \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That no railroad shall be permitted upon any right-of-way which may have been acquired by the United States leading to a national cemetery, or to encroach upon any roads or walks constructed thereon and maintained by the United States: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for repairing any roadway not owned by the United States within the corporate limits of any city, town, or village.

SIGNAL CORPS

ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and improvement of the Alaska Communication System, including purchase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$3,000,000, to remain available until the close of the fiscal year 1952, and in addition not to exceed 15 per centum of the current fiscal year receipts of the Alaska Communication System may be merged with and used for the purposes of this appropriation.

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances and utilities, at stations of the Alaska Communication System, as authorized by Act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 414), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims as authorized by law (28 U. S. C. 2672); \$2,877,920, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for construction of family quarters at (1) an average cost in excess of \$24,000 for construction, including, but not limited to, kitchen range, refrigerator, telephone, architectural and engineering services, and all contingencies; nor at (2) a cost per family unit in excess of \$5,000, for site development and outside utilities, including architectural and engineering services therefor and all contingencies.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

The following appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the services of such additional technical and clerical personnel as the Secretary of the Army may deem necessary may be employed only in the Office of the Chief of Engineers, to carry into effect the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control, surveys, and preparation for and the consideration of river and harbor and flood-control estimates and bills, to be paid from such appropriations: *Provided further*, That the expenditures on this account for the current fiscal year shall not exceed \$1,525,000: *Provided further*, That the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control may be used for the purchase (for replacement only) in the current fiscal year of three hundred and fifty passenger motor vehicles and one motorboat (to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable) and the purchase (not to exceed one, to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable), maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft: *Provided further*, That the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control shall be available for payments to school districts as authorized by law.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works: For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized

as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation; for surveys of northern and northwestern lakes and other boundary and connecting waters as heretofore authorized, including the preparation, correction, printing, and issuing of charts and bulletins, and the investigation of lake levels; for prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City; for expenses of the California Débris Commission in carrying on the work authorized by the Act approved March 1, 1893, as amended (33 U. S. C. 661, 678, and 683); for removing sunken vessels or craft obstructing or endangering navigation as authorized by law; for operating and maintaining, keeping in repair, and continuing in use without interruption any lock, canal (except the Panama Canal), canalized river, or other public works for the use and benefit of navigation belonging to the United States; for payment annually of tuition fees of not to exceed seventy-six student officers of the Corps of Engineers at civil technical institutions under the provisions of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535); for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors; for the execution of detailed investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore authorized; for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; for printing and binding and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, including such printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of surveys authorized by law, and such surveys as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; \$198,811,500: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation the Secretary of the Army may, in his discretion and on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers based on the recommendation by the Board of Rivers and Harbors in the review of a report or reports authorized by law, expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency outside of harbor lines and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation, such work to be subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report or reports thereon: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congress of Navigation and for the payment of the expenses of the properly accredited delegates of the United States to the meeting of the Congresses and of the Commission: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation not to exceed \$2,700,000 shall be available for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure for the purposes of and in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 8, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 756), and the Act of August 14, 1946.

Alteration of bridges over navigable waters: For payment of the share of the United States of the cost of alteration of bridges over navigable waters in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 21, 1940 (Public Law 647), \$900,000.

FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control, general: For the construction and maintenance of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented, including printing and binding, and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, and for preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies in connection with flood control, \$383,408,250: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for flood-control work on the Salmon River, Alaska, as authorized by law: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein may be used to execute detailed surveys, and prepare plans and specifications, necessary for the construction of flood-control projects heretofore or hereafter authorized or for flood-control projects considered for selection in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, and section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 638): *Provided further*, That the expenditure of funds for completing the necessary surveys shall not be construed as a commitment of the Government to the construction of any project: *Provided further*, That the section entitled "National Military Establishment" in Public Law 343, Eighty-first Congress, first session, providing appropriations for the project at Mandan, North Dakota, is hereby amended to authorize reimbursement to local interests for such work as they may have done in providing interior drainage facilities at Mandan, subsequent to appropriation of funds for construction, as a part of the local flood protection project, insofar as such drainage facilities shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the authorized project: *Provided further*, That such payment shall not exceed the sum of \$76,000.

Flood control, general (emergency fund): For the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood control works in accordance with the Act of June 30, 1948 (Public Law 858), \$2,700,000, to remain available until expended.

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries: For prosecuting work of flood control in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act approved May 15, 1928, as amended (33 U. S. C. 702a), including printing and binding and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, \$66,422,400.

Emergency fund for flood control on tributaries of Mississippi River: For rescue work and for repair or maintenance of any flood-control work on any tributaries of the Mississippi River threatened or destroyed by flood, in accordance with section 9 of the Flood Control Act, approved June 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1508), \$450,000.

Flood Control, Sacramento River, California: For prosecuting work of flood control, Sacramento River, California, in accordance with the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1917, as amended (33 U. S. C. 703, 704; 50 Stat. 849; 55 Stat. 633-651), \$2,524,500.

Flood control, Roseville, Ohio: For the construction of local flood protection works at Roseville, Ohio, heretofore authorized by law

(Public Law 761, 75th Congress, as amended and supplemented), \$432,000.

MISCELLANEOUS CIVIL WORKS

Maintenance and operation, Certain Federal Water Mains Outside the District of Columbia: For the maintenance, operation, improvement, extension, and protection of Federal water lines located outside the District of Columbia required to serve nearby Government establishments and facilities with water from the water supply system of the District of Columbia, including interconnections with other water systems for emergency use wherever located, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, \$16,000.

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

For maintenance and operation of the United States Soldiers' Home, to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent fund, \$2,395,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the payment of hospitalization of members of the Home in United States Army hospitals at rates in excess of those prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, upon the recommendation of the Board of Commissioners of the Home and the Surgeon General of the Army.

THE PANAMA CANAL

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and civil government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, and construction of additional facilities, including printing and binding; personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed twenty-five in the current fiscal year for replacement only), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); acquisition of land and land under water, as authorized in the Panama Canal Act; expenses incident to conducting hearings and examining estimates for appropriations on the Isthmus; expenses of attendance (not to exceed \$10,000), when authorized by the Governor, at meetings of organizations concerned with activities pertaining to the Panama Canal; not to exceed \$2,000 for travel and subsistence expenses of employees of the Panama Canal incident to their special training as authorized by law (63 Stat. 600); to be available until expended, as follows:

Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal: For maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including contingencies of the Governor (including not to exceed \$3,000 for entertainment, to be expended in his discretion; payment to alien cripples as authorized by law (63 Stat. 600); and relief payments authorized by law (50 Stat. 478); \$13,251,700.

Sanitation: For sanitation, quarantine, hospitals, and medical aid and support of the insane and of lepers and aid and support of indigent persons legally within the Canal Zone, including expenses of their deportation when practicable; the purchase of artificial limbs or other appliances as authorized by law (63 Stat. 600); additional compensation to any officer of the United States Public Health Service detailed with the Panama Canal as chief quarantine officer; and pay-

ments of not to exceed \$50 in any one case to persons within the Government service who shall furnish blood for transfusions; \$3,400,000.

Civil government: For civil government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, including gratuities and necessary clothing for indigent discharged prisoners, as authorized by law (63 Stat. 600), \$3,849,000.

PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY

The following corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to it in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1951 for such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

Panama Railroad Company: Not to exceed \$820,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the company shall be available during the current fiscal year for its administrative expenses, including administrative services performed for the company by other Government agencies, which shall be determined in accordance with the company's prescribed accounting system in effect on July 1, 1946, and shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, expenses of the commissary coupon audit, commissary contraband inspection, expenditures which the company's prescribed accounting system requires to be capitalized or charged to cost of commodities acquired, and expenses in connection with acquisition, construction, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, and disposition of facilities and other property belonging to the company or in which it has an interest.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. No part of any appropriation contained in this chapter shall be used directly or indirectly, except for temporary employment in case of emergency, for the payment of any civilian for services rendered by him on the Canal Zone while occupying a skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory position unless such person is a citizen of the United States of America or of the Republic of Panama: *Provided, however,* (1) That, notwithstanding the provision in the Act approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409) limiting employment in the above-mentioned positions to citizens of the United States from and after the date of approval of said Act, citizens of Panama may be employed in such positions; (2) that at no time shall the number of Panamanian citizens employed in the above-mentioned positions exceed the number of citizens of the United States so employed, if United States citizens are available in continental United States or on the Canal Zone; (3) that nothing in this chapter shall prohibit the continued employment of any person who shall have rendered fifteen or more years of faithful and honorable service on the Canal Zone; (4) that in the selection of personnel for skilled, technical, administrative, clerical, supervisory, or executive positions, the controlling factors in filling these positions shall be efficiency, experience, training, and education; (5) that all

citizens of Panama and the United States rendering skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory service on the Canal Zone under the terms of this chapter (a) shall normally be employed not more than forty hours per week, (b) may receive as compensation equal rates of pay based upon rates paid for similar employment in continental United States plus 25 per centum; (6) this entire section shall apply only to persons employed in skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory positions on the Canal Zone directly or indirectly by any branch of the United States Government or by any corporation or company whose stock is owned wholly or in part by the United States Government: *Provided further*, That the President may suspend from time to time in whole or in part compliance with this section if he should deem such course to be in the public interest.

SEC. 103. The Governor of the Panama Canal and the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, are authorized to employ services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), in amounts not exceeding \$15,000 for the Panama Canal and not exceeding \$150,000 for the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army: *Provided*, That the rates for individuals shall not exceed \$100 per diem.

SEC. 104. Appropriations for civil functions of the Department of the Army may be used for the payment of claims pursuant to law (31 U. S. C. 223c; 28 U. S. C. 2672); examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; and for health programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150).

This chapter may be cited as the "Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER X—DEFENSE

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Council, including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals; printing and binding; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with work related to the activity of the Council; \$160,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Resources Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem and contracts with temporary or part-time employees may be renewed for one year; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the National Security Resources Board; printing and binding; travel expenses; purchase (not to exceed one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); a health service

program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150) ; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files ; and not to exceed \$5,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Chairman for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive ; \$3,500,000.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Armed Forces Policy Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Munitions Board, and the Research and Development Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia ; purchase (not to exceed four, including one at not to exceed \$3,000) and hire of passenger motor vehicles ; and not to exceed \$50,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Defense for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive ; \$11,300,000.

CLAIMS

For payment of claims by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Army (except as provided in appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army), Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 946 ; 28 U. S. C. 2672 ; 31 U. S. C. 222c, 222e, 223b, 223d, 224d ; 34 U. S. C. 600 ; 35 U. S. C. 91 ; 39 U. S. C. 135 ; 46 U. S. C. 797 ; Act of November 15, 1945, 59 Stat. 582) ; claims (not to exceed \$1,000 in any one case) for damages to or loss of private property incident to the operation of Army and Air National Guard camps of instruction, either during the stay of units of said organizations at such camps or while en route thereto or therefrom ; claims, as authorized by law, for damage to property of railroads under training contracts ; and repayment of amounts determined by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, or officers designated by them, to have been erroneously collected from military and civilian personnel of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force or from States, Territories, or the District of Columbia, or members of National Guard units thereof ; \$5,000,000.

RETIRED PAY

For retired pay and retirement pay, as authorized by law, of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force, including the reserve components thereof ; and retainer pay for personnel of the inactive Fleet Reserve ; \$342,000,000.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

CONTINGENCIES OF THE ARMY

For emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising in the Department of the Army or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices in the

District of Columbia, or in the Army at large, but impossible to be anticipated or classified, including personal services; the actual and necessary expenses or per diem in lieu thereof, as may be determined and approved by the Secretary of the Army, of military and civilian personnel in and under the Department of the Army on special duty in foreign countries; and for examination of estimates of appropriations and of military activities in the field, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government and payments from this appropriation may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, be made on his certificate that the expenditures were necessary for confidential military purposes; \$51,878,000.

GENERAL STAFF CORPS

FIELD EXERCISES

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, required for the conduct of special field exercises, including participation therein by the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, and including personal services of temporary employees, expenses of troop movements and temporary duty travel of military and civilian personnel, in connection with special field exercises, including special combat training for small units, movement of matériel, maintenance and operation of structures and utilities, rental of land or purchase of options to rent land without reference to section 3648, Revised Statutes, and for use or repair of private property, \$5,350,000.

INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of the Army to adopt such measures, appropriate to the functions and activities of the Department of the Army, as he may deem advisable, to promote better relations with the other American countries, including transportation and subsistence expenses, while traveling in the Western Hemisphere, of Army officers and military students of the other American countries and Army officers of the United States, \$432,000.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

FINANCE SERVICE, ARMY

For Finance Service, Army, to be accounted for as one fund, as follows—

PAY OF THE ARMY

For pay and allowances (except commuted rations for enlisted personnel) of cadets and all other personnel of the Army of the United States on active duty (other than personnel of the Reserve components, including the National Guard, on active duty while undergoing Reserve training); pay of civilian employees at military headquarters; interest on soldiers' deposits; payment of life insurance premiums authorized by law; mustering-out payments, as authorized by the "Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944", as amended (38 U. S. C. 691-691g), to persons who were or may be denied such payments

because they were discharged from the Army to enter the United States Military Academy or the United States Naval Academy and subsequently were discharged from either academy because of physical disability; expenses of military courts, boards and commissions; expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, escaped military prisoners, and soldiers absent without leave, including payment of rewards, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, not exceeding \$25 in any one case, to civil officers and citizens, costs of confinement of military prisoners in nonmilitary facilities, donations of not to exceed \$25 to each civilian prisoner upon each release from an Army prison and each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably upon each release from confinement under court-martial sentence, and donations of not to exceed \$10, as authorized by law, to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment; \$1,447,660,000: *Provided*, That section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), shall not apply to retired military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers' Home: *Provided further*, That the duties of librarian at the United States Military Academy may be performed by an officer of the Regular Army retired from active service, and detailed on active duty for that purpose;

TRAVEL OF THE ARMY

For travel allowances and travel in kind, as authorized by law, for persons traveling in connection with the military activities of the Department of the Army, including mileage, transportation, reimbursement of actual expenses, or per diem allowances, to officers, contract surgeons, and others whose rank, pay and allowances are assimilated to officers; transportation of troops; transportation, or reimbursement therefor, of cadets, enlisted personnel, recruits, recruiting parties, applicants for enlistment between places of acceptance for enlistment and recruiting stations, rejected applicants for enlistment, general prisoners, cadets and accepted cadets from their homes to the Military Academy, discharged cadets, civilian employees, civilian witnesses before courts martial, and dependents of civilian and military personnel; travel pay to discharged military personnel; transportation of discharged or paroled prisoners and persons discharged from Saint Elizabeths Hospital after transfer thereto from the military service; transportation of persons discharged other than honorably; monetary allowances for liquid coffee for troops traveling when supplied with cooked or travel rations; commutation of quarters and rations to enlisted personnel traveling on detached duty when it is impracticable to carry rations, and to applicants for enlistment and general prisoners traveling under orders; per diem allowances or actual cost of subsistence while in a travel status, to civilian employees and civilian witnesses before courts martial; for rental of camp sites and the local procurement of communication service, fuel, light, water service, and other necessary supplies and services incident to individual or troop movements, including transportation of organizational equipment and impedimenta; and for expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the transportation of authorized baggage of military and civilian personnel; \$76,500,000: *Provided*, That other appropriations for the Department of the Army shall be charged with such amounts as may be required for travel in connection with development, procurement, production, maintenance, or con-

struction activities; and, with such exception, no other Army appropriation in this Act shall be available for any expense for or incident to travel of personnel of the Regular Army or civilian employees under the Department of the Army, except the appropriation "Contingencies of the Army" and the appropriations for Engineer Service, Army, the Army National Guard, the Organized Reserves, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, and the appropriations "Special Field Exercises", and "Inter-American Relations, Department of the Army";

FINANCE SERVICE

For compensation of field personnel of the Finance Department, and those engaged in financial management activities not otherwise provided for; payment of exchange fees and exchange losses incurred by disbursing officers or their agents; and losses in the accounts of Army disbursing officers in accordance with the Acts of December 13, 1944 (31 U. S. C. 95a), December 23, 1944 (50 U. S. C. 1705-1707), and July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493); \$29,000,000.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

QUARTERMASTER SERVICE, ARMY

For Quartermaster Service, Army, to be accounted for as one fund, as follows—

WELFARE OF ENLISTED MEN

For the equipment and conduct of school, reading, lunch, and amusement rooms, service clubs, chapels, gymnasiums, and libraries, including periodicals and other publications and subscriptions for newspapers, transportation of books and equipment for these services, rental of films, purchase of slides for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits, and for similar and other recreational purposes at training and mobilization camps now established or which may be hereafter established, including expenses for the entertainment and instruction of enlisted personnel, \$8,362,500: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the instruction of officers on the same basis as enlisted men;

SUBSISTENCE OF THE ARMY

For purchase of subsistence supplies for issue as rations to troops, including retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, civil employees when entitled thereto, hospital matrons, applicants for enlistment while held under observation, general prisoners of war, and general prisoners at posts; ice for issue to organizations of enlisted men and for cooling drinking water and for preservation of stores; subsistence of the masters, officers, crews, and employees of the vessels of the Army Transport Service; meals for recruiting parties and applicants for enlistment while under observation; sales to officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps while on active duty, and enlisted men of the Army; payment of allowances of commutation in lieu of rations to enlisted men as authorized by law; commuted rations for enlisted men, applicants for enlistment while held under observation, civilian employees who are entitled to sub-

sistence at public expense, and general prisoners while sick in hospitals, to be paid to the surgeon in charge; advertising; for subsistence of supernumeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances; prizes to be established by the Secretary of the Army for enlisted men of the Army who graduate from the Army schools for bakers and cooks; and for other necessary expenses incident to the purchase, testing, care, preservation, issue, sale, and accounting for subsistence supplies for the Army; in all, \$160,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used for the payment of any subsidy on agricultural or other products: *Provided further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this chapter shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except to the extent that the Secretary of the Department concerned shall determine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of any articles of food or clothing grown or produced in the United States or its possessions cannot be procured as and when needed at United States market prices and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and emergency procurements or procurements of perishable foods by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall preclude the procurement of foods manufactured or processed in the United States or its possessions;

REGULAR SUPPLIES OF THE ARMY

For supplies, services, and other expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the design, development, procurement, manufacture, care, protection, alteration, repair, maintenance, installation, storage and issue of Quartermaster Corps supplies, materials, and equipment (exclusive of fixed installations in buildings otherwise provided for), including petroleum and other products, market reports and personal services; supplies and equipment for troops and general service schools; operation of field printing plants not otherwise provided for and contract printing and binding; purchase, subsistence, and care of animals required in connection with Army training and other activities; expenses incident to raising and harvesting forage on military reservations, including, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of the Army, the cost of irrigation; \$107,247,258;

CLOTHING AND EQUIPAGE

For cloth, woolens, materials, and for the purchase and manufacture of clothing for the Army, including retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, for issue and for sale; commutation of clothing due to warrant officers of the mine-planter service and to enlisted men; altering and fitting clothing and washing and cleaning when necessary, including laundry work for enlisted men while patients in a hospital; operation of laundries, existing or now under construction, including purchase and repair of laundry machinery therefor; authorized issues of articles for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances, and for applicants for enlistment while held under observation; equipment and repair of equipment of existing dry-cleaning plants, salvage and sorting store-

houses, hat-repairing shops, shoe-repair shops, clothing-repair shops, and garbage-reduction works; equipage; issue of toilet kits to recruits upon their first enlistment; expenses of packing and handling and similar necessities; citizens' outer clothing and an overcoat, when necessary, the cost of all not to exceed \$30, to be issued each person upon each release from an Army prison, each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably, to each enlisted man convicted by civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a penitentiary or other civil prison, and to each enlisted man ordered interned as an alien enemy, or, for the same reason, discharged without internment; \$93,853,365;

INCIDENTAL EXPENSES OF THE ARMY

Postage; personal services; incidental expenses of recruiting; for activities of chaplains (excluding ritual garments and personal services); for tests and experimental and development work and scientific research, not otherwise provided for, including that to be performed by the Bureau of Standards for the Quartermaster Corps; for inspection service and instruction furnished by the Department of Agriculture which may be transferred in advance; for such additional expenditures as are necessary and authorized by law in the movements and operation of the Army and at military posts, and not expressly assigned to any other departments; for burial of the dead as authorized by Acts of May 17, 1938 (10 U. S. C. 916-916d), and July 8, 1940 (5 U. S. C. 103a), including remains of personnel of the Army of the United States who die while on active duty, including travel allowances of attendants accompanying remains, communication service, transportation of remains, and acquisition by lease or otherwise of temporary burial sites; \$101,998,313.

TRANSPORTATION CORPS

TRANSPORTATION SERVICE, ARMY

For expenses necessary for the transportation of Army supplies, equipment, funds of the Army, including packing, crating, and unpacking; maintenance and operation of transportation facilities and installations, including the purchase, construction, alteration, operation, lease, repair, development, and maintenance of and research in transportation equipment, including boats, vessels, and railroad equipment; personal services in the District of Columbia; procurement of supplies and equipment; printing and binding; communication service; maps, wharfage, tolls, ferriage, drayage, and cartage; conducting instruction in Army transportation activities; \$289,960,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year the cost of transportation from point of origin to the first point of storage or consumption of supplies, equipment, and material in connection with the manufacturing and purchasing activities of the Quartermaster Corps may be charged to the appropriations from which such supplies, equipment, and material are procured: *Provided further*, That vessels under the jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission, the Department of the Army, or the Department of the Navy may be transferred or otherwise made available without reimbursement to any of such agencies upon the request of the head of one agency and the approval of the agency having jurisdiction of the vessels concerned.

SIGNAL CORPS

SIGNAL SERVICE OF THE ARMY

Purchase, equipment, operation, installation and repair of military telegraph, telephone, radio, cable, signaling, and aircraft warning systems; signal equipment and stores, heliographs, signal lanterns, flags, and other necessary instruments; wind vanes, barometers, anemometers, thermometers, and other meteorological instruments; photographic and cinematographic work performed for the Army by the Signal Corps; motor-driven and other vehicles for technical and official purposes in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of communication or signaling systems, and supplies for their operation and maintenance; maps for use of the Signal Corps and in the office of the Chief Signal Officer; telephone apparatus, including rental and payment for commercial, exchange, message, trunk-line, long-distance, and leased-line telephone service, excepting telephone service for the various bureaus in the District of Columbia, and the rental of commercial telegraph lines and equipment, and their operation, at or connecting any Army facility, including payment for official individual telegraph messages transmitted over commercial lines; electrical installations and maintenance thereof, electric time service, fire control and direction apparatus, and matériel for Field Artillery; salaries of civilian employees, including those necessary as instructors at vocational schools; supplies, general repairs, reserve supplies, and other expenses connected with the collection and transmitting of information for the Army by telegraph or otherwise; experimental investigation, research, purchase, and development, or improvements in apparatus, and maintenance of signaling and accessories thereto, including machines, instruments, and other equipment for laboratory and repair purposes; lease, alteration, and repair of such buildings required for storing or guarding Signal Corps supplies, equipment, and personnel when not otherwise provided for, including the introduction of water, electric light and power, sewerage, grading, roads and walks, and other equipment required; for all expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the preparation of plans, and construction, purchase, installation, equipment, maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft warning service systems, and their accessories, including purchase of lands and rights-of-way, acquisition of leaseholds and other interests therein, and temporary use thereof: \$158,248,000.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT

For the manufacture and purchase of medical and hospital supplies for military posts, camps, hospitals, hospital ships and transports, and supplies required for mosquito destruction in and about military posts in the Canal Zone; operation of the Army Medical Library and Museum under the direct supervision of the Surgeon General; purchase of veterinary supplies and hire of veterinary surgeons; expenses of medical supply depots and maintenance of branch depots; medical care and treatment of patients when entitled thereto by law, regulation, or contract, including their care, treatment, and subsistence in private

Hospitals, whether on duty or on furlough or on leave of absence except when elective medical treatment has been obtained by such personnel in civilian hospitals or from civilian physicians or dentists; medical care and treatment of authorized personnel of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States when such care and treatment cannot be obtained from medical units of their own country; care and treatment of epidemic and contagious diseases in the Army or at military posts or stations, including measures to prevent the spread thereof; pay of male and female nurses, not including the Army Nurse Corps, and of cooks and other civilians employed for the proper care of patients, under such regulations fixing their number, qualifications, assignments, pay, and allowances as shall have been or shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; pay of internes; pay of civilian physicians employed to examine physically applicants for enlistment and enlisted men and to render other professional services from time to time under proper authority; pay of other employees of the Medical Department; payment of express companies and local transfers employed directly by the Medical Department for the transportation of medical and hospital supplies, including bidders' samples and water for analysis; supply of Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Arkansas; advertising, and other necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Medical Department, including tuition and fees of military and civilian personnel at civilian educational institutions; \$54,883,000.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

ENGINEER SERVICE, ARMY

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, maintenance, and issue of utilities, engineer supplies, materials, and equipment; procurement, preparation, and reproduction of maps and similar data for military purposes; military surveys, engineering planning, and investigation and design; expenses incident to military and training operations, including operation of the Engineer School; personal services; travel and transportation; rentals, at the seat of Government or elsewhere, maintenance, installation, alteration, repair, protection, and operation of buildings, grounds, and other facilities, including appurtenances thereto; administration of real estate, acquisition of lands, easements, rights-of-way, or other similar interests in and temporary use of lands, and, in administering the provisions of 43 U. S. C. 315q, rentals may be paid in advance; payment of deficiency judgments and interest thereon arising out of condemnation proceedings; relocation of utilities not otherwise provided for; utility services for buildings erected at private cost, as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 1346), and buildings on military reservations authorized by Department of the Army regulations to be used for a similar purpose; and expenses of packing, crating, unpacking, and uncrating of supplies, materials, equipment, and baggage not otherwise provided for; \$304,187,500: *Provided*, That the sum of \$2,000,000 of the appropriation "Engineer Service, Army", fiscal year 1947, shall remain available until June 30, 1951, for the payment of obligations incurred under contracts executed thereunder prior to July 1, 1947.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Army, as authorized by the Act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, Eighty-first Congress), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$95,318,585, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$661,400 of the funds appropriated under this head in the Military Functions Appropriations Act, 1949, are hereby made available for construction authorized by the Act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 414).

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

ORDNANCE SERVICE AND SUPPLIES, ARMY

For manufacture, procurement, storage, and issue, including research, planning, design, development, inspection, test, alteration, maintenance, repair, and handling of ordnance material and aircraft, together with the machinery, supplies, and services necessary thereto; supplies and services in connection with the general work of the Ordnance Department, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, light, water, advertising, stationery, typewriting and computing machines, including their exchange, and furniture, tools, and instruments of service; instruction, training, and other incidental expenses of the ordnance service; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; ammunition for military salutes at Government establishments and institutions to which the issues of arms for salutes are authorized; services, material, tools, and appliances for operation of the testing machines and chemical laboratory in connection therewith; publications for libraries of the Ordnance Department, including the Ordnance Office; \$647,327,000.

CHEMICAL CORPS

CHEMICAL SERVICE, ARMY

For purchase, manufacture, and test of chemical agents and toxic substances, incendiary materials and munitions, gas masks, or other offensive or defensive materials or appliances required for chemical purposes, investigations, research, design, experimentation, and operation, purchase of chemicals, special scientific and technical apparatus and instruments, including services connected therewith; maintenance and repair of plants, buildings, and equipment, and the machinery therefor; receiving, storing, and issuing of supplies, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuels, gasoline, lubricants, paints and oils, rope and cordage, light, water, advertising, stationery, typewriting and computing machines including their exchange, office furniture, tools, and instruments; incidental expenses; civilian employees; libraries of the Chemical Corps; expenses incidental to the organization, training, and equipment of special gas troops not otherwise provided for, including the training of the Army in Chemical Corps activities, both offensive and defensive, together with the necessary schools, tactical demonstrations, and maneuvers; expenses of chemical

projectile filling plants and proving grounds, including maintenance of rail transportation, repairs, alterations, accessories, building and repairing butts and targets, clearing and grading ranges; \$37,300,000.

ARMY TRAINING

For miscellaneous supplies, material, equipment, personal and other services, tuition and other incidental expenses, not otherwise provided for, essential in conducting instruction in service schools and elsewhere; contingencies for the Commandant of the National War College, to be expended in his discretion (not exceeding \$1,000); purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards at the National War College; operation of the Office, Chief, Army Field Forces, subordinate commands, installations, and boards, not otherwise provided for, \$7,830,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

For text and reference books for instruction; increase and expense of library; office equipment and supplies; stationery, blank books, forms, printing and binding; diplomas for graduates; expense of lectures; apparatus, equipment, supplies, and materials for purpose of instruction and athletics, and maintenance and repair thereof; musical instruments and maintenance of band; care and maintenance of organ; equipment for cadet mess; postage, telephones, and telegrams; freight and expressage; for commutation of rations to the cadet mess for civilians employed and subsisted at cadet mess in the same amount as deducted from each civilian's pay for said rations; maintenance of children's school (not exceeding \$12,200); contingencies for Superintendent of the Military Academy (not exceeding \$5,200) and for the Commandant of Cadets (not exceeding \$1,200), to be expended in their respective discretions; expenses of the members of the Board of Visitors (not exceeding \$1,500); contingent fund, to be expended under the direction of the Academic Board (not exceeding \$1,000); improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings and grounds (including roads, walls, and fences); shooting galleries and ranges; cooking, heating, and lighting apparatus and fixtures and operation and maintenance thereof; maintenance of water, sewer, and plumbing systems; maintenance of and repairs to cadet camp; fire-extinguishing apparatus; machinery and tools and repairs of same; policing buildings and grounds; furniture, refrigerators, and lockers for Government-owned buildings at the Academy and repair and maintenance thereof; fuel for heat, light, and power; pay of employees; and other necessary incidental expenses in the discretion of the superintendent; in all, \$5,120,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,750 of this amount shall be available to liquidate the indebtedness of cadets separated from the service for any reason during their first year, who at the time of their separation are in debt to the Treasurer of the United States Military Academy.

CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses necessary for equipping, maintaining, operating and training the Army National Guard, including expenses of camps, air-

fields, storage facilities and alterations and additions to present structures, transportation and erection of temporary structures, either on Government-owned or State-owned land, or on land made available by lease or loan from any political subdivision of a State or any individual, corporation, or organization for a period of not less than ten years, construction and maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities, the purchase (not to exceed one hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles for official use only, and the modification, repair, maintenance and operation of airplanes; transportation of things; personal services at the seat of government or elsewhere (including personal services in the National Guard Bureau and services of personnel of the Army National Guard employed as civilians, without regard to their military rank) necessary for the care, maintenance, modification and repair of materials and equipment, for Federal property and custodial accounting work, and for administrative and such other duties as may be required; medical and hospital treatment of members of the Army National Guard who suffer injury or contract disease in line of duty and other expenses connected therewith as authorized by law; pay at a rate not less than \$2,400 per annum and travel of property and disbursing officers for the United States; travel expenses (other than mileage), at the same rates as authorized by law for Army National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of Army National Guard division and regimental commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; attendance of Army National Guard personnel at military service schools; drill pay of the Army National Guard; expenses of temporary duty travel of personnel of the Regular Army in connection with activities of the Army National Guard; procurement and issue to the Army National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia of military equipment and supplies, as provided by law, including motor-propelled vehicles and airplanes, and repair and modification of such equipment and supplies; \$210,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to issue to the Army National Guard without charge against this appropriation except for actual expenses incident to such issue, supplies and equipment from surplus or excess supplies or equipment purchased for the Army: *Provided further*, That the number of caretakers authorized to be employed for any one unit or pool under the provisions of section 90 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Army.

ORGANIZED RESERVES

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation (including mileage, actual and necessary expenses, or per diem in lieu thereof), and medical and hospital treatment and related expenses, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Organized Reserve Corps while on active duty undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills or equivalent duty; maintenance, operation, repair, and other necessary expenses of facilities for the training and administration of the Organized Reserve Corps; construction of buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities, including alterations and additions thereto, and acquisition of land, rights pertaining thereto, leasehold, and other

interests therein and temporary use thereof; personal services; expenses of temporary-duty travel in connection with activities of the Organized Reserve Corps; transportation of things; purchase (not to exceed two hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; supplies, services, matériel, and equipment, not otherwise provided for, necessary to train and equip the Organized Reserve Corps; and expenses of modification, issue, maintenance, and use of supplies, matériel, and equipment, which may be furnished without reimbursement from excess Army stocks; \$114,525,000.

The pay and allowances of such additional officers and nurses of the Medical Reserve Corps as are required to supplement the like officers and nurses of the Regular Army in the care of beneficiaries of the United States Veterans' Administration treated in Army hospitals may be paid from the funds allotted to the Department of the Army by that Administration under existing law.

ARMY RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

For expenses necessary for the operation of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law, including procurement, maintenance, transportation, and issue of supplies and equipment; pay, subsistence, allowances, transportation (including mileage), and medical and hospital treatment and related expenses for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps as authorized by law; hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation of facilities; establishment and maintenance of camps; cleaning and laundering of uniforms and clothing at camps; expenses of temporary duty travel in connection with activities of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; expenses for institutions as authorized by section 1225, Revised Statutes, as amended, and section 55c of the National Defense Act, as amended (34 U. S. C. 1129; 10 U. S. C. 1180, 1181); expenses of modification, issue, maintenance, and use of supplies, materials, and equipment, which may be furnished without reimbursement from excess Army stocks; to remain available until June 30, 1952, \$24,900,000.

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE, ARMY

Promotion of rifle practice: For construction, equipment, and maintenance of rifle ranges, the instruction of citizens in marksmanship; and promotion of practice in the use of rifled arms, for arms, ammunition, targets, and other accessories for target practice, for issue and sale in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and approved by the Secretary of the Army; clerical services, including not exceeding \$91,427 in the District of Columbia; procurement of materials, supplies, trophies, prizes, badges, services, and such other items as are authorized in section 113, Act of June 3, 1916, and under this head in War Department Appropriation Act of June 7, 1924; conduct of the national matches, including incidental travel of rifle teams and of individuals and of Marine Corps and other detachments required in the operation of the matches and including incidental travel of rifle teams and individuals attending regional, national, and international competitions, and for the purchase of medals and badges for use in National Rifle Association competitions, including those fired as a

part of the national matches; mileage at 8 cents per mile for members of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice when authorized by the Secretary of the Army, any provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding; and maintenance of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, including not to exceed \$10,500 for incidental expenses in addition to the amount authorized by Act of May 28, 1928; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army; \$160,000: *Provided*, That officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard and Organized Reserves, who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, volunteer to participate without pay as competitors or range officers in the national matches to be held during the current fiscal year, may attend such matches without pay, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, but shall be entitled to travel and subsistence allowances at the same rates as are provided for civilians who attend and participate in said matches, but this proviso shall not operate to prohibit the pay of such competitors or range officers, provided funds for such payment are available from this appropriation, nor shall any provision in this Act operate to deprive a Reserve officer ordered to active duty incident to the national matches of pay for the full period of such active duty, provided funds for such payment are available from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard and Organized Reserves may be ordered to duty, with their consent, for the care, maintenance, and operation of the ranges used in the conduct of the national matches, and such officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men while so engaged shall be entitled to the same pay, subsistence, and transportation as officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of corresponding grades of the Regular Army are entitled by law, which expense shall be provided by this appropriation; and after being duly mustered may be paid for the period from the date of leaving home rendezvous to date of return thereto as determined in advance, both dates inclusive.

DEPARTMENTAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

SALARIES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

For compensation for personal services in the Department of the Army proper, to be accounted for as one fund, as follows:

Office of Secretary of the Army: Secretary of the Army, Under Secretary of the Army, Assistant Secretaries of the Army and other personal services, \$3,368,271;

Office of Chief of Staff, \$6,576,293;

Adjutant General's Office, \$9,777,200;

Office of the Inspector General, \$203,880;

Office of the Judge Advocate General, \$595,375;

Office of the Chief of Finance, \$1,483,202;

Office of the Quartermaster General, \$6,981,504;

Office of the Chief of Transportation, \$2,940,000;

Office of the Chief Signal Officer, \$2,455,821;

Office of Chief of Special Services, \$58,636;

Office of the Provost Marshal General, \$116,038;

Office of the Surgeon General, \$2,475,873;

Office of Chief of Engineers, \$3,751,026;
Office of Chief of Ordnance, \$4,137,696;
Office of Chief, Chemical Corps, \$817,707;
Office of Chief of Chaplains, \$131,100.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

For miscellaneous expenses at the seat of government, \$9,970,000.

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, clothing, hire of quarters, permanent change of station travel (including expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty stations), and transportation of dependents, as authorized by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty (except those on active duty while undergoing reserve training), \$1,162,435,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVAL RESERVE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, and travel, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Naval Reserve on active duty while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, \$66,893,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, OFFICER CANDIDATES

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, travel, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, for officer candidates, including midshipmen at the Naval Academy, aviation midshipmen, aviation cadets, regular and contract enrollees in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Reserve officer candidates; and retainer pay authorized by the Act of August 13, 1946 (34 U. S. C. 1020h), to remain available until June 30, 1952; \$18,430,300.

NAVY PERSONNEL, GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general training, education and administration of regular and reserve personnel, including tuition, cash book allowances of not to exceed \$50 for each Naval Aviation College program student, and other costs incurred at civilian schools, general training aids and devices, procurement of military personnel, and authorized annuity premiums and retirement benefits for civilian members of teaching staffs; maintenance and operation of Navy training and personnel facilities, including the Naval Academy, Naval Postgraduate School, Naval War College, Naval Home, Navy training schools and facilities, disciplinary barracks, and retraining commands; rent; hire of motor vehicles; not to exceed \$30 per person for civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted personnel discharged otherwise than honorably; welfare and recreation; medals and other awards; research and development; care of the Naval Academy collection of ship models; and departmental salaries; \$60,533,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, clothing, hire of quarters, permanent change of station travel (including expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty stations), and transportation of dependents, as authorized by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty (except those on active duty while undergoing reserve training), \$200,923,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, and travel, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve and the Marine Corps platoon leaders class on active duty while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, \$17,532,000.

MARINE CORPS TROOPS AND FACILITIES

For necessary expenses of troops and facilities of the Marine Corps not otherwise provided for, including maintenance and operation of equipment and facilities, and procurement of military personnel; training and education of regular and reserve personnel, including tuition and other costs incurred at civilian schools; welfare and recreation; not to exceed \$30 per person for civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted personnel discharged otherwise than honorably; research and development; procurement and manufacture of ordnance, ammunition, and other military supplies, equipment and clothing; purchase (for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; transportation of things; industrial mobilization; rent; medals, awards, emblems and other insignia; care of the dead; and departmental salaries; \$82,354,000.

AIRCRAFT AND FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft; maintenance, operation, and lease of air stations and facilities, testing laboratories, fleet and other aviation activities; procurement of services, supplies, special clothing, tools, materials, and equipment, including rescue boats; research and development; industrial mobilization; aerological services, supplies, and equipment for the Navy and Marine Corps; and departmental salaries; \$532,226,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of the appropriations for "Aviation, Navy, 1947" and "Aviation, Navy, 1948" shall remain available until June 30, 1951, for the liquidation of contract obligations incurred thereunder during the fiscal years 1947 and 1948, respectively, for aircraft equipment and research and development.

CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

For construction, procurement, and modernization of aircraft and equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public plants, and not to exceed \$500,000 for expansion of private plants; procurement and installation of equipment in public or private plants; and departmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, \$620,000,000, of which \$530,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations

incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes: *Provided*, That there is hereby established a 1951 aircraft procurement program (including all purposes and objects provided for under this head) in an amount of \$790,293,000, to be provided from (1) this appropriation, (2) the contract authority granted hereinafter, and (3) \$124,797,000 of the balance of the contract authority granted under this head in the "National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950", but this proviso shall not be construed to prevent the use in the fiscal year 1951 of other unused contract authority heretofore granted for aircraft procurement: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed \$575,496,000.

SHIPS AND FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for design, maintenance, operation, and alteration of vessels; maintenance and operation of facilities; procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants; procurement of equipment, supplies, special clothing and services, including subsistence and other expenses of civilian crews of vessels; installation, maintenance, and removal of ships' ordnance; lease of facilities and docks; charter and hire of vessels; relief of vessels in distress; maritime salvage services; research and development; industrial mobilization; and departmental salaries; \$411,782,000.

CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS

For an additional amount for "Construction of Ships," to remain available until expended, \$111,420,000, of which \$76,400,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head: *Provided*, That the limitation imposed under this head on the total obligations to be incurred for construction, conversion, or replacement approved during the fiscal year 1950 is hereby increased by \$35,020,000, and obligations incurred for construction, conversion, or replacement approved during the current fiscal year shall also be charged against said limitation.

ORDNANCE AND FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for the production and procurement of Navy ordnance and ammunition (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); alteration, preservation, and handling of ordnance and ammunition; maintenance of ordnance (except installation, maintenance, and removal of ships' ordnance, and line maintenance of ordnance installed in aircraft); maintenance and operation of ordnance facilities; procurement of equipment, supplies, special clothing and services; procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in naval or private plants; lease of facilities; research and development; industrial mobilization; and departmental salaries; \$181,665,000.

ORDNANCE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Ordnance for New Construction,"

to remain available until expended, \$41,856,000, of which \$30,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head: *Provided*, That the limitation imposed under this head on the total obligations to be incurred for armor, armament, and ammunition for construction, conversion, or replacement approved during the fiscal year 1950 is hereby increased by \$11,856,000 and obligations incurred for such purposes for construction, conversion, or replacement approved during the current fiscal year shall also be charged against said limitation.

INCREASE AND REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS

CONSTRUCTION AND MACHINERY

For an additional amount for "Construction and machinery", including, during the current fiscal year, personal services in the Bureau of Ships necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$43,800,000.

ARMOR, ARMAMENT, AND AMMUNITION

For an additional amount for "Armor, armament, and ammunition," including, during the current fiscal year, personal services in the Bureau of Ordnance necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$47,400,000.

MEDICAL CARE

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of naval hospitals, medical centers, clinics, schools, research facilities, the medical supply system, and other medical activities; procurement of medical and dental supplies, equipment and services; rent; instruction of medical personnel in naval hospitals, naval medical schools, and civilian schools; research and development; industrial mobilization; care of the dead; and departmental salaries; \$37,862,000.

CIVIL ENGINEERING

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of district public works offices, public works centers, advance base depots, construction battalion centers, defense housing projects, other civil engineering facilities, and shore activities not otherwise provided for; procurement of services, supplies and equipment for the foregoing activities; purchase (for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; research and development; advance engineering planning; industrial mobilization; and departmental salaries; \$34,778,000.

PUBLIC WORKS

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy, as authorized by the Act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459), and the Act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, Eighty-first Congress); major repairs and improvements to the Davisville pier, Naval Base, Newport, Rhode Island; furniture for public quarters; personnel in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; and engineering and architectural services as authorized by section 3 of the Act of April 25, 1939 (34

U. S. C. 556); \$62,928,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated by the Act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1027), for construction of two new storehouses at Adak, Alaska, may be used for the conversion of existing facilities, if the Secretary of the Navy determines such action would result in a savings to the Government.

RESEARCH

For conduct and encouragement of research and development, not otherwise provided for; dissemination of scientific information; administration of patents, trade-marks, and copyrights; maintenance and operation of research and development facilities; development, installation, and maintenance of special devices (including specialized housing therefor); procurement of supplies, services, and equipment; departmental salaries; and other expenses necessary in carrying out the Act of August 1, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 475), to remain available until expended, \$43,083,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the funds made available under this head in the Naval Appropriation Act, 1947, shall remain available until June 30, 1951, for liquidation of obligations incurred thereunder during the fiscal year 1947.

SERVICE-WIDE SUPPLY AND FINANCE

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of service-wide supply and finance activities, including supply depots and centers, clothing depots, market and purchasing offices, supply demand control points, fleet fueling facilities, overseas air cargo terminals, regional accounting and disbursing offices, the material catalog office, the cost inspection service, and other service-wide supply and finance facilities, as designated by the Secretary; procurement of supplies, services, special clothing, and equipment; rent; intra-Navy transportation of things, including contract operation of tankers, all transportation of navy stock fund and clothing and small stores fund material, and transportation of household effects; research and development; industrial mobilization; losses in exchange and in the accounts of disbursing officers, as authorized by law; and departmental salaries; \$209,292,000.

SERVICE-WIDE OPERATIONS

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of the Naval Observatory, the Hydrographic Office, Service-wide Communications, Naval Records Centers, Naval District Headquarters (except training and public works offices), River Commands, Sea Frontiers and other service-wide operations and functions not otherwise provided for; procurement of supplies, services and equipment for activities financed hereunder; Latin-American cooperation; not to exceed \$26,090,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, as authorized by section 6 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 419c), to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; for examination of estimates for appropriations and of naval activities in the field for any branch of the naval service; and departmental salaries; \$99,281,000.

ISLAND GOVERNMENTS

For expenses incident to the administration of island governments, including liberated and occupied areas and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, \$1,500,000.

OPERATION AND CONSERVATION OF NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

For expenses necessary for exploration, prospecting, conservation, development, use, and operation of the naval petroleum reserves, as authorized by law, \$4,000,000.

NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE NUMBERED 4, ALASKA

For expenses necessary for exploration and prospecting in Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4, \$11,000,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of the appropriations made available under this head by the "Department of the Navy Appropriation Act, 1949" and the "Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950" shall be consolidated herewith, to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund which shall remain available until June 30, 1952.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

For construction, procurement, and contract modification of aircraft and equipment, armor and armament, spare parts and accessories therefor; electronic and communication equipment, detection and warning systems, and specialized equipment; expansion of public plants, and Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in public or private plants for the foregoing purposes; industrial mobilization, including maintenance of reserve plants and equipment and procurement planning; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, including rents, transportation of things and personal services in the field; to remain available until expended, \$1,700,000,000 of which \$1,525,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes: *Provided*, That there is hereby established a 1951 aircraft procurement program (including all purposes and objects provided for under this head) in an amount of \$1,711,440,000, to be provided from (1) this appropriation, (2) the contract authority granted hereinafter, and (3) \$726,151,000 of the balance of the contract authority granted under this head in the "National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950", but this proviso shall not be construed to prevent the use in the fiscal year 1951 of other unused contract authority heretofore granted for aircraft procurement: *Provided further*, That the unexpended balances of the appropriations granted under the head "Air Corps, Army," for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948, shall remain available until June 30, 1951, for the payment of obligations incurred thereunder prior to July 1, 1947, and July 1, 1948, respectively: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes in an amount not to exceed \$810,289,000.

SPECIAL PROCUREMENT

For the procurement of ordnance supplies, materials, and equipment, and spare parts therefor; purchase of passenger motor vehicles (including one at not to exceed \$3,000); and supplies, materials, and equipment, not otherwise provided for, \$147,900,000.

ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAL PROPERTY

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the Act of March 30, 1949 (Public Law 30, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 415, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of May 11, 1949 (Public Law 60, Eighty-first Congress), and the Act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, Eighty-first Congress), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, to remain available until expended, \$164,784,000, of which \$25,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, or authorized to be transferred to this head by the National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

For expenses necessary for the maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft, and for maintenance, operation, repair, and other expenses necessary for Air Force facilities, including transportation of things; rents at the seat of government and elsewhere, and in administering the provisions of 43 U. S. C. 315q payments of rents may be made in advance; field printing plants; hire of passenger motor vehicles; training and instruction of military and civilian personnel of the Air Force, including tuition and related expenses; pay, allowances and travel expenses of contract surgeons; utility services for buildings erected at private cost as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 1346), and buildings on military reservations authorized by Air Force regulations to be used for welfare and recreational purposes; rental of land or purchase of options to rent land without reference to section 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended, use or repair of private property, and other necessary expenses of combat maneuvers; expenses of courts, boards, and commissions; organizational clothing and equipage; civilian clothing and when necessary an overcoat, the cost of all not to exceed \$30, for each person upon each release from a military prison, each enlisted man discharged otherwise than honorably, each enlisted man convicted by a civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a civil prison, and each enlisted man interned, or discharged without internment as an alien enemy; payment of exchange fees and exchange losses incurred by Air Force disbursing officers or their agents; losses in the accounts of Air Force disbursing officers as authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 95a; 50 U. S. C. 1705-1707; Act of July 26, 1947, Public Law 248); burial of the dead as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 916-916d; 5 U. S. C. 103a), including remains of personnel of the Air Force of the United States who die while on active duty, travel allowances of attendants accompanying remains, and acquisition by lease

or otherwise of temporary burial sites; conduct of schoolrooms, service clubs, chapels, and other instructional, entertainment, and welfare expenses for enlisted men; expenses for inter-American cooperation as authorized for the Navy by the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 421f), for Latin-American cooperation; payments of deficiency judgments and interests thereon arising out of condemnation proceedings heretofore instituted; and special services by contract or otherwise, \$1,027,662,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation, interest on deposits of enlisted personnel, payment of life insurance premiums, and travel in kind for cadets and all other personnel of the Air Force of the United States on active duty (other than personnel of the Reserve components, including the Air National Guard, on active duty while undergoing reserve training), including mileage, per diem allowances, reimbursement of actual expenses of travel, transportation of troops, commutation of quarters, subsistence supplies for issue as rations to enlisted personnel, cloth and materials and clothing for issue and sale, and clothing allowances, as authorized by law; and, in connection with personnel paid from this appropriation, for rental of camp sites and local procurement of utility services and other necessary expenses incident to individual or troop movements (including packing and unpacking and transportation of organizational equipment), ice, meals for recruiting parties, monetary allowances for liquid coffee for troops when supplied cooked or travel rations, altering and fitting clothing, and commutation of rations, as authorized by law, to enlisted personnel, including those sick in hospitals (to be paid to the surgeon in charge); transportation, as authorized by law, of dependents, baggage, and household effects of personnel paid from this appropriation; transportation, or reimbursement therefor, of applicants for enlistment between places of acceptance for enlistment and recruiting stations, rejected applicants for enlistment, general prisoners, and discharged cadets; travel pay to discharged military personnel; transportation of persons discharged otherwise than honorably, prisoners upon each termination of confinement, and persons discharged from Saint Elizabeths Hospital after transfer thereto from the military service; commutation of quarters and rations to applicants for enlistment and general prisoners traveling under orders; rations for civilian employees when entitled thereto, applicants for enlistment, prisoners of war, and general prisoners; subsistence supplies for resale, as authorized by law; commutation of rations, as authorized by regulations, to applicants for enlistment, civilian employees entitled to subsistence at public expense, and general prisoners, while sick in hospitals (to be paid to the surgeon in charge); subsistence of supernumeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances; issues of toilet articles and barbers' and tailors' material to general prisoners confined at military posts without pay and allowances, applicants for enlistment, and recruits upon first enlistment; expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, stragglers, and escaped military prisoners; payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, of rewards (not to exceed \$25 in any one case) for the apprehension of deserters; confinement

of military prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed \$25 to each civilian prisoner upon each release from a military prison, to each enlisted man discharged otherwise than honorably upon each release from confinement under court-martial sentence, and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment, \$1,245,000,000.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research and development, by contract or otherwise, and transportation of things, to remain available until expended, \$182,611,000.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation (including mileage, actual and necessary expenses, or per diem in lieu thereof), and medical and hospital treatment and related expenses, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Air Force Reserve while on active duty undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills or equivalent duty; maintenance, operation, repair, and other necessary expenses of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve; maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft; personal services at the seat of the government and elsewhere; transportation of things; hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplies, materials, and equipment, not otherwise provided for, necessary to train and equip Air Force Reserve organizations; and expenses incident to the maintenance and use of supplies, materials, and equipment furnished from stocks under the control of the Air Force; \$73,235,000.

AIR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

For pay, subsistence, transportation, and allowances, including travel allowances, commutation of subsistence and uniforms, medical and hospital treatment and related expenses, as authorized by law, for the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of training and instruction of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, including maintenance and operation of facilities; transportation of things; hire of passenger motor vehicles; procurement and issue to institutions of supplies, materials, and equipment, including uniforms, necessary for the training and instruction of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law; and expenses incident to the maintenance and use of supplies, materials, and equipment furnished from stocks under the control of the Air Force; to remain available until June 30, 1952; \$10,600,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation (including mileage, actual and necessary expenses, or per diem in lieu thereof), medical and hospital treatment and related expenses, for members of the Air National Guard while undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, as authorized by law; travel expenses (other than mileage), on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units

in compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; establishment, maintenance, operation, repair, and other necessary expenses of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, either on Government-owned or State-owned land or on land made available by lease or loan from any political subdivision of a State or any individual, corporation, or organization, for a period of not less than ten years, including construction of facilities, and additions, extensions, alterations, improvements, and rehabilitation of existing facilities; maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft; personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere; transportation of things; hire of passenger motor vehicles; procurement and issue to the Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia of supplies, materials, and equipment, as authorized by law; and expenses incident to the maintenance and use of supplies, materials, and equipment, including such as may be furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; \$103,935,000: *Provided*, That the number of caretakers authorized to be employed under the provisions of law (32 U. S. C. 42) may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Air Force.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ADMINISTRATION

For expenses necessary for the administration of the Air Force at the seat of government and at headquarters of major commands, including personal services; transportation of things; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and travel expenses, transportation of dependents, baggage, and household effects of civilian employees upon permanent change of station; \$58,545,000.

CONTINGENCIES

For emergencies and extraordinary expenses, including personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, to be expended on the authority or approval of the Secretary of the Air Force, and such expenses may be accounted for solely on his certificate, \$26,714,000.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Air Force, Army, and Navy, respectively, if they should deem it advantageous to the national defense, and if in their opinions the existing facilities of the Department of Defense are inadequate, are authorized to procure services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per day, and to pay in connection therewith travel expenses of individuals, including actual transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence while traveling from their homes or places of business to official duty station and return as may be authorized by law: *Provided*, That such contracts may be renewed annually.

SEC. 602. Section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply, in the case of payments made from appropriations contained in this Act, (1) to payments made in compliance with the laws of foreign coun-

tries or their ministerial regulations, (2) to payments for rent in such countries for such periods as may be necessary to accord with local custom, or (3) to payments made for tuition.

SEC. 603. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 604. No part of any appropriation contained in this chapter for "Pay and allowances" of military personnel shall be transferred or used for any other purpose.

SEC. 605. The appropriations in this chapter otherwise available for travel or transportation which are current on date of relief from duty station of personnel traveling under orders may be charged with all expenses in connection with such travel including transportation of dependents and household goods, regardless of time of arrival at destination of such personnel.

SEC. 606. During the current fiscal year the dependents and household effects of such civilian personnel (without regard to grade) of the Department of Defense on duty at stations outside the continental limits of the United States, or in Alaska, as may be determined upon by the Secretary concerned, may, prior or subsequent to the issuance of orders for the relief of such personnel from their stations, be moved (including packing and unpacking of household effects) from such stations outside the continental limits of the United States, or in Alaska, to such locations as may be designated by such personnel (subject to the approval of the Secretary concerned), by the use of either Government or commercial means of transportation, and later from such locations to the duty stations to which such personnel may be ordered, and current appropriations available for travel and transportation may be used for this purpose, the decision of the Secretary concerned to be final as to the dependency of any individual sought to be affected by this provision except as to travel performed subsequent to arrival in the United States.

SEC. 607. Appropriations contained in this chapter available for travel shall be available for all expenses incident to attendance at meetings of technical, scientific, professional, or other similar organizations.

SEC. 608. No part of any money appropriated in this chapter or included under any contract authority granted in this chapter shall be expended for the payment of any commission on any land purchase contract in excess of 2 per centum of the purchase price.

SEC. 609. The appropriations in this chapter shall not be available for the pay, allowances, or travel of any member of the Air National Guard, Air Force Reserve, Army National Guard, or the Organized Reserve Corps, for periods of active duty, drills, training, instruction, or other duty for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to any provisions of law, who may be drawing a pension, retirement pay, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay (where retirement has been made on account of physical disability or age) from the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this section or any other provision of law shall be so construed as to prevent the application of funds to the pay, allowances, or travel of any member of the Air National Guard,

Air Force Reserve, Army National Guard, Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, or Marine Corps Reserve, who may waive or relinquish said pension, retirement pay, disability allowance, or disability compensation (where such disability is of such degree as not to prevent acceptance for active Federal duty) for the periods of active duty, field training, instruction, other duty, or drill, for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to law: *Provided further*, That adjutants general who may be drawing such emoluments may be continued in a federally recognized status without pay under this chapter.

SEC. 610. Such military and naval personnel as may be detailed for duty with agencies not a part of the Department of Defense on a reimbursement basis may be employed in addition to the numbers otherwise authorized and appropriated for.

SEC. 611. No collection or reclamation shall be made by the United States on account of any money paid to assignees, transferees, or allottees, or to others for them, under assignments, transfers, or allotments of pay and allowances made under authority of law where liability might exist with respect to such assignments, transfers, or allotments or the use of such moneys, because of the death of assignors, transferors, or allottees.

SEC. 612. Appropriations contained in this chapter shall be available for insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by laws of such countries; payments in advance of expenses determined by the investigating officer to be necessary and in accord with local custom for conducting investigations in foreign countries incident to matters relating to the activities of the department concerned; reimbursement of General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; and all necessary expenses, at the seat of government of the United States of America or elsewhere, in connection with (1) instruction and training, including tuition, not otherwise provided for, of civilian employees, (2) printing and binding, communication and other services and supplies as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter, and (3) health programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150).

SEC. 613. The appropriations contained in this chapter for the Air Force, Navy, and for the Army, which are available for the procurement or manufacture of supplies, materials, and equipment of special or technical design may be used for the development and procurement of gages, dies, jigs, and other special aids and appliances, production studies, factory plans, and other production data, including specifications and detailed drawings, and for the purchase of copyrights and letters patent, applications therefor, and licenses thereunder pertaining to such supplies, equipment, and materials for which the appropriations are made.

SEC. 614. Any appropriation available to the Air Force, Army, or the Navy may, under such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, be used for expenses incident to the maintenance, pay, and allowances of prisoners of war, other persons in Air Force, Army, or Navy custody whose status is determined by the Secretary concerned to be similar to prisoners of war, and persons detained in such custody pursuant to Presidential proclamation.

SEC. 615. During the current fiscal year, without deposit to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States and withdrawal on money requisitions, receipts of public moneys from sales or other sources by officers of the Department of Defense on disbursing duty and charged in their official accounts, except receipts to be credited to river and harbor and flood-control appropriations, may be used by them as required for current expenditures, all necessary bookkeeping adjustments of appropriations, funds, and accounts to be made in the settlement of their disbursing accounts.

SEC. 616. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized to expend out of Army, Air Force or Navy appropriations available for construction or maintenance such amounts as may be required for minor construction (except living quarters), extensions to existing structures and improvements at facilities of the department concerned, but the cost of any project authorized under this section which is not otherwise authorized shall not exceed \$30,000 except that, whenever in the judgment of the Secretary of Defense the interests of national defense so require, such appropriations shall be available for construction projects of a temporary nature without regard to such limitation, and the cost of any such temporary project authorized under this section which is not otherwise authorized shall not exceed \$100,000: *Provided*, That the cost limitations of this section shall not apply to the appropriations for "Contingencies of the Army", "Army National Guard", "Organized Reserves", and "Contingencies of the Air Force".

SEC. 617. During the current fiscal year, appropriations contained in this chapter (except those for liquidation of prior contract authorizations) shall not be obligated for construction of family quarters for personnel at a cost per family unit in excess of \$14,040 on housing units for generals; \$12,040 on housing units for majors, lieutenant colonels and colonels, or equivalent; \$11,040 on housing units for second lieutenants, lieutenants, captains, and warrant officers, or equivalent; or \$10,040 on housing units for enlisted personnel, except that when such units are constructed outside the continental United States or in Alaska, the average cost per unit of all such units shall not exceed \$25,850 and in no event shall the individual cost exceed \$35,000. The last proviso of section 3 of the Act of June 12, 1948 (Public Law 626), and the last proviso in the next to last paragraph of section 3 of the Act of June 16, 1948 (Public Law 653), shall not be applicable to appropriations made herein or heretofore to carry out such Acts, in cases where the Secretary of the Department concerned determines that the erection of prefabricated family quarters will be more advantageous to the United States than multiple type dwellings of conventional construction.

SEC. 618. (a) All negotiated contracts for procurement in excess of \$1,000 entered into during the current fiscal year by or on behalf of the Department of Defense (including the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, and Department of the Air Force), and all subcontracts thereunder in excess of \$1,000, are hereby made subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1948 in the same manner and to the same extent as if such contracts and subcontracts were required by such Act to contain the renegotiation article prescribed in subsection (a) of such Act. Each contract and subcontract made subject to the Renegotia-

tion Act of 1948 by this section shall contain an article stating that it is subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1948. In determining whether the amounts received or accrued to a contractor or subcontractor during his fiscal year from contracts and subcontracts subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1948 amount in the aggregate to \$100,000, receipts or accruals from contracts and subcontracts made subject to such Act by this section shall be added to receipts or accruals from all other contracts and subcontracts subject to such Act.

(b) Notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary, the profit limitation provisions of the Act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503, 505), as amended and supplemented, shall not apply to any contract or subcontract which is subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1948.

SEC. 619. Appropriations for the Air Force and the Army for the current fiscal year shall be available for carrying out the purposes of Executive Order 9112 of March 26, 1942; for expenses in connection with the administration of occupied areas; for distribution of trophies and devices as authorized by law; for actual and necessary expenses or per diem in lieu thereof authorized by law; and for primary and secondary schooling for dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense residing on military installations or stationed in foreign countries, but in amounts not exceeding \$140 per child in the United States, when the Secretary of the department concerned finds that schools, if any, available in the locality, are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents; and appropriations for the Air Force for the current fiscal year shall be available for expenses of temporary duty travel of military personnel and for travel expenses of civilians (other than on permanent change of station) traveling in connection with the activities of the Air Force.

SEC. 620. Appropriations for the Navy for the current fiscal year shall be available for expenses in connection with the transfer to the United States of foreign vessels, including pay, subsistence, transportation, and repatriation of alien crews; expenses including those heretofore incurred incident to the operation by the Navy of private plants taken over at the direction of the President, and the Secretary of the Navy may designate any naval appropriation to be charged with such expenses, proper adjustment to be made on the basis of final costs between applicable appropriations; payment of rewards, as authorized by law, for information leading to the discovery of missing naval property or the recovery thereof, and contributions for the support of schools for dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense as authorized by section 13 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 421d).

SEC. 621. No part of any appropriation contained in this chapter shall be used directly or indirectly, except for temporary employment in case of emergency, for the payment of any civilian for services rendered by him on the Canal Zone while occupying a skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory position unless such person is a citizen of the United States of America or of the Republic of Panama: *Provided, however*, (1) That, notwithstanding the provision in the Act approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409), limiting employment in the above-mentioned positions to citizens of the United States from and after the date of approval of said Act, citizens of Panama may be employed in such positions; (2) that at

no time shall the number of Panamanian citizens employed in the above-mentioned positions exceed the number of citizens of the United States so employed, if United States citizens are available in continental United States or on the Canal Zone; (3) that nothing in this chapter shall prohibit the continued employment of any person who shall have rendered fifteen or more years of faithful and honorable service on the Canal Zone; (4) that in the selection of personnel for skilled, technical, administrative, clerical, supervisory, or executive positions, the controlling factors in filling these positions shall be efficiency, experience, training, and education; (5) that all citizens of Panama and the United States rendering skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory service on the Canal Zone under the terms of this chapter (a) shall normally be employed not more than forty hours per week, (b) may receive as compensation equal rates of pay based upon rates paid for similar employment in continental United States plus 25 per centum; (6) this entire section shall apply only to persons employed in skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory positions on the Canal Zone directly or indirectly by any branch of the United States Government or by any corporation or company whose stock is owned wholly or in part by the United States Government: *Provided further*, That the President may suspend from time to time in whole or in part compliance with this section if he should deem such course to be in the public interest.

SEC. 622. The powers and duties vested in the Secretaries of the Army and the Navy with respect to civil-service employees of their Departments by section 3 of the Act of December 17, 1942 (56 Stat. 1053), shall, during the current fiscal year, be vested also in the Secretary of Defense with respect to civil-service employees of all agencies of the Department of Defense other than the Department of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and in the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to civil-service employees of the Department of the Air Force. The provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), shall not apply to any civil-service employees with regard to whom the powers granted in this section are exercised: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall repeal or modify any existing powers and duties of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force under section 3 of the Act of December 17, 1942 (56 Stat. 1053).

SEC. 623. Insofar as practicable, the Secretary of Defense shall assist American small business to participate equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds appropriated under this chapter by making available or causing to be made available to suppliers in the United States, and particularly to small independent enterprises, information, as far in advance as possible, with respect to purchases proposed to be financed with funds appropriated under this chapter, and by making available or causing to be made available to purchasing and contracting agencies of the Department of Defense information as to commodities and services produced and furnished by small independent enterprises in the United States, and by otherwise helping to give small business an opportunity to participate in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds appropriated by this chapter.

SEC. 624. During the current fiscal year, commuted rations for enlisted personnel of the uniformed services (as defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949) on leave, or otherwise authorized to mess separately, shall not exceed the cost of the ration as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 625. No appropriation contained in this chapter shall be available for expenses of operation of messes (other than organized messes which are financed principally from nonappropriated funds) at which meals are sold to officers or civilians except under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense, which shall (except under unusual or extraordinary circumstances) establish rates for such meals sufficient to provide reimbursement of operating expenses and food costs to the appropriations concerned: *Provided*, That, for the purposes of this section, payments for meals at the rates established hereunder may be made in cash or by deductions from the pay of civilian employees.

SEC. 626. No part of any appropriation contained in this chapter shall be available until expended unless expressly so provided elsewhere in this or some other appropriation Act.

SEC. 627. No part of any appropriation contained in this chapter shall be available for or on account of the supply or replacement of table linen, dishes, glassware, silver, and kitchen utensils for use in the residences or quarters of officers on shore (other than for field messes, messes temporarily set up on shore for bachelor officers and officers attached to seagoing or district defense vessels, to aviation units based on seagoing vessels, to the fleet air bases, to the submarine bases, or to landing forces and expeditions), except in accordance with regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense, which shall provide for uniform practices among all of the services.

SEC. 628. The provisions of the Act of February 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 3), shall be applicable to the appropriations of the Army and Air Force for military pay for the fiscal year 1950 and the current fiscal year, upon certification by the appropriate agency of the department concerned.

SEC. 629. Not more than \$15,000,000 of the amounts received during the current fiscal year by each of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as proceeds from the sale of scrap or salvage material, shall be available during the current fiscal year for expenses of transportation, demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage of military supplies, equipment, and matériel: *Provided*, That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limitation shall be made quarterly to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress.

SEC. 630. During the current fiscal year, appropriations, funds, and contract authorizations, available for military functions under the Department of Defense, shall not be subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1211 of this Act.

TITLE VII—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 701. The contract authorization granted under the head "Ordnance for New Construction," in title IV of the "National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950," is reduced by the sum of \$31,460,000 and the amount of the limitation imposed by the

proviso under said head on the total obligations to be incurred for armor, armament, and ammunition, for construction, conversion, or replacement approved during the fiscal year 1950, is also reduced by the sum of \$31,460,000.

This chapter may be cited as the "Defense Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER XI—FOREIGN AID

TITLE I—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

ECONOMIC COOPERATION

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended by the Act of April 19, 1949 (Public Law 47), and as further amended by the Act of June 5, 1950 (Public Law 535), including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation (not to exceed \$30,000); hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation and hire of aircraft; payment of damage claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); rents in the District of Columbia; transportation of privately owned automobiles; entertainment (not to exceed \$20,000); exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes; and loss by exchange; \$2,250,000,000, of which not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for expenditures of a confidential character (other than entertainment) under the direction of the Administrator or the Deputy Administrator, who shall make a certificate of the amount of each such expenditure which he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein specified: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be consolidated and merged with funds heretofore made available for the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and such consolidated appropriation may be used during the fiscal year 1951 within the limitations herein specified: *Provided further*, That the Administrator is authorized and directed to issue notes from time to time during the fiscal year 1951 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to make such purchases, in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate \$62,500,000 for the purpose of assistance to Spain, to be extended upon credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$14,000,000 of such consolidated appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses during the fiscal year 1951, of which not more than \$25,000 shall be available to the Administrator for any further action he may consider advisable to carry out the provisions of section 115 (f) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500,000,000 shall be available for transfers under section 111 (d) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended: *Provided further*, That after November 1, 1950, no funds herein appropriated shall be made available to any nation of which a dependent area fails in the opinion of the President to comply with any treaty to which the United States and such dependent area are parties: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein

appropriated shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which, in the opinion of the President, has failed, refused, or neglected to support the United Nations in resisting aggression.

ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

For expenses necessary to provide assistance to the Republic of Korea, as authorized by law, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); transportation of privately owned automobiles; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes; and loss by exchange; \$90,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Act for International Development (title IV of Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950), including personal services in the District of Columbia; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase (not to exceed twelve), and hire of passenger motor vehicles for use outside the continental limits of the United States; printing and binding; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; acquisition of temporary quarters outside the continental limits of the United States to house employees of the United States Government by rental (without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), lease, or construction, and necessary repairs and alterations to such temporary quarters; exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543); entertainment (not to exceed \$2,000); health and accident insurance for foreign trainees and technicians while absent from their own countries participating in activities authorized under this appropriation, and actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of such persons who may die away from their homes while participating in such activities; services of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for purposes of providing such services the Public Health Service may appoint not to exceed twenty officers in the Regular Corps to grades above that of senior assistant, but not above that of director, as otherwise authorized in accordance with section 711 of the Act of July 1, 1944, as amended (42 U. S. C. 211a), and the Coast and Geodetic Survey may appoint for such purposes not to exceed twenty commissioned officers in addition to those otherwise authorized; \$26,900,000; and, in addition, there may be transferred to this appropriation for the purposes hereof not to exceed \$2,600,000 from the appropriation to the Department of State for "International information and educational activities," fiscal year 1951: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for contracts or agreements entered into during the fiscal year 1951 pursuant to section 405 (e) of the Act for International

Development which entail commitments for the expenditure of funds for not to exceed three years: *Provided, however*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for the duplication of any program being carried on by any other agency of the United States Government or any international agency to which the United States is a major contributor, nor for the construction of any project except for demonstration or instructional purposes, nor for any purpose except administrative expenses, and preliminary surveys and technical cooperation programs upon which reports shall be made to the Congress of the United States quarterly: *Provided further*, That the making of any survey or the advancement of any technical cooperation program or the preparation of plans for projects does not constitute any obligation whatsoever on the part of the Government of the United States to make any loan or grant for the execution or construction of any project or for the completion of any program devised under title IV of Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950: *Provided further*, That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of State to give written notice to each recipient of funds or beneficiary under said title that such assistance shall not be construed as an obligation on the part of the United States to make funds available for the construction or execution of any project and to report such action to Congress.

MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, for the period through June 30, 1951, \$1,678,023,729, of which (a) \$1,000,000,000 shall be available, in accordance with section 102 (b), for carrying out the provisions of title I, including expenses, as authorized by section 408 (b), of administering the provisions of said Act and the Act of May 22, 1947 (61 Stat. 103), as amended; (b) \$131,500,000 shall be available for carrying out the provisions of title II; (c) \$91,000,000 shall be available for carrying out the provisions of title III, including \$16,000,000 as authorized by section 302 (b) and \$75,000,000 as authorized by section 303 (b); and (d) \$455,523,729 shall be available for payment of obligations incurred under the authority to enter into contracts granted under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of appropriations and contract authorizations granted under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, shall continue available until June 30, 1951.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CIVIL FUNCTIONS

GOVERNMENT AND RELIEF IN OCCUPIED AREAS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government or occupation of certain foreign areas (except Germany), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere and, subject to such authorizations and limitations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned, tuition, personal allowances (not to exceed \$10 per day), travel

expenses (not to exceed those authorized for like United States military or civilian personnel), and fees incident to instruction in the United States or elsewhere of such persons as may be required to carry out the provisions of this appropriation; travel expenses and transportation; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); translation rights, photographic work, educational exhibits, and dissemination of information, including preview and review expenses incident thereto; expenses incident to the operation of schools in Japan for American children who are dependents of Government personnel; printing and binding; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; repair and maintenance of buildings, utilities, facilities, and appurtenances; contingencies for the United States commanders, commissioners, or other administrators of foreign areas, to be expended in their respective discretions (not exceeding amounts authorized or approved by the head of the department or agency concerned); such minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such areas as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest, prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished; and such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; \$288,000,000, of which not to exceed \$18,200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That the general provisions of the appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1951 for the military functions of the Department of the Army shall apply to expenditures made by that Department from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made outside continental United States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sections 355, 1136, 3648, and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, civil service or classification laws, or provisions of law prohibiting payment of any person not a citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 151-161): *Provided further*, That expenditures may be made hereunder for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in such occupied areas in such manner as to be consistent with the general objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated hereunder and unexpended at the time of the termination of occupation by the United States, of any area for which such funds are made available, may be expended by the President for the procurement of such commodities and technical services, and commodities procured from funds herein or heretofore appropriated for government and relief in occupied areas and not delivered to such an area prior to the time of the termination of occupation, may be utilized by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the maintenance of the political and economic stability of such areas: *Provided further*, That before any such assistance is made available, an agreement shall be entered into between the United States and the recognized government or authority with respect to such area containing such undertakings by such government

or authority as the President may determine to be necessary in order to assure the efficient use of such assistance in furtherance of such purposes: *Provided further*, That such agreement shall, when applicable, include requirements and undertakings corresponding to the requirements and undertakings specified in sections 5, 6, and 7 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, approved December 17, 1947): *Provided further*, That funds appropriated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable, and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned to pay ocean transportation charges from United States ports, including territorial ports, to ports in Japan and the Ryukyus for the movement of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned to individuals residing in such countries: *Provided further*, That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the head of the department or agency concerned shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to Japan or the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals: *Provided further*, That the President may transfer to any other department or agency any function or functions provided for under this appropriation, and there shall be transferred to any such department or agency such unobligated balances of this appropriation and, without reimbursement and without regard to the appropriation from which procured, such property as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to relate primarily to any function or functions so transferred; and any funds so transferred may be expended either under the authority contained herein or under the authority governing the activities of the department or agency concerned.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

GOVERNMENT IN OCCUPIED AREAS OF GERMANY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government, occupation, and control of occupied areas of Germany, under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, including personal services in the District of Columbia; one deputy to the United States High Commissioner for Germany at a salary of \$17,500; tuition, personal allowances (not to exceed \$10 per day), travel expenses (not to exceed those authorized for United States civilian personnel), health and accident insurance, and fees incident to instruction in the United States or elsewhere, of such persons as may be required to carry out the provisions of this appropriation; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672) and payment of tort

claims in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; expenses for translation and reproduction rights; acquisition, maintenance, operation, and distribution of educational, informational, reorientation, and rehabilitation materials and equipment for Germany, including grants; medical and health assistance for the civilian population of Germany; expenses incident to the operation of schools for American children who are dependents of Government personnel; expenses incident to maintaining discipline and order in occupied areas (including trial and punishment by courts established by or under authority of the President); printing and binding, including printing and binding outside continental United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase, rental, operation, and maintenance of printing and binding machines, equipment, and devices abroad; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; transportation to occupied Germany of property donated for the purposes of this appropriation; unforeseen contingencies (not to exceed \$100,000) for the United States High Commissioner for Germany, to be accounted for pursuant to the provisions of section 291 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 107); and representation allowances (not to exceed \$20,000) similar to those authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131); \$27,000,000: *Provided*, That provisions of law, including current appropriation Acts, applicable to the Department of State shall be available for application to expenditures made from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That when section 601 of the Economy Act of 1932, as amended (31 U. S. C. 686), is employed to carry out the purposes of this appropriation the requisitioned agency may utilize the authority contained in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made outside the continental United States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sections 355 and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Department of State is authorized to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, including unforeseen contingencies, without dollar reimbursement from this or any other appropriation (1) currencies deposited in Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany in accordance with section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and which may be made available by the Economic Cooperation Administration, (2) currencies otherwise deposited in Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany and which become available for use of the Government of the United States, its representatives or agencies in Germany, in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be determined by the Secretary of State after consultation with the Administrator for Economic Cooperation, and (3) other currencies derived from activities carried on under this appropriation: *Provided further*, That civilian employees of the United States serving in Germany who received appointments in October 1949 to the Foreign Service of the United States for service in Germany shall, for the purposes of section 625 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, be considered to have been in class on September 30, 1949: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this appropriation appointments may be made to the Foreign Service Reserve with-

out regard to the four-year limitation contained in section 522 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946: *Provided further*, That in the event the President assigns to the Department of State responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government, occupation, or control of foreign areas in addition to Germany, the authorities contained in this appropriation may be utilized by the Department of State in connection with such government, occupation, or control of such foreign areas: *Provided further*, That when the Department of the Army, under the authority of the Act of March 3, 1911, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1253), furnishes subsistence supplies to personnel of civilian agencies of the United States Government serving in Germany, payment therefor by such personnel shall be made at the same rate as is paid by civilian personnel of the Department of the Army serving in Germany.

AID TO PALESTINE REFUGEES

For contributions by the United States to the United Nations for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, as authorized by title III of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950 (Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950), \$27,450,000.

This chapter may be cited as the "Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1951".

CHAPTER XII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

SEC. 1201. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year, in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station wagons), is hereby fixed at \$1,400.

SEC. 1202. Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, or (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further*, That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philip-

pires or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the prosecution of the war.

SEC. 1203. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for living quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), and regulations prescribed thereunder, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regulations of the President, for all civilian officers and employees of the Government permanently stationed in foreign countries: *Provided*, That the availability of appropriations made to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected hereby.

SEC. 1204. No part of any appropriation for the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve of the nomination of said person.

SEC. 1205. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay in excess of \$4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United States Code Annotated and such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in excess of \$4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest.

SEC. 1206. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 841), shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; examination of budgets and estimates of appropriations in the field; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and the objects specified in the sections of this title under the head "Departments and agencies", all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 1207. No part of any funds of or available to any wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the purchase or construction of any office building at the seat of government primarily for occupancy by any department or agency of the United States Government or by any corporation owned by the United States Government.

SEC. 1208. Funds of corporations and agencies, subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, covered by the provisions of this or any other Act shall be available during the current fiscal year for payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672).

SEC. 1209. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this or any other Act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That, as applicable to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

SEC. 1210. No funds made available by this or any other Act shall be withdrawn from one appropriation account for credit to another, or to a working fund, except as authorized by law: *Provided*, That, except as otherwise specifically provided by law, any funds so withdrawn and credited shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same limitations, conditions, and restrictions, as provided by the Act appropriating such funds: *Provided further*, That any such withdrawal and credit shall be made, without warrant action, by check: *Provided further*, That no funds withdrawn and credited pursuant to section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686), shall be available for any period beyond that provided by the Act appropriating such funds.

SEC. 1211. Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3679. (a) No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount

available therein; nor shall any such officer or employee involve the Government in any contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law.

“(b) No officer or employee of the United States shall accept voluntary service for the United States or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of emergency involving the safety of human life or the protection of property.

“(c) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period; and all appropriations or funds not limited to a definite period of time, and all authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. As used hereafter in this section, the term ‘appropriation’ means appropriations, funds, and authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations.

“(2) In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available. Whenever it is determined by an officer designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments that any amount so reserved will not be required to carry out the purposes of the appropriation concerned, he shall recommend the rescission of such amount in the manner provided in the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for estimates of appropriations.

“(3) Any appropriation subject to apportionment shall be distributed by months, calendar quarters, operating seasons, or other time periods, or by activities, functions, projects, or objects, or by a combination thereof, as may be deemed appropriate by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments. Except as otherwise specified by the officer making the apportionment, amounts so apportioned shall remain available for obligation, in accordance with the terms of the appropriation, on a cumulative basis unless reapportioned.

“(4) Apportionments shall be reviewed at least four times each year by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments, and such reapportionments made or such reserves established, modified, or released as may be necessary to further the effective use of the appropriation concerned, in accordance with the purposes stated in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

“(d) (1) Any appropriation available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the officer having administrative control of such appropriation. Each such appropriation shall be apportioned not later than thirty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty

days after approval of the Act by which the appropriation is made available, whichever is later.

“(2) Any appropriation available to an agency, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The head of each agency to which any such appropriation is available shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of such appropriation. Such information shall be submitted not later than forty days before the beginning of any fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than fifteen days after approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall apportion each such appropriation and shall notify the agency concerned of his action not later than twenty days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than thirty days after the approval of the Act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. When used in this section, the term ‘agency’ means any executive department, agency, commission, authority, administration, board, or other independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States. Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with the initiation, operation, and administration of agricultural price support programs and no funds (other than funds for administrative expenses) available for price support, surplus removal, and available under Section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), with respect to agricultural commodities shall be subject to apportionment pursuant to this section. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any corporation which obtains funds for making loans, other than paid in capital funds, without legal liability on the part of the United States.

“(e) (1) No apportionment or reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate shall be made except upon a determination by such officer that such action is required because of (A) any laws enacted subsequent to the transmission to the Congress of the estimates for an appropriation which require expenditures beyond administrative control; or (B) emergencies involving the safety of human life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulae prescribed by law.

“(2) In each case of an apportionment or a reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate, such officer shall immediately submit a detailed report of the facts of the case to the Congress. In transmitting any deficiency or supplemental estimates required on account of any such apportionment or reapportionment, reference shall be made to such report.

“(f) (1) The officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments may exempt from apportionments trust funds and working funds expenditures from which have no significant effect on the financial operations of the Government, working capital and revolving funds established for intragovernmental operations, receipts from industrial and power operations available under law and any appropriation made specifically for—

“(1) interest on, or retirement of, the public debt;

“(2) payment of claims, judgments, refunds, and draw-backs;

“(3) any item determined by the President to be of a confidential nature;

“(4) payment under private relief Acts or other laws requiring payments to designated payees in the total amount of such appropriation;

“(5) grants to the States under title I, IV, or X of the Social Security Act, or under any other public assistance title in such Act.

“(2) The provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to appropriations to the Senate or House of Representatives or to any Member, committee, Office (including the office of the Architect of the Capitol), officer, or employee thereof.

“(g) Any appropriation which is apportioned or reapportioned pursuant to this section may be divided and subdivided administratively within the limits of such apportionments or reapportionments. The officer having administrative control of any such appropriation available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, and the head of each agency, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall prescribe, by regulation, a system of administrative control (not inconsistent with any accounting procedures prescribed by or pursuant to law) which shall be designed to (A) restrict obligations or expenditures against each appropriation to the amount of apportionments or reapportionments made for each such appropriation, and (B) enable such officer or agency head to fix responsibility for the creation of any obligation or the making of any expenditure in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment.

“(h) No officer or employee of the United States shall authorize or create any obligation or make any expenditure (A) in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment, or (B) in excess of the amount permitted by regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (g) of this section.

“(i) (1) In addition to any penalty or liability under other law, any officer or employee of the United States who shall violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall be subjected to appropriate administrative discipline, including, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without pay or removal from office; and any officer or employee of the United States who shall knowingly and willfully violate subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

“(2) In the case of a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section by an officer or employee of an agency, or of the District

of Columbia, the head of the agency concerned or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall immediately report to the President, through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and to the Congress all pertinent facts together with a statement of the action taken thereon."

SEC. 1212. No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, including the government of the District of Columbia, shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any civilian officer or employee during the calendar year 1950 and unused at the close of business on June 30, 1951: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States: *And provided further*, That this section shall not apply with respect to the payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave in the case of officers or employees who leave their civilian positions for the purpose of entering upon active military or naval service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

SEC. 1213. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests of the United States.

SEC. 1214. Appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations and reauthorizations made by this Act for departments and agencies in the executive branch of the government shall, without impairing national defense, be reduced in the amount of not less than \$550,000,000 through the apportionment procedure provided for in Section 1211 of this Act.

SEC. 1215. No payment shall be made from appropriations in this Act to any officer on the retired lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service for a period of two years after retirement who for himself or for others is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service any supplies or war materials.

This Act may be cited as the "General Appropriation Act, 1951".

Approved September 6, 1950.

COPY

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C., August 30, 1950.

Hon. Frederick J. Lawton,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Director:

The General Appropriation Act for 1951 includes section 1214, which reads:

"Appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations, and reauthorizations made by this act for departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government shall, without impairing national defense, be reduced in the amount of not less than \$550,000,000 through the apportionment procedure provided for in section 1211 of this act."

Under the provisions of this section it will be necessary for you, as the official empowered to make apportionments under subsection (d) of section 3679, as amended, to place in reserve and withhold from expenditure not less than \$550,000,000 of the amounts provided in the general appropriation bill. In view of the fact that there has been some discussion as to how this reduction would be applied to the various items in the budget it occurs to me that I should call your attention to a few of the considerations in the legislative history of the act for your guidance in making the fund reserves contemplated.

You will recall that an amendment was offered on the floor of the House by Mr. Thomas, of Texas, requiring the President to impound \$500,000,000 of funds appropriated in the bill with certain restrictions as to the amount by which single items might be reduced and also exempting items related to the national defense. As a substitute Mr. Taber, of New York, offered an amendment to make reductions totaling \$600,000,000 and proceeding to specify percentage reductions in the standard budget classifications such as personal services, travel, etc. The proposal of Mr. Taber applied to every item in the budget but specifically reduced those amounts chargeable to budget classifications 1 to 9, inclusive.

Also the House adopted the so-called Jensen amendment which would have frozen 90 percent of the vacancies occurring in Federal employment during the fiscal year excepting certain exempted categories such as law-enforcement officers, hospital personnel, and so forth.

During the consideration of the bill in the Senate the Taber-Thomas and Jensen amendments were stricken from the bill and there was substituted therefor the so-called Byrd-Bridges amendment (Senate amendment No. 508) which reduced by 10 percent all appropriations in the bill except certain specified items.

The conference between the Houses was confronted with the Taber-Thomas, Jensen and Byrd-Bridges amendments, all of which were subject to inclusion, in either original or revised form, in the bill or exclusion from the bill by the conferees. After considerable discussion the conferees determined upon the language which now appears in section 1214 of the appropriation act.

I recite all this rather obvious and well-known history for the purpose of demonstrating that it is the clear intent of the Congress that the reduction imposed by section 1214 is intended to apply generally to the items in the Act. Any other interpretation would not be supported by the facts. The specific phraseology of the statute is that reduction shall be accomplished "without impairing national defense." That phrase does not necessarily mean that all items appearing in the national defense chapter of the budget are untouchable. It does mean that any item in either the national defense chapter or any other chapter of the bill which is related to the national defense shall not be reduced to the point where such reduction would impair national defense and, further, that any item in either the national defense or other chapters of the bill which can be reduced must be reduced. Every effort that has been made during the consideration of the bill in both the House and the Senate and in conference has been to obtain general reduction in the nondefense portions of the budget.

Opponents of the theory of section 1214 have stated—and I do not agree with their reasoning—that the Director of the Budget has been granted plenary powers to impose reductions wherever he may please and, in so doing, thwart the will of Congress. The Director of the Budget in discharging his responsibilities under the law is restricted in several ways. He is restricted by the law in two specific provisions. In the first place he is required by section 3679, as amended, to apportion funds in such a manner as to avoid deficiency or supplemental appropriations except in those special cases meeting the tests of other provisions of the law and therefore beyond his control. Secondly, he is required to so apportion the funds as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. He is also very pointedly restricted by the force of circumstances surrounding the adoption of section 1214. It seems obvious that he must give consideration to a general revision of the nondefense portions of the budget. To fail to do so would result in failure to recognize the clear intent of Congress in enacting the legislation as every proposal for a general reduction in the budget applied across the board to every item. The only difference between section 1214 and the Taber-Thomas and Byrd-Bridges and Jensen amendments is to leave to the Director of the Budget a degree of discretion in applying the reduction so as adequately to maintain essential services of the Government. It has also been stated that the Director of the Budget can defeat the purpose of the law by deferring meeting obligations until a later date or by paper savings such as postponement of essential items which will not affect the actual expenditure of funds. To accomplish the reduction in such manner would be such an obvious violation of the spirit of the statute that no responsible official would think of it. I mention it here only because the possibility has been suggested and I want to make it clear that while technically such action might be possible it is entirely without the realm of reason when the legislative history of the law is considered.

There is an important part of the language in section 1214 which has been obscured in the publicity regarding it. The section has been generally stated to be a reduction of \$550,000,000 whereas the reduction reads "not less than \$550,000,000. I want to particularly call your attention to this phraseology and to point out to you that this wording places the burden on the Director of the Budget to impose reductions above and beyond \$550,000,000 to such a degree as is possible without impairing national defense. The clear intent of the section is to secure as large a reduction as possible in nondefense activities and \$550,000,000 is only a minimum figure. In view of the radical change in conditions since the original budget was prepared there is no alternative.

In order that the committee may be fully advised in the matter I shall appreciate it if you will send me a report showing the reserves established.

I have known you personally for a number of years and I know your personal integrity and devotion to duty so well that I realize the lack of necessity of writing this letter to you but I thought it well to record the legislative history and atmosphere surrounding the item in order that there may be no misunderstanding in the future.

Sincerely yours,

(S) Clarence Cannon,

Chairman.

